

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Adoption of Ordinance No. 338, a Public Hearing to consider a Development Code amendment to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services

PRESENTED BY: Tim Stewart, Planning Director
Jeffrey Thomas, Senior Planner

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

The issue before Council is an application to amend the Development Code to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan generally located at 2300 North 165th Street (see Attachment A1: Vicinity Map).

The site design of this Master Plan is based on the preferred alternative identified in the 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update for the First Northeast Transfer Station (see Attachment B, Exhibit 2: Master Plan Preferred Alternative Map).

The preferred alternative was analyzed for compatibility with the City of Shoreline Development Code standards and for on-site and off-site environmental impacts. The result was the creation of a specific set of development standards (see Attachment B, Exhibit 3: Master Plan Development Standards), to guide the future build out of the preferred alternative and to mitigate on-site and off-site environmental impacts. Together with the preferred alternative, these development standards form the Master Plan.

A Development Code amendment application is a Legislative Action which is reviewed by the Planning Commission, where an open record public hearing is conducted and a recommendation for action is forwarded to the City Council, who is the final decision making authority for such. A Development Code amendment application shall be evaluated using the three criteria detailed in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 20.30.350. The City Council may approve a Development Code amendment application if these criteria are met.

ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED:

The following options are within Council's discretion and have been analyzed by staff:

- The Council could adopt the Development Code amendment for the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan as requested by King County and recommended for approval with conditions by the Planning Commission and Staff through Ordinance No. 338 (Attachment B).

- The Council could adopt the Development Code amendment for the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan as requested by King County and recommended for approval with conditions by the Planning Commission and Staff with supplemental findings, conclusions and/or conditions.
- The Council could deny the Development Code amendment for the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan, which would require King County to make improvements consistent with the R-6 Zoning District land use review requirements and development standards.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

There are no direct financial impacts to the City.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Planning Commission and Staff recommend that Council adopt Ordinance No. 338, thereby approving the Development Code amendment for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan located generally at 2300 North 165th Street.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A: Planning Commission Staff Report, August 7, 2003
 - 1) Vicinity Map
 - 2) Existing Uses Map
 - 3) King County Public Involvement Process Summary
 - 4) King County Responses to Planning Commission Questions, August 6, 2003
 - 5) Planning Commission Staff Report, June 19, 2003
 - 6) Letters received during Public comment period
- Attachment B: Ordinance No. 338
 - Exhibit 1) Planning Commission Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation, August 7, 2003
 - Exhibit 2) Master Plan Development Standards
 - Exhibit 3) First Northeast Transfer Station Site Legal Description
- Attachment C: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
 - 1) August 7, 2003 – Draft
 - 2) June 19, 2003 – Approved

Approved By:

City Manager



City Attorney



Attachment A


Planning Commission Staff Report

August 7, 2003

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE: Legislative Public Hearing: A Development Code amendment to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan.

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services

PRESENTED BY: Jeffrey B. Thomas, Senior Planner 

I. PROPOSAL

This Development Code amendment, a Legislative or "Type L" action, before the Planning Commission is a request to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan located at 2300 North 165th Street. The site design of this Master Plan is based on the preferred alternative identified in the 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update for the First Northeast Transfer Station and is included as Attachment A.

The preferred alternative was analyzed for compatibility with the Development Code standards and for on-site and off-site environmental impacts. The result was the creation of a specific set of development standards, included as Attachment B, to guide the future build out of the preferred alternative and to mitigate on-site and off-site environmental impacts. Together with the preferred alternative, these development standards form the Master Plan.

II. HISTORY

The First Northeast Transfer Station is designated with selected other transfer stations in King County as capable of being expanded on-site. The purpose of this designation is to maximize existing transfer station sites by concentrating capital investment where significant improvements are physically possible and supported by the local jurisdiction.

It was determined as part of the 1994 King County Facility Master Plan that an upgrade to the existing transfer station building was not feasible, therefore a new enclosed transfer station building utilizing waste compaction technology and additional recycling capability was required.

The 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update focuses directly on operational, environmental and regulatory requirements as well as the input received from the existing neighborhood and facility users. The preferred alternative is seeking a "Silver Rating" in the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) sustainability rating system for environmental stewardship.

As part of the 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update, an extensive public involvement process was completed beginning in June of 2002. This process is summarized and included in Attachment C. In total, more than fifteen potential site design alternatives were developed and reviewed during the public involvement process. These alternatives contributed variations that were incorporated into the consensus, preferred alternative.

III. FINDINGS

1. SITE

The transfer station site is located in the Meridian Park Neighborhood. It is generally bounded by North 167th Street to the north, residential development along Meridian Avenue North to the west, I-5 to the east and North 165th Street, the King County Metro Transit North Base and a Seattle City Light Power Substation to the south. The primary access to the site is from North 165th Street via Meridian Avenue North, which is classified as a Minor Arterial by the Comprehensive Plan. The vicinity map, included as Attachment D, details the location of and access to the site.

The site is approximately 12 acres, of which approximately one third is impervious surface. Primary uses include the transfer station building located in the northeast corner of the site, the recycling area located in the southwest corner of the site and the weigh scales and house located adjacent to the recycling area. Thornton Creek enters the site in the northwest corner, flows generally south to southeast in an open channel before entering a culvert near the south property line and flowing onto the Metro Transit North Base site. A number of encroachments into the current 100' buffer width requirement for Thornton Creek exist, including a storm water detention pond and operational roads. A map detailing the existing uses at the site is included as Attachment E.

2. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) REVIEW

King County is the lead agency for the environmental review of this proposal. An environmental checklist, included as Attachment F, was prepared on March 19, 2003 and issued on April 17, 2003 with a SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS), which is included as Attachment G. A written response included as Attachment H was issued on July 17, 2003. This response specifically addresses the concerns detailed below expressed by the public during the review of the environmental checklist.

- Windblown refuse on Meridian Avenue North.
- Road kill on Meridian Avenue North.
- Long term operational truck noise and wear and tear on Meridian Avenue North.
- Addition of more recycling bins at the public recycle area to reduce traffic backup onto North 165th Street and Meridian Avenue North.
- Purchase of property on North 166th Street to permit the expansion of the public recycle area.
- Purchase of property on Meridian Avenue North.
- Provide a public viewing area within the Thornton Creek buffer area.

- Reroute all traffic to Interstate 5 via the King County Metro Transit North Base access ramps and a new over crossing.
- Relocate the transfer station or cover it with a roof and park.
- Upgrade North 167th Street with new sidewalks to reduce potential pedestrian impacts during construction.
- Minor inconsistencies in the environmental checklist related to truck volumes and access points during construction.

3. TIMING AND AUTHORITY

The Development Code amendment application was determined to be complete for processing on May 23, 2003. The Planning Commission Public Hearing commenced on June 19, 2003 for which the associated staff report (without attachments) is included as Attachment I and the meeting minutes are included as Attachment J.

This public hearing was continued to August 7, 2003. A notice of Public Hearing Continuation was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the site, advertised in the Seattle Times and Shoreline Enterprise and posted at the North 165th Street access to the site on July 24, 2003.

A Legislative Action is reviewed by the Planning Commission, where an open record public hearing is conducted and a recommendation for action is forwarded to the City Council, who is the final decision making authority for such. The City Council may choose to conduct a second open record public hearing prior to taking any action.

A Development Code amendment application shall be evaluated using the three criteria detailed in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 20.30.350. The City Council may approve a Development Code amendment application if the three criteria are met.

4. APPROVAL CRITERIA

The purpose of a Development Code amendment is to generally bring regulations into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan or to respond to changing conditions or needs. A Development Code amendment must meet the following criteria to be considered for approval:

Criteria 1: The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan designates the King County Transfer Station as an Essential Regional Public Facility and encourages the completion of a Master Plan for such. The Comprehensive Plan further describes the purpose of a Master Plan and how it is to be implemented:

EFP14: A Master Plan is encouraged for Essential Regional Public Facilities. The purpose of the Master Plan is to incorporate all proposed new development, redevelopment and/or expansion of an existing development. A Master Plan is a comprehensive long-range plan for the use of the property. Its purpose is to guide growth and development of the facility so that they serve their users and benefit the community.

EPF15: When a Master Plan is accepted by the City, an overlay designation will be placed upon the property, indicating that the Master Plan is the governing document for new development or redevelopment. Any proposed development that is not in the approved Master Plan will be considered under a Development Permit Application or a Special Use Permit and will be reviewed through the underlying Land Use Designation/Zoning regulations.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies a number of policies to help guide any future planning effort at the King County First Northeast Transfer Station:

- LU41: Ensure that existing industrial uses adjacent to I-5 drive access from that highway and mitigate their impacts on the adjacent land uses and City streets.
- T53.1 Encourage trucks and bus traffic to access the Metro Bus Barn and the Solid Waste Transfer Station from I-5 rather than from City neighborhoods.
- U24: Ensure appropriate mitigation of regional solid waste facilities for both the community and adjacent areas.

The preferred alternative will accommodate the rerouting of the large haul trucks used to export solid waste from the transfer station to the existing King County Metro Transit North Base I-5 connector ramps. Permission is currently being sought from the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) for this change. Internal roadways will avoid at-grade conflicts by using counter-clockwise circulation.

Mitigation standards, which may occur on-site and/or off-site are proposed for visual, noise and light environmental impacts from daily transfer station operations.

Criteria 2: The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

All approved development applications must meet the requirements of SMC 20.10.020 that states the general purpose of the Development Code is to "promote the public health, safety, and general welfare."

Future development applications to build out the Master Plan for the site shall show compliance with all applicable standards of the Development Code, including the standards proposed as part of the Master Plan as well as all other applicable plans and codes.

The dimensional development standards proposed for the Master Plan are detailed below in Figure 1 and compared with the dimensional development standards for the underlying R-6 Zoning District. The net change (+/-) is provided for reference.

Figure 1:

Development Standard	Proposed Master Plan	R-6 Zoning District	Change (+/-)
Min. Lot Width	100 ft	50 ft	+ 50 ft
Min. Lot Area	500,000 sq ft	7,200 sq ft	+ 492,800 sq ft
Min. Front Yard Setback	50 ft	20 ft	+ 30 ft
Min. Rear Yard Setback	50 ft	15 ft	+ 35 ft
Min. Side Yard Setback	50 ft	5 ft	+ 45 ft
Max. Building Height	n/a	35 ft	n/a
Max. Building Coverage	35%	35%	0
Max. Impervious Surface	50%	50%	0

The dimensional development standards proposed for the Master Plan generally provide for a much larger site with larger setbacks, while maintaining the maximum building coverage and impervious surface percentages of the R-6 Zoning District.

The proposed maximum building height of 85 feet encountered a number of application problems that led to supplemental analysis as to how can the building height be regulated at the site. Figure 2 compares four important elevations of the existing transfer station building to that of the proposed transfer station building. Although the proposed transfer station building is not yet designed, these elevations are considered to be "maximums" and will easily accommodate the final design.

Figure 2:

Max. Building Height Development Standard	Proposed Building	Existing Building	Cumulative Change (+/-)
Tunnel Floor Elevation	366 ft	370 ft	- 4 ft
Tipping Floor Elevation	396 ft	387 ft	+ 9 ft
Eave Line Elevation	426 ft	411 ft	+ 15 ft
Roof Peak Elevation	446 ft	420 ft	+ 26 ft

Existing encroachments into the current 100' buffer width requirement for Thornton Creek will be removed and the subject areas will be restored to the greatest possible extent at a time to be determined in conjunction with future construction schedules.

Storm water quality and management facilities will be upgraded and integrated into the site landscaping and habitat management plans to complement Thornton Creek and its buffer.

Criteria 3: The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

The site is currently and will remain in the R-6 Zoning District. Any applicable development standards for a proposal at the site that are not included in this Development Code amendment application default back to the development standards of the existing zoning district.

The current uses at the site are not changing, but being reconfigured and expanded to accommodate future, increased solid waste volume projections. New compaction technology will be used in the proposed transfer station building. Yard waste will be separated from other solid waste and recycling opportunities will be increased. The transfer station building will be enclosed to reduce on-site and off-site environmental impacts and the recycling area will be covered for customer convenience.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. **Consistency** - The proposed Development Code amendment is consistent with the designation of the site as an Essential Regional Public Facility, identified future land use patterns, applicable Master Plan policies and transfer station policies of the City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan.
2. **Compatibility** - The proposed Development Code amendment will continue to allow the site to function as an Essential Regional Public Facility and operate the existing primary uses. Mitigation is proposed for the resulting environmental impacts from the site. A condition to ensure completion of the proposed mitigation for the Thornton Creek buffer is required.
3. **Supplemental Analysis** - The maximum building height can be regulated with greater accuracy and efficiency by using elevations instead of a numeric height. A numeric height requires the calculation of average existing grades around a building footprint, which could increase the possible height of a structure on a site with existing berms. Elevations establish maximums that will not change with alterations on a site.
4. **Environmental Review** - A SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS) was issued on April 17, 2003 for which King County was the lead agency.

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLE AND OPTIONS

As this is a Legislative action, the Planning Commission is required to conduct an open record public hearing on the proposal. The Commission should consider the proposal, any received written public comments as well as any public testimony and develop a recommendation for Development Code amendment approval or denial. The City Council will then consider this recommendation prior to making the final decision on this proposal.

Planning Commission has the following options to consider for the proposal:

1. Recommend approval for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on the findings presented in this report.
2. Recommend approval with specific conditions for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on the findings presented in this report.
3. Recommend denial for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on specific findings made by the Planning Commission.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission move to recommend to the City Council approval with specific conditions of the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street and enter into findings based on the information presented in this report that the proposal meets the decision criteria for a Development Code amendment as detailed in SMC 20.30.350.


The specific conditions accompanying this approval recommendation include:

1. The proposed mitigation for the Thornton Creek buffer shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new transfer station building.
2. The proposed maximum building height of 85 feet shall be deleted.
3. The new transfer station building shall have a maximum eave line elevation of 426 feet and a maximum roof peak elevation of 446 feet.
4. The maximum building height for any other structure at the site shall be 35 feet as calculated by SMC 20.50.050.

VII. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Proposed Preferred Alternative Map
Attachment B: Proposed Development Standards
Attachment C: Public Involvement Process Summary
Attachment D: Vicinity Map
Attachment E: Existing Uses Map
Attachment F: SEPA Environmental Checklist
Attachment G: SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance
Attachment H: SEPA Environmental Checklist Written Response
Attachment I: Planning Commission Staff Report, June 19, 2003
Attachment J: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes, June 19, 2003



SW 1/4 OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 26 N, RANGE 4 E, W.M.
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON



First Northeast Transfer Station

Vicinity Map

Project Address: 2300 North 165th Street




201219




KPG
Architecture
Landscape Architecture
Civil Engineering
Urban Design
Issued: August 7, 2002

Figure 1



First Northeast Transfer Station Existing Site



KPG
Architecture
Landscape Architecture
Civil Engineering
Urban Design
Issued: August 1, 2002

Figure 2



King County

Department of
Natural Resources and Parks
Solid Waste Division

1st NE Transfer Station Facility Master Plan

FMP Public Involvement Process

As part of the 1st NE Transfer Station Facility Master Plan (FMP) update process, the Solid Waste Division (SWD) initiated a public involvement process in June 2002.

Three public meetings were held:

- June 18, 2002
- September 26, 2002
- December 4, 2002

Public meeting notices were mailed to more than 1200 residences surrounding the transfer station. Meeting fliers were also distributed at the transfer station and were available at the King County libraries in Shoreline and Lake Forest Park. Notice was published in the Shoreline/Lake Forest Park Enterprise, posted on SWD's website and on the City of Shoreline's Government Access Channel and website. Prior to the second public meeting, a press release was published in the Shoreline Enterprise

Approximately two dozen residents attended the first public meeting. About a dozen attended the second and third meetings. At the first public meeting, residents were asked if they were interested in forming a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to work closely with SWD on the FMP. Interest was expressed and names for CAC members were solicited from the City's of Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, and Kenmore, the Shoreline School District, Shoreline Chamber of Commerce, commercial haulers, neighborhood groups, and Thornton Creek groups. A list of CAC members is attached.

Four CAC meetings were held:

- August 14, 2002
- September 18, 2002
- October 16, 2002
- November 20, 2002

Concerns/issues expressed at the public and CAC meetings:

- Protect Thornton Creek and habitat; keep green area integrated with storm water ponds to create bigger habitat.
- Don't construct a bridge over the creek.
- Enhance recycling to improve access and add additional bins in order to accept wider variety of materials, including yard waste.
- Use I-5 ramps.
- Concerned about increased traffic, odors and noise.
- Do not want transfer station service area to expand.
- Do not create crossover traffic; provide adequate queuing space; and separate commercial traffic from self-haul traffic.
- Stay open during construction.
- Coordinate with other large construction projects scheduled in the area so projects don't overlap.
- Buy adjacent properties (private and public) if it will help protect the creek, reduce queuing and provide more opportunity for recycling.

The public and CAC processes resulted in the proposed design alternative.

SWD received applause at the last public meeting for listening and responding to residents' concerns/issues.

CAC members expressed appreciation for SWD's care and protection of the environment. The CAC has indicated its satisfaction with the proposed design.

Additional FMP Presentations:

- March 4, 2002: Shoreline City Council
- March 17, 2003: Shoreline City Council
- May 1, 2003: Joint Open House with Shoreline Planning Commission
- June 19, 2003: Shoreline Planning Commission Public Hearing
- August 7, 2003: Shoreline Planning Commission Public Hearing

1st NE Transfer Station Facility Master Plan Implementation Project

Citizen Advisory Committee

Members

Dennis Lee
Shirley Fullerton
Rika Cecil
Steve Goldstein
Pete Prekeges
Tim Crosby
Bruce Bentley
Richard Decker
Patty Crawford
Janet Way
Matthew Loper
Hon. Elodie Morse

Affiliation

Shoreline, Self Hauler
Lake Forest Park, Self Hauler
City of Shoreline
Arts
Neighbor
Waste Management rep
Rabanco rep
Meridian Park Neighborhood
Parkwood Neighborhood
Thornton Creek rep
Thornton Creek rep
City of Kenmore

FMP Questions
(8/06)

1. Will the master plan improvements set us up to take a proportionately larger share of the waste stream than we are getting now? How can we be assured that more of other people's garbage (i.e. Bothell or Kenmore) is not being diverted our way? Shoreline is largely built out, whereas there is more developable land in Kenmore/Bothell...this seems to indicate that the bulk of future increases to the waste stream will be from outside Shoreline. Should this waste stream be at least partially routed to other transfer stations?

Answer:

The improvements specified in the FMP are based on projections from this service area. The improvements are not designed to attract customers from outside the service area. The Division does not, however, place restrictions on which facilities our customers may choose. The Division is evaluating service needs for the rest of the system and will be proposing improvements to other transfer stations in the County.

2. I believe "private" access to the I-5 ramps was interpreted to include personal vehicles, such as pick up trucks. How feasible would it be to limit "private" I-5 access to only commercial waste haulers operating in King County, such as Waste Mgmt? Would FHWA possibly go for this?

Answer:

It is not feasible. WSDOT has told the County that further increases in use of the ramps will not be permitted for vehicles other than County transfer trucks. As currently proposed, the ramps will serve regional traffic: solid waste transfer trailers hauling refuse from Shoreline to a regional disposal facility. Use of the regional transportation system for this purpose is acceptable. Allowing waste haulers to use the ramps would move local traffic (haulers collecting in the neighborhoods) to the regional freeway. Also, it could attract haulers from farther away to come to the site.

3. What assurance do we have that operational capacity increases to our transfer station will not be used to accept waste (collected by commercial waste haulers) from south Snohomish County? I realize that (right now) only King County commercial haulers are allowed. Nevertheless, I believe planners see it as a positive to look at regional solutions, which means to me that capacity improvements in Shoreline may make some sort of future agreement with Snohomish County more appealing for regional officials to pursue? If this is a possible outcome, let's get it on the table for discussion now.

Answer:

King County and Snohomish County operate separate systems. Snohomish County is making its own investments in its Southwest Transfer Station in Mountlake Terrace and its Paine Field transfer station to accommodate population growth in those service areas.

4. Will the new transfer station be one uniquely designed for us, or a standardized design used at multiple sites, but with minor site modifications? This will affect how much design influence we might have over the Shoreline facility.

Answer:

The design will be unique to the site. It will build upon lessons learned at other sites, and ideas developed here may be used elsewhere. The site, however, is unique.

5. How will the new weighing/ticketing system prevent back ups at the scale house and traffic back ups affecting Meridian traffic? Any study data to support this?

Answer:

Future improvements in the weighing/ticketing system are being considered, but have not yet been included in the specific design. These improvements include use of emerging technology including transponders for commercial haulers, and "swipe card" billing for regular customers. These emerging technologies are expected to improve circulation through the scale house.

6. Are solid waste growth rates cited in the County-wide solid waste master plan premised solely on # of trips? Is there a growth estimate measured in cubic yard (volumetric) growth? I believe an average person would view a large rumbling tractor trailer "trip" as being significantly different from a trip by a Toyota pickup. Is there a breakout of the percentage of trips attributable to (1) private citizen/small business pick ups and trailers, (2) commercial municipal waste haulers (like Waste Mgmt or Rabanco) and (3) bulk transfer container trucks? Are the growth rates derived or taken from other growth planning documents, or did Solid Waste formulate their own?

Answer:

Solid waste forecasts are based on an economic model and predict total collected tonnages. Factors that are included in the analysis are service area population, job market (number and type of employment), household size, per capita income, disposal fees, and accepted wastes.

For 2000, 96% of the transactions (vehicles entering the station) were self-haulers and 4% were commercial haulers. By tonnage, 57% of the collected waste was from self-haulers, and 43% was from commercial haulers. (King County Solid Waste Division Final 2000 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, Table 6-3.)

7. A friend of mine who regularly hauls stuff had these 3 concerns about the 1st NE Transfer Station: (a) the expense is higher than Seattle; (b) the yard waste isn't separated; and (c) the lines are too long. Therefore, he uses Seattle's instead. It would seem like this proposal addresses (b) and could address (c).

Answer:

The County Solid Waste Division and the City of Seattle's Solid Waste Management are independent agencies and have different rate structures. The County rates are set by the County Council and are based on many factors. Separate yard waste collection is a feature of the new design. The proposed facility will also handle traffic more efficiently reducing waiting time.

8. Letter from Larry Bendiksen said that the site will be open during the improvement with the traffic being re-routed during the construction. It sounded to me that whether the site will be

open or not during construction has not been determined...if this is the case, then any re-route probably hasn't been determined, either. It would seem that closure would be the best course of action, but do we have any say in suggesting this?

Answer:

The Division has not yet determined whether there will be closures during construction.

9. Letter from Lynn Grigsby triggered a question about screening...is there going to be screening, e.g. a line of trees, on the north edge of the property? She asked about open waste pits...it didn't sound like this was going to be the case. She asked about sound/noise insulation...it seemed like this would be controlled via having a covered dumping area, an enclosed compacted area. Perhaps the open sides of this could be towards the freeway and the electrical substation (from northeast to southwest orientation)?

Answer:

As described in SEPA checklist the project includes several noise mitigation features. The noise wall at the north side of the property will be retained, or replaced with a new wall comparable to the existing wall. The main transfer building will be moved to the center of the property. It will be fully enclosed. The trailer yard will be depressed with the open side facing I-5. There will not be any "open pits". The yard waste area at the north side of the facility will be enclosed.

10. Letter from Riva Zeff suggested that King County is planning to close other transfer stations...if so, which ones (it didn't sound like any others were being closed)? She inquired about having this underground...it sounded like this was going to be the case. She suggested a rooftop garden...to me, this seemed impractical due to the gas and smell that Mr. Medrash mentioned.

Answer:

The Division is not currently considering complete closure of any facility. We are looking at operating hours and may reduce operating hours or close the less used rural facilities on certain days. These actions will not affect customers in the 1st NE Transfer Station service area.

A rooftop garden would not be practical because the rooftop will be relatively small and elevated above the surrounding grades.

11. Page 21: why are no other plastics able to be recycled (#3-4-5-6)?

Answer:

Recycling is limited to those materials for which there is an existing market. Specific commodities to be recycled will be reassessed based on market conditions on facility opening. As the recycling market evolves over the station lifetime, so will the collected materials. The expanded recycling capacities are designed to provide for these future needs.

12. Page 22: How were these operating hours chosen? Could they be advanced forward 1 hour to 9 a.m.-7 p.m. to: (a) avoid conflict with school-age children, most of whom are in school before 9 a.m.; and (b) enable working folks to bring their loads in during the week rather than having to wait for the weekend? Are these hours adjusted for daylight saving time? Is the sound limit for "daytime" considered from sunrise to dusk or ?

Answer:

There may be some flexibility on operating hours. Be aware however that the commercial haulers begin service early and they would be significantly affected. Regarding noise regulations, "daytime" is defined by City and County ordinances as being 7:00 am - 10:00 pm on weekdays, and 9:00 am - 10:00 pm on weekends.

13. Page 24: From the open house, it seemed that the issue of potentially heating of the stream had been addressed...perhaps this should be mentioned "on the record." The issue is that just a seemingly-minor increase of the temperature of the stream can result in fish dying.

Answer:

The proposed riparian planting along the creek and the buffer landscaping will provide improved shading of the creek, reducing solar heating of the creek flows. The onsite stormwater facilities will be designed to meet or exceed all current requirements.

14. Page 31: Why can't all of the lighting be shielded?

Answer:

Glare levels will be kept as low as possible considering safety and operational needs. All light fixtures will be designed to focus light onto areas where lighting is needed without directing light toward residences or into the night sky. Lighting efficiency is one of the key elements of the LEED certification program being implemented by the Division for this project. The LEED design goals for light and glare control exceed the current standards.

15. Page 32: Describe what "buffer averaging" is?

Answer:

Buffer averaging is the process where a buffer width is reduced in some locations and expanded in others. This typically accommodates minor encroachments. On the 1st NE Transfer Station site it could accommodate public viewing areas or other desirable site features that would otherwise be infeasible. The buffer width may not be reduced by more than 25%, and the total area contained within the buffer after averaging is no less than that contained within the standard buffer prior to averaging. Proposed buffer averaging would be reviewed by staff during the permitting process. (See Shoreline Municipal Code, §20.80.480 *Required buffer areas.*)

16. Page 33: How are vehicle trips reduced?

Answer:

The Division's policy is to encourage users to subscribe to curbside service, and to expand such services to make it convenient and cost-effective. The Division is also evaluating alternative price structures to encourage self-haulers to subscribe.

17. Page 34: Elaborate on direct access pursued. The Metro ramps would be used by the trucks that haul the garbage out of the site? Any other uses? The citizens suggested an extension of the onramp at 175th, in other words a separate ramp. Is this practical given the limitations as to how far between one exit to another. My concern about any shift of traffic to I-5 is then the debris (mattresses, sofas, etc.) that these citizens are concerned about would then be along I-5,

where traffic is moving considerably faster than on Meridian Avenue North. However, I could see where traffic departing the transfer station-particularly on weekends, when Metro bus traffic to/from the bus base is lighter, could be directed out onto the Metro base I-5 onramps...any chance of this?

Answer:

Please see the previous discussion on WSDOT's restriction of I-5 access. Additional access to I-5, beyond the possible routing the solid waste transfer trailers to the Metro Ramps, is not feasible and would not be permitted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

18. Comment from John Delano was that capacity at the station is being increased 3 times...true?

Answer:

The proposed station offers expanded services with separate yard waste collection and recycling facilities. Additionally, the facility provides for additional tipping stalls to reduce queuing and improve service. However, the station design capacity is based on projected waste collection in 2030 of 83,000 tons, which is a 41% increase over the 59,000 tons collected in 2002.

19. Comment from Kay Pethe suggested that King County is going to close site to self haulers except at certain times...true? Can the movement through the facility be improved with the swipe card system she mentioned?

Answer:

The Division is not considering restricting access by self-haulers. The Division is considering emerging technologies including swipe-card systems for frequent customers, and transponders for commercial haulers. These technologies will improve circulation of inbound traffic through the scale house.

20. Comment from Janet Way was a concern about increasing the impervious surface...if so, how much is this being increased.

Answer:

As described in SEPA checklist the facility design will provide a significant benefit to water quality in Thornton Creek. Although impervious surface will be increased from the current 35% up to 45%, the new facility will include a modern stormwater detention and treatment system, to replace the existing stormwater system that provides negligible detention and treatment. The current detention standards attempt to mimic the hydrology of native forest conditions, prior to modern development.

21. Comment from Jan Trowbridge re: getting out of the facility (making left turns). Can we make the exit a right turn only, or is this practical? Is a right turn channel (on 165th) practical? Is a left turn channel on southbound Meridian practical? Can there be 2 incoming lanes? What other methods are being used to improve flow through the facility? Would it make more sense to have the yard waste recycling closer to the other recycling?

Answer:

A traffic signal warrant analysis for NE 165th Street and Meridian was prepared and was included as Appendix I of the FMP. Based on the state criteria (including traffic counts), the

intersection does not warrant a signal (i.e., a signal would not be an appropriate and would interfere with traffic flow).

Additionally, a general traffic study was prepared and is included in the Environmental Checklist as Appendix D. The study concluded the proposal would have no significant adverse impact on traffic, and may improve traffic due to better onsite circulation and decreased queuing.

22. Perhaps we could have Rika Cecil comment on their experience on the CAC...maybe if we had some better idea of what areas they covered, we'd avoid covering the same (e.g., perhaps many/all of my questions above have been asked and satisfactorily answered already)?

Answer:

Please also refer to the Agenda Attachment C: Public Involvement Process Summary, and the FMP Appendix B: Public Involvement Process Meeting Exhibits and Notes (copy distributed by staff).

23. How can existing conditions described be handled...blowing trash, rodent control, uncovered loads? Can the site have an officer present to cite those with uncovered loads, at least on a regular basis if not daily?

Answer:


Most problems with trash on city streets are caused by uncovered loads on self-hauler trucks. Uncovered loads are not legal in the City of Shoreline, and the City is encouraged to take appropriate steps to enforce these laws. The scale house operators also have the authority to charge a significant surcharge for uncovered loads. The Division has always staffed its own cleanup crew to respond to citizen requests for prompt cleanup of trash along access routes, and the Division is working with the City to ensure that residents along Meridian are given the Division's direct telephone number to request cleanup by that crew. Similarly, residents along Meridian will be given the direct telephone number for the County Health Department animal control division, which will provide prompt cleanup of road kill upon request.

Planning Commission Meeting Date: June 19, 2003

**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON**

AGENDA TITLE: Legislative Public Hearing: A Development Code amendment to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan.

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Development Services

PRESENTED BY: Jeffrey B. Thomas, Senior Planner 

I. PROPOSAL

This Development Code amendment, a Legislative or "Type L" action, before the Planning Commission is a request to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan located at 2300 North 165th Street. The site design of this Master Plan is based on the preferred alternative identified in the 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update for the First Northeast Transfer Station and is included as Attachment A.

The preferred alternative was analyzed for compatibility with the Development Code standards and for on-site and off-site environmental impacts. The result was the creation of a specific set of development standards, included as Attachment B, to guide the future build out of the preferred alternative and to mitigate on-site and off-site environmental impacts. Together with the preferred alternative, these development standards form the Master Plan.

II. HISTORY

The First Northeast Transfer Station is designated with selected other transfer stations in King County as capable of being expanded on-site. The purpose of this designation is to maximize existing transfer station sites by concentrating capital investment where significant improvements are physically possible and supported by the local jurisdiction.

It was determined as part of the 1994 King County Facility Master Plan that an upgrade to the existing transfer station building was not feasible, therefore a new enclosed transfer station building utilizing waste compaction technology and additional recycling capability was required.

The 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update focuses directly on operational, environmental and regulatory requirements as well as the input received from the existing neighborhood and facility users. The preferred alternative is seeking a "Silver Rating" in the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) sustainability rating system for environmental stewardship.

Prior to proceeding with the 2003 King County Facility Master Plan Update, an extensive public outreach process was conducted. Public outreach included conduction of community information and input meetings, the formation of a Citizen Advisory Committee to supplement the input of the community meetings and the conduction of an Eco Charrette. In total, more than fifteen potential site design alternatives were developed and reviewed during the public outreach process. These alternatives contributed variations that were incorporated into the consensus, preferred alternative.

III. FINDINGS

1. SITE

The transfer station site is located in the Meridian Park Neighborhood. It is generally bounded by North 167th Street to the north, residential development along Meridian Avenue North to the west, I-5 to the east and North 165th Street, the King County Metro Transit North Base and a Seattle City Light Power Substation to the south. The primary access to the site is from North 165th Street via Meridian Avenue North, which is classified as a Minor Arterial by the Comprehensive Plan. The vicinity map, included as Attachment C, details the location of and access to the site.

The site is approximately 12 acres, of which approximately one third is impervious surface. Primary uses include the transfer station building located in the northeast corner of the site, the recycling area located in the southwest corner of the site and the weigh scales and house located adjacent to the recycling area. Thornton Creek enters the site in the northwest corner, flows generally south to southeast in an open channel before entering a culvert near the south property line and flowing onto the Metro Transit North Base site. A number of encroachments into the current 100' buffer width requirement for Thornton Creek exist, including a storm water detention pond and operational roads. A map detailing the existing uses at the site is included as Attachment D.

2. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) REVIEW

King County is the lead agency for the environmental review of this proposal. A SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS) was issued on April 17, 2003 and is included as Attachment E.

3. TIMING AND AUTHORITY

The Development Code amendment application was determined to be complete for processing on May 23, 2003. A notice of application and public hearing was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the site, advertised in the Seattle Times and Shoreline Enterprise and posted at the North 165th Street access to the site on June 5, 2003. The notice included a solicitation for written public comments.

At the time of the issuance of this report, no written public comments have been received (the written public comment deadline of June 19, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. is after the issuance date of this report). Written public comments received after the issuance of this report will be forwarded to the Planning Commission at the Public Hearing.

A Legislative Action is reviewed by the Planning Commission, where an Open Record Public Hearing is conducted and a recommendation for action is forwarded to the City Council, who is the final decision making authority for such. The City Council may choose to conduct a second Open Record Public Hearing prior to taking any action.

A Development Code amendment application shall be evaluated using the three criteria detailed in Shoreline Municipal Code (SMC) 20.30.350. The City Council may approve a Development Code amendment application if the three criteria are met.

4. APPROVAL CRITERIA

The purpose of a Development Code amendment is to generally bring regulations into conformance with the Comprehensive Plan or to respond to changing conditions or needs. A Development Code amendment must meet the following criteria to be considered for approval:

Criteria 1: The amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan designates the King County Transfer Station as an Essential Regional Public Facility and encourages the completion of a Master Plan for such. The Comprehensive Plan further describes the purpose of a Master Plan and how it is to be implemented:

EFP14: A Master Plan is encouraged for Essential Regional Public Facilities. The purpose of the Master Plan is to incorporate all proposed new development, redevelopment and/or expansion of an existing development. A Master Plan is a comprehensive long-range plan for the use of the property. Its purpose is to guide growth and development of the facility so that they serve their users and benefit the community.

EPF15: When a Master Plan is accepted by the City, an overlay designation will be placed upon the property, indicating that the Master Plan is the governing document for new development or redevelopment. Any proposed development that is not in the approved Master Plan will be considered under a Development Permit Application or a Special Use Permit and will be reviewed through the underlying Land Use Designation/Zoning regulations.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies a number of policies to help guide any future planning effort at the King County First Northeast Transfer Station:

LU41: Ensure that existing industrial uses adjacent to I-5 drive access from that highway and mitigate their impacts on the adjacent land uses and City streets.

T53.1 Encourage trucks and bus traffic to access the Metro Bus Barn and the Solid Waste Transfer Station from I-5 rather than from City neighborhoods.

U24: Ensure appropriate mitigation of regional solid waste facilities for both the community and adjacent areas.

The preferred alternative will accommodate the rerouting of the large haul trucks used to export solid waste from the transfer station to the existing King County Metro Transit North Base I-5 connector ramps. Permission is currently being sought from the Washington State Department of Transportation for this change. Internal roadways will avoid at-grade conflicts by using counter-clockwise circulation.

Mitigation standards, which may occur on-site and/or off-site are proposed for visual, noise and light environmental impacts from daily transfer station operations.

Criteria 2: The amendment will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.

All approved development applications must meet the requirements of SMC 20.10.020 that states the general purpose of the Development Code is to "promote the public health, safety, and general welfare."

Future development applications to build out the Master Plan for the site shall show compliance with all applicable standards of the Development Code, including the standards proposed as part of the Master Plan as well as all other applicable plans and codes.

The dimensional development standards proposed for the Master Plan are detailed below in Figure 1 and compared with the dimensional development standards for the underlying R-6 Zoning District. The net change (+/-) is provided for reference.

Figure1:

Development Standard	Proposed Master Plan	R-6 Zoning District	Change (+/-)
Min. Lot Width	100 ft	50 ft	+ 50 ft
Min. Lot Area	500,000 sq ft	7,200 sq ft	+ 492,800 sq ft
Min. Front Yard Setback	50 ft	20 ft	+ 30 ft
Min. Rear Yard Setback	50 ft	15 ft	+ 35 ft
Min. Side Yard Setback	50 ft	5 ft	+ 45 ft
Max. Building Height	85 ft	35 ft	+ 50 ft
Max. Building Coverage	35%	35%	0
Max. Impervious Surface	50%	50%	0

The dimensional development standards proposed for the Master Plan generally provide a larger site with larger setbacks, while maintaining the maximum building coverage and impervious surface percentages. A larger maximum height is required to accommodate a new transfer station building. The existing transfer station building is approximately 45 feet in height from the tunnel floor.

Existing encroachments into the current 100' buffer width requirement for Thornton Creek will be removed and the subject areas will be restored to the greatest possible extent.

Storm water quality and management facilities will be upgraded and integrated into the site landscaping and habitat management plans to complement Thornton Creek and its buffer.

Criteria 3: The amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens and property owners of the City of Shoreline.

The site is currently and will remain in the R-6 Zoning District. Any applicable development standards for a proposal at the site that are not included in this Development Code amendment application default back to the development standards of the existing zoning district.

The current uses at the site are not changing, but being reconfigured and expanded to accommodate future, increased solid waste volume projections. Yard waste will be separated from other solid waste and recycling opportunities will be increased. The transfer station building will be enclosed to reduce on-site and off-site environmental impacts and the recycling area will be covered for customer convenience.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. **Consistency** - The proposed Development Code amendment is consistent with the designation of the site as an Essential Regional Public Facility, identified future land use patterns, applicable Master Plan policies and transfer station policies of the City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan.
2. **Compatibility** - The proposed Development Code amendment will continue to allow the site to function as an Essential Regional Public Facility and operate the existing primary uses. Mitigation standards are proposed for the environmental impacts from daily transfer station operations.
3. **Environmental Review** - A SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS) was issued on April 17, 2003 for which King County was the lead agency.

V. PLANNING COMMISSION ROLE AND OPTIONS

As this is a Legislative action, the Planning Commission is required to conduct an Open Record Public Hearing on the proposal. The Commission should consider the proposal, any received written public comments as well as any public testimony and develop a recommendation for Development Code amendment approval or denial. The City Council will then consider this recommendation prior to making the final decision on this proposal.

Planning Commission has the following options to consider for the proposal:

1. Recommend approval for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on the findings presented in this report.
2. Recommend approval with specific conditions for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on the findings presented in this report.
3. Recommend denial for the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street based on specific findings made by the Planning Commission.

VI. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission move to recommend to the City Council that the Development Code amendment to adopt a Master Plan for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station for the properties generally located at 2300 North 165th Street and enter into findings based on the information presented in this report that the proposal meets the decision criteria for a Development Code amendment as detailed in SMC 20.30.350.

VII. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Proposed Preferred Alternative Map
Attachment B: Proposed Development Standards
Attachment C: Vicinity Map
Attachment D: Existing Uses Map
Attachment E: SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance

Note: No written public comments were received as of June 12, 2003, the issuance date of this report. Any written public comments received prior to the deadline of June 19, 2003 at 5:00 p.m. will be forwarded to the Planning Commission at the Open Record Public Hearing.

City of Shoreline
Planning and Development Services
6-16-03


I am a resident of the Meridian Park Neighborhood. This is a comment to your proposed remodel of the transfer station. I am in favor of the remodel, but your proposal adversely affects the quality of life of this neighborhood in the following manners:

- 1) Meridian Ave, north and south, is one of the main arterials in the Shoreline area. It is very busy, with traffic stopping up during rush hours, and other times. This makes turns onto Meridian and traffic flow very difficult. The proposal to keep access on Meridian, would further impede traffic flow. This will be increased as the County plans to close other transfer stations so more people will be using this station and this road.
- 2) Due to increased traffic, the noise level from Meridian will be greatly increased, as will the garbage that is in the area. No matter the law that says garbage must be covered as it is transported, it is not. If you drive near the station on any day, you will find garbage on the street from traffic using this station. This adversely impacts real estate value, quality of life in the neighborhood and pride in our community. Garbage on the streets only adds to people not caring for their property.
- 3) Increased garbage, adds to an increased rodent population. You can find dead animals on the road at all times.

PROPOSAL:

I propose this station should be an underground facility, that King County and Shoreline close traffic from Meridian Ave to the dump from Meridian and route it via I-5 exits. The bus barn already has an exit from the freeway that feeds directly into its facility without impeding the freeway traffic. Your station is adjacent and directly north of the bus barn. Traffic for the transfer station can use these same roads (from the freeway) without impacting freeway or the bus barn, and thus keep Meridian Ave free for residential traffic.

It would also be nice if King County's plan could include a rooftop garden such as one that Metro has implemented. This would add a park space, room for sports fields (sorely needed) and a place for community residents to enjoy.




Conclusion:


Shoreline can be a nice place to live. It advertises itself as such with a good quality of life. This should not be for only residents of Innis Arden or Richmond Beach, but for all of Shoreline. It is enough you have strip joints and gambling one block from a high school. If the proposed plan is put into effect, this part of Shoreline will be traffic glutted, dirty community, with low property values. Not a quality of life for affordable and quality living for families.

Please call me if you have questions at 542-1347.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Riva Zeff'.

Riva Zeff
2009 N 164th Pl
Shoreline, Wash. 98133



June 12, 2003

King County
Department of
Natural Resources and Parks
Solid Waste Division

Subject: First NE Transfer Station Improvement Project

Dear Sir or Madam:


I would like to compliment all of those who have been involved in designing this proposed project. Hats off to you all. The project takes the environment into consideration along with the style of the finished product. Job well done.


I have some concerns on how this project will be set in motion. I understand that the Transfer Station will be open during the improvement. With twenty years of experience in construction, it would be more efficient to close the transfer station during the improvements. This would expedite the time it will take to complete the project not to mention the savings of taxpayer's money.

I am also concerned with the fact while the station will stay open during the improvements: the private sector of traffic will be redirected, to enter the station, down 167th street. Doing this will affect several residence's living on this street along with two adjoining cul-de-sacs. This will substantially increase traffic horrifically, not to mention the increased danger for the number of children living in these cul-de-sacs.

I propose for the City of Shoreline to reconsider leaving this transfer station open during improvements to close until completed. There are other transfer stations that can accommodate those in need for this short period of time during this development.

Thank you,


Larry Bendiksen
16733 Corliss Ave. N
Shoreline, WA 98133



June 16, 2003

City of Shoreline
Planning & Development Services Dept.
17544 Midvale Avenue North
Shoreline, WA 98133

Re: Comments on Master Plan Amendment Proposal for King County Solid Waster Transfer Station at Meridian Avenue North and North 165th/167th Streets, Shoreline, Washington

To Whom It May Concern:

As property owner of 1840 N. 165th Street (single family dwelling), I am very concerned that any modifications made to the Solid Waste Facility be sure to **LESSEN** negative property effects for those of us who live directly across the street from the site.

Construction should be timed and phased with as little disruption to the existing neighborhood as possible. As a property owner, I am concerned that the updating of the transfer station might devalue my home. I am a divorced woman, single parent. I am looking at putting my home on the market in 2005. I am very concerned that the construction will create an unsightly mess and that the updated facility will negatively impact the neighborhood, preventing me from getting top market value for my property, which is the only asset of any value that I have.

Also, please consider the following:

- No open waste pits; everything covered to keep rodents and other animals away from the site
- Proper and plentiful landscaping at the entrance, along the street, and on top of the enclosed facility
- A public grounds/park built on the top of the covered facility to enhance property values in the area, not decrease them
- **All trucks enter to and from the site from I-5, not Meridian**
- Proper sound/noise insulation at the public re-cycle bins to prevent increased noise on weekends and evenings.

March 21, 2003


Page 2.

Please register these concerns with the Shoreline City Council and keep the concerns of the property owners across the street from the Transfer Station foremost in the minds of the City when approving of King Country's plans.

Thank you for your consideration.


Mrs. Lynn Grigsby
1840 N. 165th Street
Shoreline, WA 98133

cc: Mr. Fatin Kara, Construction Coordinator
King Country Solid Waste Division
201 South Jackson St., Suite 701
Seattle, WA 98104



June 17, 2003

City of Shoreline
Planning and Development
Services department
17544 Midvale Ave N.
Shoreline, WA 98133

I am writing to voice my opposition to the planned changes of the King County Solid Waste Transfer Station located between I-5 and Meridian Ave N., south of N. 167th Street.

I feel that the proposed changes will adversely affect the neighborhood with increased traffic, noise and pollution. If the proposed changes must be made, I would suggest that the truck traffic to the station be required to access the Transfer Station from the existing Metro on and off ramps from the I-5 freeway. This would at least reduce the traffic and noise on Meridian Avenue.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Boyd J. Brannan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Boyd J. Brannan
2001 N. 164th Place
Shoreline, WA 98133

Attachment B

Ordinance 338

ORDINANCE NO. 338

**AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON
AMENDING THE CITY'S DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADOPT THE
KING COUNTY FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION MASTER
PLAN GENERALLY LOCATED AT 2300 NORTH 165TH STREET**

WHEREAS, certain properties used for the King County First Northeast Transfer Station, located at 2300 North 165th Street, Shoreline, WA, are designated on the Comprehensive Plan Map as Essential Regional Public Facilities; and

WHEREAS, owners of these properties, with tax parcel numbers 2065600020, 2065600030, 2065600035, 5727500380, 5727500390 and 5727500410, have filed an application to amend the City's Development Code to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 19, 2003 and August 7, 2003, public hearings on the application to amend the City's Development Code to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan were held before the Planning Commission for the City of Shoreline pursuant to notice as required by law; and

WHEREAS, on August 7, 2003, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions to amend the City's Development Code to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan and entered findings and conclusions based thereon in support of that recommendation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council does concur with the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the Planning Commission, specifically that to amend the City's Development Code to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan generally located at 2300 North 165th Street is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and appropriate for this site;

**NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE DO
ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. Findings. The Findings and Recommendation on File No. 201219 as set forth by the Planning Commission on August 7, 2003 and as attached hereto as Exhibit 1 are hereby adopted.

Section 2. New Chapter and Zoning Map Amendment..

- A. The Development Code, Shoreline Municipal Code Title 20, is hereby amended by adding a new Chapter 20.100 Special Districts, Subchapter 1, *the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan* as set forth in Exhibit 2 .

Chapter 20.100 Special Districts

20.100.010 First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan

The First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan, given *Clerk's Receiving Number 2346* is adopted herein by reference.

- B. The Shoreline Zoning Map is amended to designate the area generally located at 2300 North 165th Street (tax parcel numbers 2065600020, 2065600030, 2065600035, 5727500380, 5727500390 and 5727500410) and further described and depicted in Exhibit 3 attached hereto as Special Overlay (SO).

Section 3. Amendment. Section 20.40.050A of the Shoreline Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

A. Special Overlay District. The purpose of the special overlay (SO) district is to apply supplemental regulations as specified in this code to a development of any site, which is in whole or in part located in a special overlay district (Chapter ~~20.80~~ 20.100 SMC, Special Districts). Any such development must comply with both the supplemental SO and the underlying zone regulations.

Section 4. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance or the application of a provision to any person or circumstance, is declared invalid, then the remainder of this Agreement, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

Section 5. Effective Date and Publication. A summary of this ordinance consisting of its title shall be published in the official newspaper of the City and the ordinance shall take effect and be in full force five (5) days after the date of publication.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2003.

Mayor Scott Jepsen

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Sharon Mattioli, CMC
City Clerk

Ian Sievers
City Attorney

Date of Publication: September 11, 2003
Effective Date: September 16, 2003

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE CITY OF SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION

King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan
Development Code Amendment Request, Application #201219

Summary-

After reviewing and discussing the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan application to amend the Development Code on August 7, 2003 the City of Shoreline Planning Commission did find and conclude that the application is in compliance with applicable codes and is not detrimental to the health, safety, or welfare of the City of Shoreline, and therefore recommended approval of such action with conditions.

I. FINDINGS

1. Project Description -

- 1.1 Action: A Development Code amendment to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan.
- 1.2 Site: 2300 North 165th Street
- 1.3 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Designation: Essential Regional Public Facility
- 1.4 Development Code Zoning Map Designation: Residential Six Units/Acre (R-6)

2. Procedural History -

- 2.1 Continued public hearing held by the Planning Commission: August 7, 2003
- 2.2 Public hearing held by the Planning Commission: June 19, 2003
- 2.3 Complete Application Date: May 23, 2003
- 2.4 No prior action or approvals related to this application have been taken.

3. Public Comment -

- 3.1 Written Comments have been received from:
 - Boyd Brannan 2001 North 164th Place, Shoreline WA
 - Larry Bendiksen 16733 Corliss Avenue North, Shoreline WA
 - Lynn Grigsby 1840 North 165th Street, Shoreline WA
 - Riva Zeff 2009 North 164th Place, Shoreline, WA

PC FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

- 3.2 Public Testimony was given during the August 7, 2003 continued Public Hearing by:
Kevin Rodgers 14509 Meridian Avenue North, Shoreline WA
Mark Rodgers 14509 Meridian Avenue North, Shoreline WA
- 3.3 Public Testimony was given during the June 19, 2003 Public Hearing by:
Yaakov Medrash 2009 North 164th Place, Shoreline WA
John Delano 2004 North 163rd Place, Shoreline WA
Steve Brooks 16441 Meridian Avenue North, Shoreline WA
Young Lim 2002 North 164th Place, Shoreline WA
Janet Groden-Thertcher 16510 Meridian Avenue North, Shoreline WA
Kaye Pethe 4621NE 175th Street, Lake Forest Park WA
Janet Way 940 NE 147th Street, Shoreline WA
Sal Ziz 1826 North 165th Street, Shoreline WA
Jan Troubridge 1826 North 165th Street, Shoreline WA

4. SEPA Threshold Determination -

- 4.1 King County is the lead agency for the environmental review of this application. An environmental checklist was prepared on March 19, 2003 and issued on April 17, 2003 with a SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS).

5. Approval Criteria -

- 5.1 The proposal has been evaluated and found to be consistent with the Development Code amendment approval criteria detailed in Shoreline Municipal Code Section 20.30.350.
- 5.2 Approval of this Development Code amendment application does not constitute approval for any other development proposal. All applicable permits and/or reviews shall be obtained prior to construction. Permit and/or review applications shall show compliance with this Master Plan and all other applicable regulations.

II. CONCLUSIONS

1. **Consistency** - The Development Code amendment application is consistent with the designation of the site as an Essential Regional Public Facility, identified future land use patterns, applicable Master Plan policies and transfer station policies of the City of Shoreline Comprehensive Plan.
2. **Compatibility** - The Development Code amendment application will continue to allow the site to function as an Essential Regional Public Facility and operate the existing primary uses. Measures are proposed to mitigate the resulting environmental impacts from the site to the immediate vicinity. A condition to ensure completion of the proposed mitigation for the Thornton Creek buffer is required.

PC FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

3. **Building Height Regulation** - The maximum building height can be regulated with greater accuracy and efficiency by using elevations instead of a numeric height. A numeric height requires the calculation of average existing grades around a building footprint, which could increase the possible height of a structure on a site with existing berms. Elevations establish maximums that will not change with alterations on a site.
4. **Right-of-Way Improvements** - To ensure the safe movement of pedestrians, a condition to provide continuous sidewalks on Meridian Avenue North is required. Concern regarding queuing onto Meridian Avenue North must be examined further as well as general ingress/egress improvements.
5. **Environmental Review** - King County is the lead agency for the environmental review of this proposal. An environmental checklist was prepared on March 19, 2003 and issued on April 17, 2003 with a SEPA Threshold Determination of Non-significance (DNS).

III. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the aforementioned Findings and Conclusions, the Planning Commission unanimously recommends approval of a Development Code amendment to adopt the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan, Application #201219 for the site located at 2300 North 165th Street with the following conditions:

1. The proposed mitigation for the Thornton Creek buffer shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new transfer station building.
2. The proposed maximum building height of 85 feet shall be deleted.
3. The new transfer station building shall have a maximum eave line elevation of 426 feet and a maximum roof peak elevation of 446 feet.
4. The maximum building height for any other structure at the site shall be 35 feet as calculated by SMC 20.50.050.
5. Sidewalks shall be installed by the applicant on the eastside of Meridian Avenue North between North 172nd Street and North 175th Street as detailed in the SEPA Environmental Checklist, Appendix D, Page 2.
6. Queuing on Meridian Avenue North near the entrance to the site shall be decreased to the maximum possible extent and ingress/egress improvements should be considered including the installation of a right turn only lanes to and from Meridian Avenue North.

City of Shoreline Planning Commission

Brian F. Deenelil
Chairperson

8/19/03
Date

First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan

Sections:

20.100.010	Purpose
20.100.020	Permitted Uses
20.100.025	Operating Hours
20.100.030	Review and Approval of Projects
20.100.040	Dimensional Standards
20.100.050	Street Frontage Standards
20.100.060	Visual Impact and Mitigation
20.100.070	Noise Impact and Mitigation
20.100.080	Light Impact and Mitigation
20.100.090	Landscape
20.100.100	Critical Area Buffer
20.100.110	Stormwater Management and Water Quality
20.100.120	Traffic Flow

20.100.010 Purpose

This Chapter establishes the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan, and contains the land use requirements for improvements to the First Northeast Transfer Station. These requirements reflect the long-range goals and plans in King County Solid Waste's *First Northeast Transfer Station 2003 Facility Master Plan* (KCSW FMP), published March 2003. The project location is shown in Figure 20.100.010(a) Vicinity Map.





Figure 20.100.010(a): First Northeast Transfer Station Vicinity Map

Proposed actions on this site that are in general conformance to the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan Site Development Plan, Figure 20.100.010(b) shall be permitted uses and may be reviewed under the City of Shoreline's building permit process.

Sustainable design shall be applied to site improvements, with the intent of achieving the KCSW FMP goal of a LEED™ (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Silver Certification.



First Northeast Transfer Station

Figure 20.100.010 (b)

Site Development Plan




KPG

Architecture
Landscape Architecture
Civil Engineering
Urban Design
March 2003

- NOTE:
1. Surge pit style transfer station configuration illustrated. Final configuration may alternatively be stepped floor configuration.
 2. Elevation information approximate.
 3. Indicated site is preliminary.

- LEGEND
- PERIMETER BUFFER AREAS: MIXED CONIFER WITH NATIVE UNDER STORY
 - CREEK SIDE AND/OR WETLAND VEGETATION: NATIVE RIPARIAN RESTORATION (FINAL PLANT MATERIAL TO BE SELECTED IN COLLABORATION WITH THE THORNTON CREEK ALLIANCE GROUP)
 - LOW GROWING NATIVE PLANTING (PER HEALTH DEPT APPROVAL)
 - NATURAL AREAS: LOW GROWING NATIVE PLANTS WITH MIXED DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTINGS
 - LITTER BARRIER OR SCREEN



20.100.020 Permitted Uses

- A. A transfer station is a permanent, fixed, supplemental collection and transportation facility, used by persons and route collection vehicles to deposit collected solid waste from off-site into a larger transfer vehicle for transport to a solid waste handling facility. Transfer stations may also include recycling facilities, and compaction/baling systems.
- B. The First Northeast Transfer Station may include the following uses:
 - 1. Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Transfer
 - a. Waste Receiving (Self-Haul and Commercial)
 - b. Waste Screening
 - c. Waste Processing
 - d. Waste Storage
 - e. Vector Waste Receiving
 - 2. Non-Fee Recycling
 - a. Unattended Containers for:
 - Mixed Paper
 - Newspaper
 - Cardboard
 - Glass Bottles
 - Aluminum Cans
 - Steel ("Tin") Cans
 - #1/#2 Plastic Bottles
 - (Rigid) Plastic Containers
 - Christmas Trees
 - Scrap Metal
 - Film Plastics / Bags
 - Other Approved Items
 - b. Attended Stations/Containers for:
 - Scrap Metal
 - Appliances
 - Carpet and Carpet Pads
 - Reusable Building Materials
 - Textiles
 - Household Batteries
 - Fluorescent Tubes
 - Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)
 - Other Approved Items
 - 3. Paid Recycling
 - a. Attended Stations/Containers for:
 - Primary and Secondary Recyclables
 - White Goods (Appliances with/without Refrigerants)
 - Yard Waste
 - Food Waste
 - Wood Waste
 - Electronics
 - Construction, Demolition and Landclearing (CDL) Waste
 - Tires
 - Mattresses
 - Household Porcelain Items
 - Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)
 - Other Approved Items
 - b. Trailer / Container Maneuvering and Parking
 - c. Scalehouse with Associated Parking

- d. Employee Facilities with Associated Parking
 - Offices
 - Visual Oversight of Operations
 - Meeting and Break Area
 - Restrooms
 - Storage
 - Training
 - e. Public Facilities with Associated Parking
 - Environmental Education
 - Public Art
 - Vending
 - Restrooms
- C. Additional uses, in general conformance with the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan, are also permitted.

20.100.025 Operating Hours

- A. Under normal conditions, the First Northeast Transfer Station may be open daily, for all public uses, from 8:00 am until 6:00 pm.
- B. The First Northeast Transfer Station may operate from 6:00 to 8:00 am and from 6:00 to 8:00 pm for set-up, close down, facility maintenance and administration.
- C. The First Northeast Transfer Station's hours of operation may be extended under a King County emergency response.
- D. Transfer truck activities and traffic may extend beyond these operation hours if the vehicles directly access I-5, bypassing residential streets.

20.100.030 Review and Approval of Projects

- A. Review Process for Actions/Uses In The First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan shall be reviewed under existing SMC site, building and utility permit processes, as a permitted use.
- B. These standards will supplement and/or modify the development standards specified in Chapter 20.50 SMC. In the event of a conflict between the standards, the standards of this chapter shall prevail. SMC Chapters 20.10 - 20.70 shall be applied in accordance with the underlying zoning of the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan site for development standards and procedures not addressed in the overlay zone.
- C. Review Process for Actions/Uses In General Conformance with the First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan after staff determination that they are in general conformance, shall be reviewed under existing SMC site, building and utility permit processes.
- D. Review Process for Actions/Uses Not In General Conformance with The First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan shall require a Special Use Permit (SMC 20.40.140 Other Uses/Regional/Transfer Station).
- E. For any proposed project action, the City of Shoreline, acting as the Lead Agency under SEPA, shall require an Environmental Checklist and shall perform a threshold determination.
- F. Buildings and structures shall conform to Section 20.100.040, illustrated in Figure 20.100.040, ensuring that they are in scale with adjacent residential uses.
- G. Public Art: The First Northeast Transfer Station shall participate in the King County Public Art Program ("1% For Art"), to develop accessible artwork, integrated into the architecture and site of the facility. Such art shall further an educational message and center on a selected, site-appropriate theme.

20.100.040 Dimensional Standards

Table 20.100.040 Dimensional Standards

<u>Standards</u>	<u>First Northeast Transfer Station</u>
Minimum Lot Width	100 ft
Minimum Lot Area	500,000 sf
Minimum Front Setback	50 ft ⁽¹⁾
Minimum Rear Setback	50 ft ⁽¹⁾
Minimum Side Setback	50 ft ⁽¹⁾
Maximum Transfer Station Building Height	Eave Line Elevation 426 ft; Roof Peak Elevation 446 ft
Maximum Building Coverage	35% ⁽²⁾
Maximum Impervious Surface	50% ⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ The actual distance shall be that needed to place the main structure(s) far enough from any residential use that the effective height of such structure(s) is equivalent to a 30' - 35' residential building. See Figure 20.100.040.

⁽²⁾ Coverage calculated based on gross site area.




Figure 20.100.040
Maximum Building Height / Building Setback Diagram


20.100.050 Street Frontage Standards

This Section addresses the uses that may be permitted at each point where the First Northeast Transfer Station fronts a public street, and their general character, but does not eliminate the requirements of relevant SMC Sections relating to street design.

- A. N 165th Street and Meridian Avenue N Frontage
 - 1. Vehicle access shall be located in the southern portion of this frontage, close to the existing City Light Substation.
 - 2. The remainder of the frontage shall be used for perimeter buffer planting. See Figure 20.100.090 Conceptual Landscape Plan, for the location of the proposed Perimeter Buffer Areas, consisting of mixed, native conifers with native understory plants.
- B. N 166th Street Frontage
 - 1. This street is to remain a dead end, with no site access.
 - 2. The street frontage shall be used for perimeter buffer planting.
- C. N 167th Street Frontage
 - 1. One existing emergency access shall remain in the northeast corner, opposite Keough Park.
 - 2. The remainder of the street frontage shall be used for Perimeter Buffer, Creek Side and/or Wetland Vegetation, and Natural Area (in the Thornton Creek Buffer) planting. See Figure 20.100.090 Conceptual Landscape Plan.
 - 3. A portion of the value of any normally required street improvements may be used, in lieu of such improvements, to enhance the habitat and buffer around Thornton Creek, in the 167th Street right-of-way.

20.100.060 Visual Impact and Mitigation

- A Visual impact mitigation shall be achieved, in general, by adherence to Section 20.100.040, illustrated in Figure 20.100.040 and the perimeter buffer planting to the west and north, between the First Northeast Transfer Station and existing residential property. See Figure 20.100.090 Conceptual Landscape Plan, for the location of the proposed Perimeter Buffer Areas, consisting of mixed, native conifers with native understory plants. To the extent feasible, non-public operational areas shall be screened to minimize visibility from offsite locations.
- B Visual Impact Mitigation shall be achieved, at specific offsite and onsite locations by:
 - 1. East / From I-5: the Transfer Station structures and site shall be designed to achieve a subdued visual presence. Perimeter buffer planting or structures shall provide screening and blend the Transfer Station into the existing freeway corridor.
 - 2. East / From Ridgecrest Park (across I-5): No mitigation is needed, given the intervening freeway corridor.
 - 3. South / From North Base and Substation: No mitigation is needed between compatible land uses.
 - 4. West / From Meridian Avenue: perimeter buffer planting shall blend the wider entrance into the background Thornton Creek buffer. Building design shall not draw the driver's eye. See Figure 20.100.060(1).
 - 5. Internal / From No-Fee Recycle Area and Public Facilities: clear circulation patterns, consistent building and structure design, integrated lighting and consistent signage shall be used to reduce visual clutter.
 - 6. West and Northwest / From Residences: perimeter buffer planting, site grading and controlled lighting shall be used. These residences will also be separated from most of the active site areas by the full, double width of Thornton Creek's 100' buffers.
 - 7. North / From Keough Park: perimeter buffer planting integrated with the existing landscape shall be used to screen structures. See Figure 20.100.060 (2).




View from Meridian Avenue/165th looking NE (Sketch "A")



View from Meridian Avenue/165th looking NE (Photograph "A")

Figure 20.100.060 (1)



*View from North End of Keough Park looking South
(Sketch "C")*



*View from North End of Keough Park looking South
(Photograph "C")*

Figure 20.100.060 (2)

20.100.070 Noise Impact and Mitigation

- A. The SMC has no numerical noise limits applicable to industrial or commercial operations, so the following regulatory noise limits are adopted and shall apply at the First Northeast Transfer Station site.
- B. Table 20.100.070 – Noise Limits at the First Northeast Transfer Station

Noise Duration	Daytime Limit (dbh)	Nighttime Limit (dbh)
1.5 minutes/hour or less (L_{max})	75	65
5 minutes/hour	70	60
15 minutes/hour	65	55
More than 15 minutes/hour	60	50


Note: of these limits, the criterion for daytime L_{max} is the most relevant noise limit, because short-term noise spikes have the greatest potential to be objectionable. Normally, only limited nighttime operations are anticipated or allowed. See Section 20.100.025 Operating Hours.

20.100.080 Light Impact and Mitigation

- A. All site lighting shall conform to SMC Section 20.50.115 Lighting – Standards, which requires that “any lighting should be nonglare and shielded to minimize direct illumination of abutting properties and adjacent streets.”
- B. All lighting adjacent to residential property shall have full-cutoff, shielded luminaries.
- C. All site lighting shall be designed to focus only on the surface to be illuminated, eliminating light trespass on the night sky.
- D. To the extent feasible, onsite vehicle lights should be screened from adjacent residential properties.
- E. Building and pole mounted electric lighting shall illuminate exterior operational areas around the transfer station and new scalehouse. Outdoor lighting may be illuminated between dusk and dawn, for public and non-public uses (and shall be maintained at reduced levels at night, for security).

20.100.090 Landscape

- A. Conceptual Landscape Plan: The proposed landscape may be seen in Figure 20.100.090: Conceptual Landscape Plan. Vegetation plantings within the immediate vicinity of the transfer and recycling structures shall be minimal, due to King County Department of Health requirements to maintain a rodent-free environment around solid waste facilities, including transfer stations. To the extent feasible, the banks of Thornton Creek, and any stormwater detention ponds, shall be restored/planted with native, riparian vegetation. The 100' wide creek buffer zones shall be enhanced with low-growing native materials and native deciduous trees like Red Alder (*Alnus rubra*) and Big Leaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*). Portions of the site perimeter shall be enhanced with a mixed native understory and conifers like Western Red Cedar (*Thuja plicata*), Douglas Fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and Western Hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*).
- B. Irrigation: No irrigation shall be installed. Planted areas shall use larger quantities of smaller stock in anticipation of a higher initial mortality rate.
- C. Significant Trees: While there may be trees in the existing northern creek stand that meet the specific dbh (diameter breast high) standard for significant trees, it is more important that they are part of a stand, with closed canopy, providing critical riparian habitat, and shall be actively managed for that purpose. See Section 20.100.100: Critical Area Buffer. Moving the No-Fee Recycling Area out of the 100' creek buffer will result in the removal of at least five significant conifers west of the entrance to the existing No-Fee Recycling Area. This impact cannot be mitigated through horticultural BMPs, because of extreme changes in grade (to accommodate bi-level tipping) and increased paving.



- LEGEND**
- PERIMETER BUFFER AREAS: MIXED CONIFER WITH NATIVE UNDER STORY
 - CREEK SIDE AND/OR WETLAND VEGETATION: NATIVE RIPARIAN RESTORATION (FINAL PLANT MATERIAL TO BE SELECTED IN COLLABORATION WITH THE CITY OF SHORELINE & THE THORNTON CREEK ALLIANCE GROUP).
 - LOW GROWING NATIVE PLANTING (PER HEALTH DEPT APPROVAL)
 - NATURAL AREAS: LOW GROWING NATIVE PLANTS WITH MIXED DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTINGS.
 - LITTER BARRIER OR SCREEN




Department Of Natural Resources
King County Solid Waste Division

First Northeast Transfer Station

KPG

Architecture
Landscape Architecture
Civil Engineering
Urban Design

Figure 20.100.090
Conceptual Landscape Plan



SMC 20.50.360: Tree Replacement and Site Restoration, allows the removal of “up to six significant trees and associated vegetation per parcel with no replacement of trees required.” Site improvements shall meet this standard. If the removal of more than six significant trees is necessary, they shall be replaced under Section 20.50.360 (C.). Such replacements shall follow the Conceptual Landscape Plan, Figure 2, in the *First Northeast Transfer/Recycling Station Facility Master Plan Implementation Final Environmental Checklist*, published March 2003. A formal evaluation shall be provided during project permit submittals, under SMC Subchapter 5: Tree Conservation, Land Clearing and Site Grading Standards.

20.100.100 Critical Area Buffer

- A. To the extent feasible, existing active uses shall be removed from Thornton Creek’s 100-foot buffers.
- B. The First Northeast Transfer Station may utilize “Buffer Averaging,” if final design requires it.
- C. Surface water facilities and perimeter buffer planting adjacent to residences shall be designed as part of an overall vegetation, habitat and water quality management plan.
- D. Removal of any existing trees shall be part of the vegetation, habitat and water quality management plan, to provide (as an example) openings for the introduction of uneven-aged, native conifer clusters to reduce the existing stand’s monoculture and increase habitat diversity.
- E. The proposed mitigation for the Thornton Creek buffer shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new transfer station building.

20.100.110 Stormwater Management and Water Quality

- A. General: Surface water design shall meet the current City of Shoreline requirements. Additional measures may be implemented to achieve compliance with the requirement or guidelines of other agencies, or to meet sustainability goals.
- B. Leachate Management: Site design, impervious capping, the hydraulic separation of leachate draining surfaces from the general stormwater system and other BMPs (Best Management Practices) shall be used to ensure that any waters in contact with MSW (Municipal Solid Waste) shall be collected in the sanitary sewer system and not drain to Thornton Creek.
- C. Stormwater Facility: Open drainage facilities shall be integrated into the overall landscape and habitat management plans to compliment the Thornton Creek buffer and planned natural areas.

20.100.120 Traffic Flow

- A. The use of recycling, compaction and other technologies shall be used to reduce the number of required transfer vehicle trips.
- B. Internal Traffic Flow:
 - 1. Onsite roadways shall avoid at-grade conflicts by utilizing counter-clockwise site circulation.
 - 2. Multiple lanes, modern scales and consistent signage shall be used to avoid excessive vehicle queuing.
 - 3. Parking shall be limited to designated Staff and Public areas.
- C. Traffic Flow at Meridian Avenue N:
 - 1. Perimeter buffer planting shall not limit exiting/entering driver vision.
 - 2. Two exit lanes shall be used to limit internal queuing and improve the merge of exiting vehicles into north- and south-bound traffic.
 - 3. The potential for direct access to Metro Transit’s freeway ramps shall be diligently pursued, to further reduce the waste transfer traffic on residential streets.
 - 4. Curbs shall be located to allow safe intersection use by all commercial haulers, waste transfer vehicles and Metro Transit.
 - 5. Queuing near the entrance to the site shall be decreased to the maximum possible extent and ingress/egress improvements should be considered including the installation of a right turn only lanes to and from Meridian Avenue N.
 - 6. Sidewalks shall be installed on the eastside of Meridian Avenue N. between N 172nd Street and N 175th Street.

Parcel Numbers:

572750-0410
572750-0390
572750-0380
206560-0020
206560-0035
206560-0030

Exhibit 3

Location & Legal Description:

The main entrance to the site is at the intersection of N.E. 165th Street at Meridian Avenue N.E. The site is located at the SW 1/4 of Section 8, Township 26 North, Range 4 East. The legal description of the site and affected adjacent parcels is as follows:

All of Tracts 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73 of Murphy's Interurban Acres according to plat recorded in Volume 17 of Plats, pages 83, in King County, Washington, excepting:

The south 50' of Tract 63
The south 50' of Tract 64
The south 50' of Tract 67
The south 50' of Tract 68
The south 50' of Tract 71

That portion of Tract 61 condemned in King County Superior Court Case 586860 for Primary State Highway No. 1

also

Lots 4 and 8 of Donna Claire addition according to plat recorded in Volume 61 of Plats, page 63, in King County, Washington.

Subject to

An easement of record to the City of Seattle for the operation of overhead power lines.


Additional properties adjacent to the project to be acquired:

The two parcels in the southeast corner of the site (portions of Tracts 59 and 60 of Murphy's Interurban Acres, Lot 6 and Lot 7 of the Donna Claire Addition, Tax Lots 206560-0035 and 206560-0030) are to be acquired. These properties are currently attached to the King County Metro Transit North Base and used for storage and staging (a "bone yard"). This acquisition will include a land swap that will give the transit base some current transfer station property. Portions of the transit base and the transfer station operations currently cross their respective boundaries into the adjacent facility. The property lines will be adjusted to match the actual facility use boundaries.


Near the site's west entrance, Lots 6 and 7 of Donna Claire addition are to be acquired (currently single family residences).

The portion of N. 165th Street from the existing facility entrance to Meridian Avenue North will be acquired from the City of Shoreline.

That portion of N.E. 167th Street lying easterly of the east right-of-way line of Corliss Avenue North and westerly of the west right-of-way of Interstate 5.



201219



Attachment C

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

DRAFT

These Minutes Subject to
September 4 Approval

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

August 7, 2003
6:30 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Board Room

PRESENT

Chair Doennebrink
Vice Chair Harris
Commissioner Gabbert
Commissioner Kuboi
Commissioner Sands
Commissioner McClelland
Commissioner Doering
Commissioner MacCully

STAFF PRESENT

Tim Stewart, Director, Planning & Development Services
Jeff Thomas, Planner III, Planning & Development Services
Paul Cohen, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services
Lanie Curry, Planning Commission Clerk

ABSENT

Commissioner Piro

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Doennebrink, who presided, called the regular meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Doennebrink, Commissioners Doering, Kuboi, MacCully, Sands, Piro and McClelland. Commissioner Piro was excused, and Vice Chair Harris arrived at 6:53 p.m.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER GABBERT MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PROPOSED.
COMMISSIONER MALONEY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner McClelland recalled that the Commission was instructed that only those Commissioners who were present when the original recommendation was made could participate in a motion to reconsider. Mr. Stewart said that unless the absent Commissioners fully reviewed the record and testimony from the public hearing, they would not be allowed to participate in the reconsideration. Commissioner McClelland noted that she did not participate in the first recommendation, and neither did Commissioner Sands or Commissioner Doering. Therefore, only four of the Commissioners would be allowed to participate.

COMMISSIONER GABBERT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner MacCully inquired if the four remaining Commissioners who could participate in reconsideration would constitute a quorum. Mr. Stewart suggested that since there was not a quorum available to reconsider the issue, the Commission's discussion on the issue should be continued until later in the meeting when there may be a quorum available. The Commission agreed to place this discussion after Item 6b on the agenda.

6b. Continued Type L Legislative Public Hearing from June 19, 2003 regarding the King County First Northeast Transfer Station Master Plan

Chair Doennebrink reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing, and then opened the public hearing.

Jeff Thomas suggested that because this item was tentatively scheduled to begin at about 7:20 p.m. some members of the public might come in a little later. These people should be provided an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Thomas said the discussion that was prepared by King County staff follows up on many of the items of discussion from the June 19th hearing. He referred to an e-mail the Commissioners should have received, which included two attachments at the request of individual Commissioners. He said the first attachment was a copy of the slide presentation that King County would be providing to the Commission. He reminded the Commission that at the close of the June 19th meeting staff asked the Commissioners to send follow up questions to them so that they could be forwarded to King County for a response. The second attachment is King County's response to each question.

Mr. Thomas said a number of individuals from King County were present to provide additional information about the project and answer the Commission's questions. He turned the time over to Mr. Kevin Kiernan from the King County Solid Waste Division who would provide the presentation regarding the project.

Kevin Kiernan said he is the Engineering Services Manager for the King County Solid Waste Division. He referred to the packet of information provided by King County, which was provided to aid the Commission in their deliberation of the issue.

The packet includes:

- The SEPA Determination of Non-Significance and the Environmental Checklist that supports it.
- A list of the public comments to the final checklist.
- A public involvement summary.
- A final draft of the Facility Master Plan Update.

Mr. Kiernan said the current facility has been in place for a number of years and it is really no longer compatible with the County's needs. He explained that the existing transfer system was developed in conjunction with the Cedar Hills Landfill, which is going to close in about ten years. After that time, no more garbage will be landfilled within King County. Therefore, the garbage has to be taken somewhere else. At this time, King County is trying to transition from facilities that load trucks and haul garbage to the Cedar Hills Landfill to facilities that can load the waste onto a train to be transported outside of the County.

In addition, Mr. Kiernan explained that there are new code requirements that must be met. Over the past 40 years, there have been increases in waste and traffic, and technology has been improved. The new long-haul technology is different than what has been used in the past. King County is considering the option of installing a solid waste compactor. He provided a schematic view of a typical compactor. The waste would come into the top and be compressed and pushed to the back of the trailer. The waste would then be sealed in containers, and put on trains to be hauled away. He showed an illustration of how a compactor would work and noted that the building would have to be a little bit higher than what currently exists in order to accommodate the compaction equipment.

Mr. Kiernan said that, at this time, the public process for developing the facility master plan is in its final stages, but the design, permitting and construction processes are still ahead of them. Hopefully, this entire project will culminate into a new facility in 2005. He advised that the public process involved numerous meetings, including three public meetings with over 1,200 notices mailed for each. There were also four citizen advisory committee meetings. He said that at the first public meeting, King County described a process they have used elsewhere in which a citizen advisory committee was formed. Because the public agreed that an advisory committee of volunteers would be good, King County invited interested individuals to participate. They ended up with a mix of people living next to the facility, community activists, customers and representatives from other cities.

Mr. Kiernan said the citizens advisory committee and King County staff developed and evaluated 17 different alternatives. They also addressed some significant threshold issues such as the reach of Thornton Creek that goes right through the site. They also carefully consider the option of using the I-5 ramps to access the site. In addition, they looked at whether or not they should acquire property. The impacts of the different alternatives were reviewed to arrive at the proposal that is before the Commission for consideration now.

Mr. Kiernan said that early on, people dumped their garbage in the backyard, and that was fine because there were not very many people around. But as the community grew and expanded, that was no longer acceptable and a “neighborhood dump” system was developed.

This worked for a while, but in the early 60’s the Cedar Hills Landfill was developed, partly in response to the fact that the neighborhood dumps were no longer acceptable. The neighborhood dumps were replaced with a network of transfer stations, and the garbage was hauled to what was then a very rural area.

Mr. Kiernan said that, originally, there was only a small transfer station developed on First Northeast. Not much later, the existing facility was designed and developed. From a design standpoint, the building was a real success and lasted for nearly 40 years. Mr. Kiernan provided a map to illustrate the property that is owned, but not currently used, by King County.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if the property above the transfer station is a park. Mr. Kiernan said that is Keough Park. Commissioner Doering pointed out that the park is accessed from the south.

Mr. Kiernan said the proposed plan includes a new, enclosed transfer building, a significantly expanded recycling area, and a yard waste collection area. King County has previously issued requests for proposals to the private sector at different times, to provide yard waste collection in this part of the County, but they have not received any proposals. At this time, the yard waste goes to trash rather than being composted.

Mr. Kiernan pointed out the location of the I-5 ramp and reported that the regional Department of Transportation office is recommending approval to headquarters of King County’s request to connect the ramp to provide access to I-5 for the transfer trucks. The issue is working its way through the approval process.

Mr. Kiernan said the proposal would significantly increase both the green space and the buffer. The parking would be pulled back away from the creek so that the buffer could be increased. The surface water facilities would be placed outside of the buffer to provide even more green space and additional habitat. He said the protection and enhancement of the creek was strongly urged by the advisory committee.

Commissioner MacCully inquired where the creek daylighted to the north. Mr. Kiernan pointed out where the creek crosses the street. He also noted the location of the open roadside ditch and the transit base. Commissioner MacCully asked approximately how much buffer would be provided between the open water of Thornton Creek and the two other detention features. Mr. Kiernan said King County would maintain a 100-foot buffer in a natural state. In fact, they would be enhancing the buffer.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if the proposal would require the use of buffer averaging. Mr. Kiernan answered that this would not be necessary, but right now there is a gravel area that is used for recycling. There has been interest expressed in locating a public viewing and education area on this site.

If there is already a gravel area in the buffer, it might be reasonable to use it for this purpose. He said that while they haven't needed to do buffer averaging, the County would like to retain the option.

Mr. Kiernan said that at the last meeting, questions were raised as to why a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) was issued for the project. He briefly reviewed some of the key environmental considerations that were looked at that led King County to the DNS conclusion. They include water-quality improvements, noise level reductions, traffic improvements and visual considerations.

Mr. Kiernan said the proposal would significantly enhance the Thornton Creek buffer. At this time, the parking area is very close. Currently, there is a tiny pond to handle stormwater. The new stormwater facility would be designed to meet the current standards. In addition, the proposed project would protect the ground water. A significant amount of the garbage would be removed, and whatever is left would be capped to reduce the infiltration of water through the garbage. He said that, generally, they are using the LEED Process (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design) so that the entire project can be reviewed for environmental considerations.

Mr. Kiernan said the most significant traffic improvement would be the reduction in the number of truck trips because of the compactor and the redirection of the trucks onto I-5 to avoid City streets. While they have not received final approval to use the ramps, every indication is that the ramps will be favored.

Mr. Kiernan said the current building is right near the property line, and trucks maneuver around. The new proposal would relocate the building further from the residential area. He noted where the large trucks would be maneuvering, and pointed out that they would be shielded from the neighborhoods by the building.

Mr. Kiernan showed schematic drawings of both the existing building and the new building. He said the new building would be larger and taller. The peak of the building would be increased by 20 feet. He provided several slides to illustrate what the building would look like, and noted that it would not be significantly higher than some of the trees located in the area.

Mr. Kiernan said the design would maintain a large piece of undeveloped property to provide habitat for wildlife. He reminded the Commission that King County would be using the LEED Process, which is a classification system that tells how green a building is. They are seeking to get a silver certification. He said the LEED Process has been used quite a bit on office buildings, but they are one of the first commercial projects to use the process.

Mr. Kiernan said King County believes it is important to work with the neighbors of the project and try to address their concerns as much as possible.

Mr. Kiernan advised that driving with uncovered loads is prohibited by the City of Shoreline and most other jurisdictions in the State. The City does have the ability to enforce this law. In addition, there are utility workers going up Meridian periodically to pick up trash that is left behind.

Mr. Kiernan noted that if the habitat is increased, there would be more critters on the site. However, King County does have an active rodent control program. The new facility and the trailers would be enclosed, so the situation should be improved.

Regarding operational issues and concerns, Mr. Kiernan again stated that King County is working with the Department of Transportation to obtain approval to use the ramps. The issue is gradually moving forward, and approval looks to be a pretty sure thing. However, King County has been told by the Department of Transportation that they will not consider any use of the ramps other than to allow the trucks to get onto I-5. They will not allow the ramps to be used for traffic coming to the facility. They are willing to consider the large truck trips as being regional trips because they will be going from a facility that collects garbage to a regional disposal point. But the rest of the traffic is considered local traffic related to the collection of community garbage. He noted that if King County were also allowed to bring self-haul traffic off the ramps, traffic would be drawn from a much larger radius, resulting in an increased use of the facility.

Mr. Kiernan said there was previous discussion regarding a rooftop park. They determined that in order to depress the building, they would have to build a very deep hole. There is currently ground water there. While the transit base was able to do this, they did have to culvert the creek. He said King County has concluded that it would be difficult to go that deep and still protect the creek. In addition, King County believes they are achieving a lot of the same benefits by increasing the habitat. He concluded that the rooftop park option does not appear to be feasible.

Mr. Thomas explained that the City's Comprehensive Plan talks about the need for regional public facilities and encourages this type of conceptual planning document (a master plan) to be done for essential regional public facilities. The purpose of doing this is to provide information about what the facility will look like when it is built out and give the City an opportunity to review the unique features of the site up front. The intent is to avoid piecemeal development of the site by providing a plan that fits in with the existing neighborhood and identifying opportunities for total site mitigation efforts to help offset and reduce impacts, where possible.

Mr. Thomas said that if the master plan were not approved, King County would have to use a conditional use permit approach. Depending on the specific components they were looking to permit at any given time, they could string out a series of conditional use permits and possibly zoning variances to accommodate the development of their preferred alternative. The end result could be a less efficient site.

Commissioner Gabbert pointed out that, by going through the master plan process, the Commission would have the opportunity to place certain conditions or development constraints on the master plan. These conditions would be carried through and effect any future projects on the site. Mr. Thomas added that at the June 19th hearing, Commissioner McClelland suggested that some sort of timing element for the Thornton Creek vegetation corridor restoration effort be included in this report. He referred to the recommendation provided by staff in the supplemental staff report that was prepared based on the input received at the June 19th hearing. This could be attached as a condition if adopted by the Planning Commission in their recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Thomas said that issues were raised at the June 19th meeting related to building height. He explained that if someone were to build a single-family home on the site, the height limit would be a maximum of 35 feet because it is located in an R-6 zone. This height would be calculated from the average existing grade. Staff felt this concept would be too complex to apply to the proposed master plan. Depending on the location of the footprint, the average existing grade could potentially increase the height of a building. He said King County's consultant, KGB, took some real elevations of the existing transfer station building and figured out what they would be for a couple of key points—the bottom of the tunnel floor, the tipping floor, the even line and the roof peak. Next, they modeled that against what the maximum elevations would be for the new building. They came up with an approximate difference of 20 feet as the maximum amount of height they would need. Therefore, the calculation of 85 feet from the existing grade has actually been reduced to a total new transfer station building height of only about 80 feet.

Mr. Thomas said staff is recommending a few additional conditions to the staff's recommendation to the Planning Commission to replace the reference to 85 feet with "using real elevations to determine the height of the new transfer station." Staff is also recommending a condition that all other structures on the site have to comply with the 35-foot R-6 zoning district standard.

Kevin Rodgers, 14509 Meridian Ave North, said he lives at a Gateway to Shoreline near 145th Street. He said many of the Commissioners might have seen his little red house with a trimmed yard and white picket fence while they were waiting for the light. He said he hope they saw it on a good day, and not during the week when someone's dirty old stinking mattress was laying in front of the house or the day they waited for someone to come and pick up the giant discarded rhododendrons that had fallen off someone's unsecured load. He said if people who reside on Meridian didn't care about keeping their avenue being clear of unsecured load debris, it would be a garbage-strewn causeway straight to the dump.

Mr. Rodgers said citizens can call and report debris, but after a week of waiting, it makes more sense to take it to the transfer station yourself and pay to get rid of someone else's garbage. Or you can call back and ask why it hasn't been picked up only to be referred to the roads department. If the County closes transfer stations and enlarges the Shoreline site, he questioned if they really want all of the additional King County residents hauling their garbage to the dump by way of Meridian Avenue. He said his understanding is that the option of using the freeway on and off ramp is impossible, but he would like more information about that issue. Meridian handles 5,000 cars a day, and he doesn't know how much of that is considered to be transfer station traffic. But he assumes the number of cars per day would increase significantly if a new facility were built. Not only would the on and off ramps keep the increasing transfer station traffic off of Shoreline streets, it would also keep the semi-truck convoys carrying garbage off of them, as well. He said it would make more sense to have a more direct route in and out of the transfer station.

Mr. Rodgers concluded his comments by stating that just like Brightwater will be a facility to serve the County's growing needs for many years to come, the changes being made to the transfer station must be able to serve the County's needs for years to come, as well. He asked that the Commission make a decision that will make Shoreline an even better place to live.

Mark Rodgers, 14509 Meridian Ave North, said he is 13 years old and lives in a small house. As he has grown, he has noticed that his home seems to have grown smaller. He said he has learned that when you live in a small house, you have to use the space that you have better. The County wants to close some transfer stations in a need to make the one that it is in Shoreline bigger. Their plan was to, basically, make the hole bigger. He would like the Commission to consider whether that is the best use of space. He said he doesn't think so. Let them make the hole bigger, but make sure it is the best use of space. He said his small, 8' x 10' bedroom has to be a sleeping area, an entertainment center, home office, dressing room and storage area. And he is also supposed to keep it clean. The transfer station has to be more than just a transfer station. People live in Shoreline because it is full of houses for families. He asked that they make the transfer station bigger and better by putting it underground, like the Metro Facility next door, and develop a park on the top of it. It does not need to be a basketball court or a skate park; it could just be an open, grassy field where people could take their dogs. He noted that there is not one place in Shoreline where he can take his dog off leash. He asked that the Commission make the right decision, and be good leaders. They should make sure that the City uses the space they have better. They should make sure their decision are in the best interest of the citizens of Shoreline.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Commissioner Gabbert asked what the actual height of the new building would be. Mr. Thomas said the proposed roof peak elevation for the new transfer station building is supposed to be 446 feet above sea level. The current building's roof peak is 420 feet above sea level. The net change would be 26 feet. He referred to the modeling done by King County and KPG. It identifies the proposed tunnel floor elevation as 366 feet above sea level. If this is subtracted from the roof peak elevation of the new building, the net result is 80 feet of total building height, which is a little bit less than the originally proposed 85 feet from existing grade.

Commissioner Gabbert said he can only relate to this as if he strung a line from the mid points of the property lines on the four sides across. At some point the lines would cross and establish an existing grade elevation. He asked how high above that the new building would be. Mr. Thomas said the proposed tipping floor elevation is 396 feet above sea level, so it would be about 50 feet.

Mr. Kiernan said the floor of the existing building where people drive up and park is pretty close to 390 feet above sea level. Commissioner Gabbert asked how this relates to the road to the north. Mr. Kiernan said his recollection is that there is not a lot of elevation change. He said you could assume the road is about 390 feet above sea level. Because the building would be pulled further away from the road, the maximum height of the roof would be 440 feet above sea level. From the existing ground elevation, the new proposed top would be 50 feet. The existing building's top height is 420 feet above sea level so the new building would be taller.

Commissioner McClelland said the information that was provided by Mr. Kiernan has been helpful. She said she also visited the site. She sat out there for about a half an hour. There was a steady stream of pick up trucks coming to the facility, and fewer than half were covered. While this is not exactly an issue to be addressed by the master plan, it is a peripheral issue with regard to the location and to the activity on Meridian Avenue. She does not think it is sufficient to just say that people who have garbage left out in the street in front of their homes should call customer response. While she does not know if a condition could be added to the master plan, something should be done to fine the people who are not covering their loads. She suggested that there should be a sign on Meridian to indicate that uncovered trucks would not be allowed to access the site. If Metro could take their big trucks out of the facility on the bus ramps, the only traffic would be related to self-haulers. She said she believes the work that has been done on the master plan is exemplar in terms of improving the site and the master plan process is a way for the City to control another government agency's business within Shoreline. But she would like the Commission to explore options that would protect the citizens living along Meridian from debris.

Chair Doennebrink said it is his understanding that there is a surcharge for uncovered loads, but Commissioner McClelland's idea to not allow uncovered loads to access the site would be even better. Commissioner McClelland and Chair Doennebrink both expressed their opinion that the surcharge fee is not sufficient enough to cause people to cover their loads. However, Chair Doennebrink said his recollection is that this issue cannot be dealt with as a condition to the master plan approval.

Vice Chair Harris noted that the sign at the facility states that unsecured loads would be fined. It does not say that a load has to be covered. He said there are a lot of ways to secure a load without covering it.

Chair Doennebrink said Mr. Kiernan indicated that the public viewing area could be located on the southern portion of the property. He questioned if this viewing area could be located in the north, instead. He also asked if the access to the viewing area would have the same operating hours as the transfer station. Mr. Kiernan said there is often a need for a restroom, and King County does not want people stopping inside the building for this purpose. The recycling area tends to be an area where people are out of their vehicles, and this would be a good location for a viewing area as well as a restroom. However, if the City were interesting in doing something to the north, the County would be glad to let them use some of their property. There is no disturbance in the area now, and the County plans to leave it alone. Mr. Kiernan said the viewing area hours would probably be the same as those for the transfer station, itself.

Commissioner Kuboi said he feels comfortable with the building design, so most of his concerns are related to how the improvements would fit within in the greater scheme for King County solid waste management and what it means to the north end of the County. He said it is hard for him to get a comfortable feel about the proposed facility without knowing how it fits in with the rest of the County's facilities. He asked Mr. Kiernan to identify exactly how many existing facilities would be closed and which ones.

Commissioner Kuboi referred to a response he received from King County regarding one of his advance questions. Mr. Kiernan indicated that the King County Solid Waste Division is evaluating service needs for the rest of the system and will be proposing improvements to other transfer stations in the County.

He said this tells him that the overall dynamic balance of the County's system is still up in the air. While he supports King County's efforts to improve operations at the First Northeast Transfer Station, he does not want the dynamic balance of the overall system to start skewing towards this facility. While he is not fundamentally against it, if this is going to happen, they need to discuss what it means to the City of Shoreline.

Mr. Kiernan said he would attempt to provide a concise discussion of the regional solid waste plan, including both neighboring jurisdictions. He said King County operates eight transfer stations, six of which were built between 1963 and 1967. One was rebuilt in 1966 in the same location. All of these are located along the I-5/I-405 corridor. He used a map to show where each of the transfer stations is located. He added that two more transfer stations were built in the rural areas; one on Vashon Island and one in Enumclaw.

Mr. Kiernan said they have replaced the roof at the Algona Facility, which is constrained in its location. The First Northeast Transfer Station is the next of the facilities that major work will be done on. The next one in line for changes is the Bow Lake Facility. There is a lot of potential to expand this facility, and it is a good location for South County. Mr. Kiernan said there is a proposal to close the rural facilities two days a week, but there is no proposal to close a facility permanently. However, they are looking at two transfer stations that are located in close proximity with each one. One is within a very residential area and there are numerous constraints. There has been some discussion about building a new facility and limiting or closing this facility. However, he emphasized that this is not the County's proposal.

In regards to the service area for the First Northeast Transfer Station, Mr. Kiernan said that they do not ask self-haulers where they are coming from. However, commercial loads that come to the site from outside of the planning area are charged triple rate. The reality is that self-haulers tend to go to the closest facility, and he would expect that to continue.

Commissioner McClelland said it seems there is an underlying assumption that the need for the facility is generated by yard waste, construction debris, etc. But this issue is not just about residential growth and building houses; old people generate a lot of trash when someone dies and a house is emptied out. She said she was recently told that what thrift stores don't use, they either take to the transfer station in bulk or they bundle it and send it over seas to be used in third world countries. She inquired if there are any other alternatives for getting rid of household stuff. Mr. Kiernan said the web site provides a number of different alternatives. There is a materials exchange page on their site. If someone wants to get rid of a couch, they can post it on the site for free and see if someone else wants it. The web site can link people to charitable organizations, and there are also industrial material exchanges. King County is always looking for alternatives. He said their preference is behavior and not structural. They would rather have people do things other than build big structures to deal with it.

Mr. Kiernan reminded the Commission that the First Northeast Transfer Station structure is 40 years old. During the major snowstorm in 1996, the roof sagged and rivets were popped out. The building needs to be replaced now.

He emphasized that the transfer station does not accept commercial construction or demolition debris. There are size limits that must be met. Private contractors are usually hired to get rid of commercial construction debris.

Commissioner Kuboi said he asked the question about waste streams from Snohomish County coming down to the First Northeast Station. He was told that regulatory regulations would not allow this to happen. Mr. Kiernan is now saying this would be allowed, but the price would be much higher. Commissioner Kuboi inquired how he could feel more comfortable that if they build a larger facility, capacity wise, they won't become an attractive nuisance to the Snohomish County waste stream, which is not going to be impeded by the traffic on Lake City Way. Mr. Kiernan answered that Snohomish County is building a new, larger facility right off the road at Paine Field. This will increase their capacity to handle waste.

Commissioner Doering recalled several winters during hard rains when Ronald Bog would flood over Meridian and 175th. She noted that the proposed retention ponds would bleed into Thornton Creek. She inquired if there is a relationship between the ponds and the creek so that excess water would run into Ronald Bog and create a severe flooding problem. Mr. Kiernan said he would find it difficult, under any circumstance, to see where water would back up 20 blocks. There is a significant separation between the site and the ponds. They have not designed the ponds yet, and this will require engineering expertise. The record of storm events will be researched as part of this process to make sure the ponds are sized properly. He concluded that the retention facilities would be a lot better than what currently exists.

Commissioner Doering said she believes the project is a real opportunity for Shoreline. The Washington State Department of Transportation has indicated that the only access allowed to the freeway from the ramps would be for commercial trucks. She suggested that perhaps they should consider creating a new access using 175th and Keough Park.

Commissioner MacCully said most of his questions related to the site master plan have been answered. In addition, he realizes that operational concerns are not something the Commission can condition a master plan on. He said he sat in line at the transfer station for over an hour. Every vehicle that was ahead of him, and the ones he could see behind him, had some form of cover on them or were secured in some manner. He something falls out of a car, it is called littering, and there is a significant fine for littering. He said that people often come before the Commission to raise concerns that the Commission cannot really address. Staff has assured the Commission that they take the comments back to the appropriate officials. He questioned if the police force could enforce the littering law better. Every other citizen who has spoken during the public hearing has commented on this issue. King County has assured the Commission that they are doing something to address the concern, but people are saying it takes at least a week to get a response. Something needs to be done to address the issue. While they cannot make this a condition of the master plan, he would like the staff to follow up by providing ideas to remedy the problem.

Commissioner Sands agreed with Commissioner MacCully and questioned why the police department cannot do anything to correct the problem. Mr. Stewart suggested that the Commission make a motion that the City of Shoreline and King County mutually agree to tighter code enforcement.

He felt it would help him in the future when he goes in front of the City Council with code enforcement issues if the Commission were on record as addressing the issue in a positive light.

COMMISSIONER SANDS MOVED THAT THE CITY OF SHORELINE STAFF, THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND THE KING COUNTY STAFF GET TOGETHER TO DETERMINE HOW BEST TO ENFORCE THE RULES THAT ALREADY EXIST FOR LITTERING PROBLEMS. COMMISSIONER MACCULLY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Commissioner Gabbert referred to Commissioner Doering's suggestion that a new access road be created from 175th coming down through the Keough Park right-of-way. If this type of alternative access were provided, only about four houses would be impacted. Even if this access were used by self-haulers only, the option should be explored further.

Commissioner Kuboi said this access alternative was brought up at the last meeting. He said he is disappointed that King County has not provided a response as to whether the alternative access would be feasible or not. Chair Doennebrink said his recollection of the last hearing was that there was considerable discussion about extending the on-ramp. Commissioner Doering's proposal was for a separate road to provide access. Commissioner Doering said that, at the last hearing, she asked about Keough Park, and was told that was not part of the master plan as proposed.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if Commissioner Doering's proposal was for an access road from off the freeway at 175th. Chair Doennebrink clarified that Commissioner Doering proposed an access off of 175th, that goes straight down to the freeway. Commissioner McClelland pointed out that this would not take care of all the people coming north who get off at 145th. Commissioner Doering said that if these people know that the access is from 175th, they would come down this access instead.

Vice Chair Harris inquired if Commissioner Doering's proposal would forbid all traffic coming from Seattle down Meridian, passing the current entrance to gain access on the new access road. He pointed out that most people would not want to use the freeway to haul their trash to the transfer station. Most would prefer to use surface streets. Commissioner Doering said the design details of the access should be left up to the transportation designers.

Commissioner Gabbert used a drawing to illustrate Commissioner Doering's recommendation for access. Commissioner Doering clarified that she was not recommending that the existing entrance be eliminated. Her recommendation was to provide an alternative access for people coming from the north. Commissioner McClelland said that the proposed alternative would require people to turn left into Ronald Bog. While the concept is good, the practicality of it is not. She clarified that the intent is to disperse the traffic so that not everyone has to access the site from Meridian. Commissioner Doering agreed.

Commissioner MacCully inquired if there are any other transfer stations in King County that have two access points, with two scales and two sets of staff. Mr. Kiernan answered that there are none.

In fact, he says he does not know of any facilities within the region that provide two separate access points. He said one of the major costs of operation is associated with labor.

Mr. Kiernan advised that when reviewing the 17 alternatives for the site, the citizens advisory committee and the King County staff considered options for shifting the traffic. But this would only result in a new group of citizens coming before the City to voice their complaints about the access to the site being proposed through their neighborhood. He said that regardless of where the access is placed, people would have to travel on City streets a fair amount of the way. He said there is no way King County would ever get permission to put an access through Ronald Bog because it is considered a sensitive area.

Vice Chair Harris said it appears that the major issue is related to litter. He said he grew up on 185th between Meridian and Burke Street, and they have been picking up trash for years, too. While the problem likely becomes more concentrated closer to the facility, the problem exists to some extent on all of the City's arterials. He cautioned against pushing landscapers out on I-5 during rush hour with old trucks in order to carry their load to the facility.

Chair Doennebrink said it appears from the plans, that there would be only one lane going into the facility and two lanes going out. He said he has heard complaints about the traffic backing out onto Meridian. He suggested that there should be more lanes coming into the site than just one unless people can be processed faster. Mr. Kiernan said they are continuing to consider design level details that would allow them to process faster. They are looking at transponders that commercial haulers would carry in their vehicles, and they would not even be required to interact with the scale house. He said the two lanes coming out are provided to accommodate people who just pay minimum fee without being weighed. He said there is a potential to provide a second scale, etc.

Chair Doennebrink inquired if there would be a left turn lane going into the recycle area. He also questioned if a flashing light could be installed on Meridian. Mr. Kiernan said the traffic study indicated that a light would not be necessary. Mr. Thomas said this could possibly become a City initiated action to install some sort of additional traffic control.

Mr. Kiernan said they have not yet determined whether they would close the site, and if so, for how long during construction. If the site is closed, the project would probably be less costly, but there would be a time without service and a disruption to the customers. If the site continues to operate, construction would be more complicated. This decision would be made as they get further along in the design. Conceptually, it appears that the station could continue to operate. However, he said they would need to have a fair amount of confidence as to the layout before they go forward with more detailed designs.

Chair Doennebrink noted that the level of service for the 175th northbound ramps is F, as is the southbound ramp from 175th. In 1980 the delay was 24 seconds. By the year 2000 the delay was 299 seconds.

Commissioner Gabbert inquired if King County's traffic engineer was available to answer questions of the Commission. Mr. Kiernan said they did not bring their traffic engineer to the meeting, but they do have a traffic consultant working on the project. Commissioner Gabbert inquired if Mr. Kiernan has any idea about whether coming off of 175th would exacerbate the level of service as it currently stands.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that the Commission move on and deal with the master plan and the Development Code. With regard to the things that are the City's responsibility, an interlocal agreement between the City and the County could make it known that, even though Meridian is an arterial, it is also a residential street. It is the City's job to decide how to best send this message to people entering Shoreline via 145th or 175th heading towards to transfer station to dump their garbage. The City needs to figure out a way to send behavioral messages to the public related to littering. But this issue should not have anything to do with the master plan proposal that is before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND MOVED THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDER THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT THE DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADD THE MASTER PLAN AS THE COUNTY'S WAY OF MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION, WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT ARE LISTED BY STAFF. COMMISSIONER DOERING SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner McClelland said she believes this facility is something the City inherited when it incorporated. There are three other government agencies as guests in their City. To the extent that King County is making an effort to make this the least invasive plan they can, she welcomes their effort.

Commissioner MacCully recalled that at the last meeting, the Commission commented briefly about the possibility of intersection treatments at 165th. While he recognizes that a signal is not warranted, he asked Mr. Thomas to address the question about whether or not other conditions could be placed on the master plan to address this issue. He asked if King County considered widening the intersection, and providing a right turn only lane using some of Seattle City Light's property. Mr. Kiernan said they have not researched this option yet. He noted that they have not reached this level of design yet. They have acquired two properties, which will give them more flexibility. Mr. Kiernan said some people have expressed their concern that widening the intersection would create more problems, and they like people having to slow down and stop in order to egress.

Commissioner MacCully said he is not so much concerned about making it easier for people to get out of the site as he is about people getting into the facility. When people are going into the site, there are staging lines that back up. Commissioner Gabbert suggested that a condition be added to the master plan, requiring the County to provide two lanes coming in for queuing up, including both a right hand turn channel from Meridian and a left hand turn channel coming from the north. Mr. Thomas said the Commission has the opportunity to provide some direction through conditions. For instance, to address Chair Doennebrink's suggestion about alternatives to having a flashing light, he said a condition could be placed on the master plan that would require the City and the County to work towards achieving some sort of greater solution than what currently exists for access to the site. In regards to Commissioner Gabbert's comment about right-of-way improvement, this might be required at some future point during the building permit review process as the site starts to rebuild.

Commissioner McClelland asked if a free right hand turn lane could be provided for accessing the site by using a portion of the Seattle City Light property. A right only turn back onto Meridian would also improve the situation. She suggested that the motion include a recommendation that traffic improvements be considered. At the design phase, the project will come back before the City for review.

Mr. Thomas said that, generally, when development projects come in for building permits or other types of review, they are reviewed by the traffic engineer to determine the amount of traffic generated. Any alterations to the City's right-of-way are carefully reviewed by the City Engineer to make sure they are consistent with the City's plans and money is available to make the improvements if initiated by the City. To make this a condition of the master plan might be a little bit premature. But the suggestion of forwarding that thought further as a recommendation would be appropriate.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND MOVED TO AMENDED HER MOTION TO SAY THAT THE COMMISSION WOULD LIKE THE APPLICANT TO CONSIDER ALTERATIONS TO INGRESS AND EGRESS TO THE SITE. COMMISSIONER DOERING ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT AS PROPOSED.

Commissioner Gabbert suggested that it would be better to make this a requirement of the master plan. He said that master plans are generally like planned actions where a SEPA is done for the whole project. If the master plan is approved, King County would not have to come back to redo the SEPA with each of the projects identified. Mr. Stewart said the difference is that the level of detail that has been presented thus far is not sufficient to determine the project level SEPA action. He referred to Page 23 of the staff report, and noted that under Regulation 20.100.30.E, there is an additional SEPA requirement at the project level when other impacts related to traffic might be studied. As the detail gets finer and the design gets much clearer, there will be additional opportunity to take corrective actions.

Commissioner McClelland requested direction from staff as to how the Commission could best address the issue through a motion. Mr. Thomas said the amendment she proposed appears to cover the intent of the Commission's discussion. The Commission continued to discuss options for amending the motion.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND MOVED TO AMEND HER ORIGINAL MOTION TO READ:

THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDER THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO ADOPT THE DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADD THE MASTER PLAN AS THE COUNTY'S WAY OF MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION, WITH THE CONDITIONS LISTED BY STAFF AND AN ADDITIONAL CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT BE REQUIRED TO DECREASE THE QUEUING ON MERIDIAN AVENUE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE AND IMPROVE INGRESS AND EGRESS, WHICH MAY INCLUDE A RIGHT TURN ONLY. COMMISSIONER DOERING AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT.

Commissioner McClelland summarized that, if the motion is approved as amended, the applicant would be required to consider additional queuing lanes and to make improvements to egress and ingress. While the Commission has discussed the option of requiring a right turn only ingress and egress, she does not feel comfortable making that a requirement. Vice Chair Harris agreed, and said the Commission does not have the necessary information to determine whether a right turn only would be the best option.

COMMISSIONER GABBERT MOVED THAT COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND'S AMENDED MOTION BE CHANGED FURTHER BY REQUIRING THAT ALL SIDEWALKS BE CONTIGUOUS ON BOTH SIDES FROM 165TH (BETWEEN 172ND AND 175TH STREETS IN FRONT OF MERIDIAN PARK ELEMENTARY) TO THE ENTRANCE OF THE FACILITY.

Commissioner Gabbert noted that the Environmental Impact Statement (4th Bulleted Item on Page 2 of Appendix D) suggests that the applicant consider installing sidewalks in the missing sections east of Meridian Avenue between 172nd and 175th Streets in front of Meridian Park Elementary. He suggested that this become a requirement of the master plan.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that perhaps all four of the bulleted items on Page 2 of Appendix D (Environmental Impact Statement) should be made requirements. Chair Gabbert said he assumed that the other three suggestions would be incorporated into the design. Commissioner MacCully expressed his opinion that the second and third bulleted items are immaterial because the transfer trucks would no longer be going through the intersection.

COMMISSIONER GABBERT MOVED TO CHANGE HIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO REQUIRE ALL FOUR OF THE MITIGATING MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN THE SEPA CHECKLIST ON PAGE 2 OF APPENDIX D. COMMISSIONER DOERING SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND.

Commissioner Sands inquired if the Commission would have an opportunity, at a later date when they come in for specific permits to implement the plan, to require the mitigating measures as conditions to proceed. He said he is confused as to how the master plan process relates to what the City is allowed to do at a later date. There are a lot of questions still up in the air related to the master plan. He said it would seem that the Commission should have an opportunity to require some of the fine-tuning ideas that are being discussed. If the Commission will have an opportunity to make additional requirements at a later date, they should get on with approving the general master plan.

Mr. Thomas referred to Commissioner Gabbert's most recent amendment to the motion, and noted that the first three bullets on Page 2 of Appendix D are all specific to the large long-haul trucks. He recalled that with the adoption of the metro north base ramps for the long haul trucks to use, the first three bullets are no longer necessary. He suggested that the Commission consider changing the amendment to go back to Commissioner Gabbert's original amendment related to the installation of sidewalks from 172nd to 175th in front of the Meridian Park Elementary School.

COMMISSIONER GABBERT WITHDREW HIS LATTER AMENDMENT AND REFERRED BACK TO HIS ORIGINAL AMENDMENT. COMMISSIONER DOERING SECONDED COMMISSIONER GABBERT'S ORIGINAL AMENDMENT.

Commissioner McClelland requested that the staff address Commissioner Sands' question regarding who would have the authority to condition future applications that come in for specific projects identified in the master plan. Mr. Thomas answered that any time a permit project action is proposed within the City, the City staff reviews the proposal for impacts to City right-of-way, and this would include increased traffic, wear and tear of the roadway, increased risk to pedestrians, etc. In addition, Title 20 of the Shoreline Municipal Code identifies when improvements to a roadway are required. Mr. Stewart said the SEPA responsible person would make these decisions. Commissioner McClelland inquired if there would be additional opportunities for the City to condition the application. Mr. Stewart answered affirmatively.

Commissioner McClelland asked how the Commission could ensure that their intent is not lost between the time the master plan is approved and building permits are issued. She questioned if it is necessary to include all of the specific conditions identified by the Commission as part of their master plan recommendation. Mr. Stewart said the best way to ensure that the Commission's concerns are addressed would be to add bullet points to the regulatory section as part of their recommendation to the City Council. The Commission's recommendation could require that specific issues be considered during the permitting review. This would flag the issue so that it could be considered when detailed designs are submitted as part of the permitting process.

Mr. Stewart referred to Page 23 of the Staff Report, which talks about how the proposed master plan regulation would fit in with the rest of the City regulations. If a project action were found to be in conformance with the master plan, the review process would be quick. If a project action were found to be out of compliance with the master plan, a special use permit would be required. In any case, SEPA is the ultimate reviewer at the detailed project level review.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if the Commission has the ability to recommend that the City, itself, have an ordinance with a fine for littering. Mr. Stewart said the City already has litter and nuisance ordinances. The enforcement action related to this application was appropriately dealt with by the Commission in their previous motion for the City and the County to explore ways of developing a proactive enforcement program in an attempt to reduce the problem of litter and unsecured loads.

Mr. Stewart referred to Item C on Page 33 of the Staff report and suggested that the Commission might want to add an additional item to this portion of the proposed ordinance to reflect their concerns. If the Commission is concerned about backup queuing, perhaps something could be added such as "multiple entrance lanes should be considered to avoid excessive vehicle queuing." The Commission agreed that this would flag the issue so that staff would remember to consider it when reviewing the detailed plans.

Mr. Kiernan said that, at this time, the location of the building affects the queuing. Right now, the queue backs up from the floor clear out onto the scale. Since there is not yet a significant level of design, it is difficult to address these details. Part of the final process will include models to address queuing at various points throughout the site.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that Mr. Stewart's recommended language be added as another bulleted item in Section 20.100.120.C of the proposed ordinance. Additional bullets could be added to this section to address the amendment she proposed, as well as the amendment proposed by Commissioner Gabbert. If this were done, the recommendations would become part of the code. Commissioner Gabbert agreed.

ALL OF THE PREVIOUS AMENDMENTS TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION WERE WITHDRAWN.

COMMISSIONER MCCLELLAND MOVED TO AMEND HER MOTION TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

THAT THE COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE STAFF'S PROPOSAL TO ADOPT THE DEVELOPMENT CODE TO ADD THE MASTER PLAN AS THE COUNTY'S WAY OF MAKING IMPROVEMENTS TO THE FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION, WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT ARE LISTED BY STAFF. IN ADDITION, THREE ADDITIONAL BULLETS SHOULD BE ADDED TO SECTION 20.100.120.C AS FOLLOWS:

- THAT THE APPLICANT BE REQUIRED TO DECREASE THE QUEUING ON MERIDIAN AVENUE TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE AND IMPROVE INGRESS AND EGRESS, WHICH MAY INCLUDE A RIGHT TURN ONLY.
- THAT CONTIGUOUS SIDEWALKS BE REQUIRED ON BOTH SIDES OF MERIDIAN AVENUE FROM 165TH (BETWEEN 172ND AND 175TH STREETS IN FRONT OF MERIDIAN PARK ELEMENTARY) TO THE ENTRANCE OF THE FACILITY.
- THAT MULTIPLE ENTRANCE LANES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO AVOID EXCESSIVE VEHICLE QUEUING.

COMMISSIONER DOERING SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. REPORTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Doering announced that the subcommittee has been working further on the audience and Commission meeting ground rules. However, she does not have the modified documents available for the Commission's review at this time. She asked that this item be scheduled on the September 4th agenda.

Commissioner MacCully noted that when he was perusing the list of individuals who had filed for City Council positions, he noticed that Chair Doennebrink was included on the list. He requested that staff provide guidance as the types of Planning Commission issues that Chair Doennebrink can or cannot talk about if asked by the general public.

These Minutes Approved
July 10, 2003

CITY OF SHORELINE

SHORELINE PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

June 19, 2003
7:00 P.M.

Shoreline Conference Center
Board Room

PRESENT

Chair Doennebrink
Vice Chair Harris
Commissioner Gabbert
Commissioner Kuboi
Commissioner Sands
Commissioner McClelland
Commissioner Doering
Commissioner MacCully

STAFF PRESENT

Rachael Markle-Oleson, Planning Manager, Planning & Dev. Services
Jeff Thomas, Planner III, Planning & Development Services
Lanie Curry, Planning Commission Clerk

ABSENT

Commissioner Piro

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Doennebrink.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the Commission Clerk, the following Commissioners were present: Chair Doennebrink, Vice Chair Harris, Commissioners Doering, Kuboi, MacCully, McClelland, Gabbert and Sands. Commissioner Piro was excused.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

COMMISSIONER GABBERT MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PROPOSED.
COMMISSIONER MACCULLY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED
UNANIMOUSLY.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

COMMISSIONER DOERING MOVED TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 5, 2003 AS WRITTEN. COMMISSIONER KUBOI SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no one in the audience who desired to address the Commission during this portion of the meeting.

6. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARING: KING COUNTY FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION MASTER PLAN

Chair Doennebrink reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing.

a. Staff Report

Jeff Thomas, City of Shoreline Planner, provided a brief presentation on the master plan application the City received from King County for the First Northeast Transfer Station site. He explained that the application is an administrative action to amend the Shoreline Development Code and is before the Planning Commission for a public hearing and a recommendation to the City Council. Staff hopes to present the Commission's recommendation to the City Council for a final decision at their first meeting in September.

Mr. Thomas advised that a few Planning Commissioners, as well as members of the general public, contacted him asking how the SEPA review process fits in with the application to amend the Development Code. He explained that when the City receives an application for a Development Code amendment, staff issues a SEPA threshold determination prior to the Planning Commission public hearing. However, in this particular instance, King County has been concurrently undertaking their own facility master planning process. They will be taking their preferred alternative proposal to the King County Council for final review and approval, and they are the lead agency for the SEPA review process for the project. The issued a determination of non-significance on April 17, 2003. The City of Shoreline has accepted the determination of non-significance and adopted it into their process so that the Development Code amendment could move forward.

Mr. Thomas said that this application is the first master plan considered by the City of Shoreline. He advised that the City's Comprehensive Plan encourages the completion of master plans for sites in the City of Shoreline that are designated as essential regional public facilities. He referred to the land use designation map found in the Comprehensive Plan, and noted that along with properties that are designated for residential and mixed-use development, there are also a select number of properties designated for essential regional public facilities: the First Northeast Transfer Station, the Shoreline Community College and the Fircrest Campus. These three sites have been identified as having regional significance and a distinct public purpose.

Mr. Thomas emphasized that the alternative to not doing a master plan for each of the three sites is for the City to require a conditional use permit for each project. This would require King County to obtain a conditional use permit every time they want to rebuild, add a new use or expand an existing use on the site. The City would only be able to consider mitigation measures for the small portion of the site where the change is proposed rather than taking a holistic view and approach for determining the needs of the site in the future as well as compatibility with the neighborhood.

Mr. Thomas said the underlying zoning for the site is R-6, and this would not be changed by the master plan process and Development Code amendment. He explained that any actual construction or development would default back to the underlying zoning for the site if specific standards have not been approved through the master plan process. The master plan process provides an opportunity for custom design, mitigation, etc. that might not be possible by processing conditional uses and following the underlying zoning standards.

Mr. Thomas said the application has two components. The first provides a site plan map, which was developed by King County as their preferred alternative. Staff reviewed the site plan and compared it against the standards that exist for the underlying R-6 zoning district to see if they could be applied successfully using the preferred alternative. Staff found that in most cases, the standards could be easily applied. However, in some cases, they found that the site plan would not quite meet the standards—specifically with the new transfer station building that is proposed to be more than 35 feet in height. While the existing building is more than 35 feet in height, the R-6 zoning district limits the height of structures to a maximum of 35 feet.

Mr. Thomas referred to the second component of the application—the text portion. The text portion provides an evaluation of all of the R-6 zoning standards and proposes specific development standards for the site that coincide with the preferred alternative site design. Mr. Thomas referred to Figure 1 on Page 16 of the Staff Report, which provides a matrix illustrating how the bulk and dimensional development standards found in the proposed master plan and Development Code amendment would compare with the underlying R-6 zoning requirements. The matrix also identifies the difference between the two in each category.

Mr. Thomas explained that the transfer station site is well over 500,000 square feet, and there are no other R-6 zoned properties in the City that are anywhere near that size. Because this property is unique, the proposed master plan identifies different setback standards. However, staff believes they will end up with a site that maintains much larger setbacks than any standard residential property. He noted that King County has identified a need to build a new transfer station building that is up to 85 feet in height, which exceeds the height limit of the underlying zone. However, the amount of building coverage and impervious surfaces would remain constant.

Mr. Thomas advised that the Planning Commission's options have been outlined in the staff report. They can approve the amendment as proposed, approve the amendment with some recommended changes, or deny the proposed amendment. He explained that the Development Code outlines three criteria that proposed amendments must be evaluated against. The first is consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

He explained that the Comprehensive Plan encourages master plans for essential regional public facilities. There are specific policies in the Comprehensive Plan to address the transfer station site from a transportation perspective, which encourages the use of I-5 and the existing connector ramps for the King County Metro North Base Maintenance Facility as much as possible. He noted that there has been quite a bit of public input related to access, and the City has been working for quite a few years with King County Solid Waste, Metro, and the State Department of Transportation to address the situation. He advised that the Washington State Department of Transportation is currently reviewing an application that would allow the long-haul trucks to use the maintenance facility ramps, and it is hoped that a positive decision will be made in the near future. If approval is granted in the future to allow the long-haul trucks to cut through and use the ramps, the master plan would be amended.

Mr. Thomas said the second criteria that must be considered when reviewing a Comprehensive Plan amendment is that it not adversely impact public health, safety or general welfare. The third is that the amendment is not contrary to the best interest of the citizens or property owners in the City of Shoreline. He said the staff has received written public comments that were distributed to each of the Commissioners. The public comment period closed at 5:00 p.m. on June 19, 2003. Mr. Thomas advised that there are existing uses located on the site, and the application does not propose any new uses. The Development Code amendment would expand some uses on the site such as the recycling area, a new transfer station building, etc. All of the changes proposed through 2030 are aimed at improving the efficiency of the site and lessening the impacts on the existing neighborhoods.

Mr. Thomas said staff recommends that the Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the proposed Development Code amendment and Master Plan as outlined in the staff report.

b. Applicant Testimony

Kevin Kiernan, King County Solid Waste Division, said the purpose of the proposal is to revise and implement a facility master plan for the First Northeast Transfer Station to be used as a final guide for development of the facility to identify the needed modifications and improvements. The proposal must be consistent with the description of the budget found in the King County Capital Improvement Program. He said a facility master plan is required by both the King County Code and the City of Shoreline Code. King County's goal is to provide for the solid waste handling and recycling needs of the Northeast King County service area for the next 20 years in a manner that is protective of the environment, responsive to the neighbors, community and customers, and in partnership with their employees. The facility must provide for solid waste handling, continue and increase recycling opportunities, upgrade facility operations to meet or exceed current environmental standards, and mitigate and minimize potential impacts to their neighbors. Their goals are to protect the public health and environment and safely and efficiently handle solid waste.

Mr. Kiernan provided a photograph of the existing facility and noted that it is located in a residential neighborhood (quite close to its nearest neighbor). It was constructed in 1967 from a design that was created by the County in 1963. The facility is now obsolete. The roof is too low.

He explained that the trucks that collect the neighborhood garbage are larger than they were in 1963, and they now come real close to the top of the roof. The roof has also been weakened, and is now quite susceptible to snow load. During the snowstorm in the winter of 1996, they had to close down the facility for a few days because the roof was sagging and groaning. He said that the surface water facilities are also inadequate. There is only a small pond to handle all the paved area. All of the traffic (large trucks as well as customers) is currently routed onto Meridian Avenue.

Mr. Kiernan advised that King County initiated a facility master planning process in 1994, and that process ended in a proposal that included a bridge over Thornton Creek. While the size was roughly the same as the new proposal, the traffic circulation would have been different. Since that time, the City of Shoreline was incorporated, and King County feels it is appropriate to review the proposal again in light of the City of Shoreline's requirements, as well as the Endangered Species Act requirements.

Mr. Kiernan said that an extensive public process was used to develop the new plan. Three public meetings were held to discuss what the process should be. The consensus was that a citizen advisory committee should be formed, and an 11-member committee was created. Notices were mailed to more than 1,200 households around the facility as well as around the route of the trucks. People who would be impacted in any way received a notice. Notices were put on the City and County web pages, as well as in public libraries. They handed out flyers to their users and placed articles in *THE SHORELINE ENTERPRISE*. They have an active mailing list of about 50 people who receive all of the meeting and project updates. The intent of the public outreach program was to solicit ideas from the public regarding the values that should be protected and the needs that should be served.

Mr. Kiernan said that the citizen advisory committee went through several iterations of different proposed facility findings and ended up with the plan that is currently being proposed. He pointed out two significant features of the new proposal. The first is that they wanted to move the solid waste handling further from the residential neighborhoods. They have pulled the building back as far as possible up to the transit base, and the truck maneuvering will be located between the building and I-5. This will protect the residential neighborhoods from the noise of the trucks. Secondly, they attempted to protect the creek. Not only did they not bridge the creek, they pulled back some of the existing encroachments into the buffer. From the public comments, there appeared to be a strong interest in a maintaining a larger undeveloped piece of open area rather than breaking up the development.

Mr. Kiernan said that King County has conducted the SEPA process and issued a determination of non-significance. The facility plan is currently before both the City and the King County Councils. They are hoping to obtain approval of the plan from the King County Council by midyear so that they can submit their budget request for building the project in the 2004 Capital Budget that will be considered by the County Council in October. It is hoped that the City of Shoreline will also approve the master plan this year. They would like to begin holding public open houses on the specific details of the plan after approval has been obtained. They anticipate that construction could begin in early 2005 and be completed in 2006.

c. Public Comment

Medrash Yaakov, 2009 North 164th Place, said that he is representing his neighbor as well as himself. He said many people in his neighborhood did not receive notification about the project. He noted that just south of the transfer station site is the metro bus barn. He suggested that the bus barn be used as an example when designing the transfer station site. He said they have 90 buses going in and out of the site every day, but no one knows they are there. No one notices the employees coming to the site, either, because they are not coming through the neighborhood. They access via I-5, and this same concept should be adopted for the transfer station.

Mr. Yaakov said there is already a lot of traffic on Meridian Avenue, and it is sometimes very difficult to come out of their neighborhood and go north. There is garbage all over from 145th Street to 175th Street. He suggested that the entrance at 165th Street be closed in the future, and that the access be from the 175th Street ramp onto the north part of the site. Traffic could exit the site via the metro bus barn exits. He suggested that the County work with the Department of Transportation to protect the environment from sound, noise and garbage, etc.

John Delano, 2004 North 163rd Place, said that he lives just a few streets down from the transfer station. He said that while he has not reviewed any traffic studies, he knows that there are already issues on weekends as a result of traffic backing up off 165th Street onto Meridian Avenue. However, there is nothing in the plan to identify how they will accommodate more garbage coming in from unincorporated King County without looking at ways to unclog the traffic that already exists. Meridian Avenue is already busy enough as it is. Finding an alternate route for accessing the site is important.

Mr. Delano said that, as a Shoreline homeowner, he has to deal with garbage that is left along the street. He can choose to pick up the garbage, but unfortunately, he is charged when he puts it in his can. When larger items come along like mattresses, etc. he has to call the King County Police Department for pickup, and the wait is usually three to six days. He said he is concerned that if they continue to direct traffic down Meridian Avenue at 165th, increasing the capacity of the facility by three times without solving any of the traffic and garbage problems, the situation would be exacerbated. If the access were moved as recommended by the previous speaker, the garbage and traffic would not impact the neighborhood residents.

Mr. Delano said he also has a concern about the noise. He noted that the metro buses go in and out of their facility, and the neighbors very rarely hear them. He agreed that King County should model the transfer station after the metro bus facility to eliminate the impacts to the neighbors. He summarized that he would like King County to consider alternative access points to and from the site, as well as opportunities to make the site more aesthetically pleasing.

Steve Brooks, 16441 Meridian Ave North, said he lives just a stones throw away from the entrance to the transfer station. He said there is already a buffer zone along I-5, with the parks to the north, as well as the park on top of the metro facility to the south. He suggested that the greenbelt and buffer zone be continued between the residential neighborhoods and the transfer station, metro bus facility and I-5. He referred to the criteria used by Metro in the design of their facility.

They put their facility underground, to lessen the visual impact to the neighborhood and enclose some of the noise and debris. They would like this same concept included in the transfer facility proposal, as well. He said that with parks to both the north and the south, there is an opportunity to link them together with either a walking trail or some sort of continuing greenbelt. Perhaps even a playground or basketball court would be appropriate for this site.

Mr. Brooks said that while King County's plan does address the issues of noise, smell and rodents in a general manner, he would like to see some more specific solutions as to how they will contain the smell and runoff and how they will control the noise. They feel that putting the location underground could help enclose some of the noise and could potentially help keep the rodents down. If they did end up closing the 165th Street entrance, the trash and debris could be taken out of the neighborhood to a more controlled location along I-5, thus reducing the impact to the residential areas.

Young Lim, 2002 North 164th Place, said that she is in favor of the transfer station being located in Shoreline, but she felt the proposed plan would adversely and directly impact the quality of life of the neighborhood. She noted that Meridian Avenue North is already busy, going both north and south. During rush hours the traffic load is very slow. The proposed plan would add more traffic congestion, which would end up increasing the noise and damage along the street. Ms. Lim said that no matter what, the garbage must be covered as it is transported. During a normal day, you can find garbage scattered about on the road. Because rodents are attracted to the garbage, there are often dead animals on the roadway, and no one is responsible to clean this mess up. It takes a long time for the City to take care of these situations. Because this is a residential area, with several schools and daycares, they want to have a quiet and clean neighborhood. She said that if the proposed plan is put into effect, this part of Shoreline will have more traffic congestion and the property values will decrease.

Janet Groden-Thertcher, 16510 Meridian Ave North, said that hers was one of the three properties that King County considered for acquisition, and she was the only one that said no. The house behind her and the one beside her are now vacant, but the County will not be starting any construction for at least two more years. She inquired what King County plans to do with the vacant properties until that time. The yards are overgrown and she now has rodents coming onto her property. She said she has an absolutely perfect backyard, and now weeds will be growing from the seeds that blow from the vacant lots.

Ms. Groden-Thertcher said that King County has been very accommodating as far as getting sound engineers into her backyard to run sound tests, etc. That is one of the reasons there was an amendment to have the large trucks access onto I-5 because the sound rattles the windows of her house. She said she has had a lot of trouble backing into her driveway—especially during peak hours. There have been a lot of pedestrian issues because cars do not look carefully when they exit the transfer station. In addition, she and her husband have to pick up garbage in front of their house daily because people do not secure their loads as required. Lastly, Ms. Groden-Thertcher said the noise level is created by the large trucks. There is not a lot of problem as a result of sound coming from the facility, but they have noticed an increase in smell in recent months because the transfer station is being used for overflow while another facility is closed.

Kaye Pethe, 4621 NE 175th Street, Lake Forest Park, said that for the last 4½ years she has worked as an independent contractor doing the user and customer satisfaction surveys for the County there. She said that she couldn't speak as other than a private user that has been going to the facility for the past 25 years. She was happy to hear that the transfer trucks will have a separate access through Metro roads, and she hopes that this can be expanded, with a scale put in so that all the commercial haulers can have a separate entrance, too. This would keep all the heavy trucks off of Meridian Avenue North.

Ms. Pethe said there are a lot more self-haulers coming to the facility from Snohomish County now that they have closed their facility to self-haulers for the majority of the day. She noted that King County is proposing to also close their facility to self-haulers during a short period of the day because self-haulers bring in about 1/3 of the debris but make up about 80 percent of the users. What is not considered is that most of the self-haulers are also property owners in the County. If the facility is closed to self-haulers, the problem of garbage along the road will be exacerbated. She said it would make sense to place at least one scale for the commercial haulers at the same back location where the garbage is hauled out. This would allow them to keep all of the large vehicles off of Meridian Avenue North. She asked that they not close the facility to self-haulers because a large percentage of these people are also property owners in the County.

Janet Way, 940 NE 147th Street, said she represents the Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund and the Paramount Park Neighborhood Group. She said she was on the advisory committee for the transfer site, which was a good process. She referred to the issues related to Thornton Creek, and said it is important for the Commissioners to take note of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She noted that the EIS mentions that Thornton Creek has Chinook salmon downstream, but there is no evidence of them in the upper reaches. She clarified that there has been at least one report of small Chinook salmon found in the Twin Ponds area, and there have also been salmon releases in the area. There have been more reports of Coho and Chinook salmon than what is actually discussed in the EIS. There is no doubt that Thornton Creek is a Chinook stream, and there are numerous references to this in the record. She referenced the letter the Commission received about the stream inventory a few weeks ago from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, which acknowledges that there have been fish-eating birds in Ronald Bog. In addition, she said she saw someone recently walking around Ronald Bog with a fishing pole.

Ms. Way said that by and large the plan is good, but she is also concerned that the impervious surfaces will be increased significantly. She asked that there be sufficient mitigation to compensate for this increase and that there be proper detention of the runoff.

Mr. Salziz, 1826 North 165th Street, said he lives close to the transfer station. He said he supports the comments that have already been made regarding the trash that is left not just on Meridian Avenue North, but also on 165th Street, which is a dead end street. Hopefully, the access can be from the freeway instead. This will help keep the property values up, resulting in higher property taxes for the City. In addition, changing the access would increase good will with the community, which is important. Mr. Salziz said he just found out that there are about 190 buses just a block away from his home, and he did not even know it. While he can see the entrance, he cannot see the buses. He said it would be wonderful if traffic could access the site from the bus facility.

This would relieve the residential neighborhood. Additionally, he said it would also be wonderful if the site could be covered. This would make the site appear homier and would also reduce the impacts associated with sound and smell.

Jan Troubridge, 1826 North 165th Street, said that she just recently became aware of the proposal because she heard sometime ago that the City was planning to have the trucks access the site from I-5. She said that the left-hand turn onto 165th Street is really difficult, particularly when trucks are waiting to turn left going into the facility. The trash that is left along the roadways is also a problem. She reiterated that there are three grade schools within ten blocks each direction of the transfer station. Children walk along this area, and as the traffic increases the situation will become more dangerous. There have been a tremendous number of pedestrian accidents of late, and a number of these have been in Shoreline. She concluded by stating that she cannot imagine that the property values will go up if the County continues to exacerbate the traffic problem and bring in more garbage.

Commissioner Gabbert inquired why the Commission did not get a chance to review the mitigation measures identified in the Determination of Non-significance.

Neil Fuji, Supervising Facility Engineer, King County Solid Waste Division, said that when the environmental checklist was completed by the County, there was no finding that the proposal would create any worse situation than what currently exists. In fact, the proposal would improve the different elements that were addressed in the checklist. He clarified that they did not find anything that would require a mitigation measure. The checklist was forwarded to the SEPA responsible official to review the findings, and he agreed with the determination that there were no significant impacts associated with the proposal.

Commissioner McClelland inquired if the City of Shoreline's SEPA responsible official reviewed the checklist. She noted that because this is a non-project request, the County could do their own checklist. But in the actual ordinance, the City of Shoreline would be the lead agency on environmental review. Mr. Thomas answered that King County put together a draft checklist, which the City staff reviewed from a technical perspective to make sure that the factual information that was being used by the County in the SEPA checklist was correct.

Commissioner McClelland asked why the Commission did not receive a copy of the SEPA checklist. Mr. Thomas answered that King County ran the SEPA review process to correlate with their facilities master planning process. It appears that the Commission is expressing a desire for the SEPA process to run concurrent with the master plan application. Commissioner McClelland said they are only expressing a desire to review the SEPA checklist. Mr. Fuji said although it was not possible, the original intent was to run the SEPA review concurrently with the master plan proposal. . They were scheduled to attend a Planning Commission meeting for an open house presentation related to the proposal. At that time, the SEPA comment period had just started. While the meeting was cancelled, King County moved forward with their open house. They did extend the 15-day comment period to 30 days.

Mr. Thomas explained that the proposed Development Code amendment is a non-project action. This means that approval of the amendment does not directly lead to a building being constructed.

It is an amendment to the standards in the Development Code. King County also had a non-project action going forward—their own facility master planning process—which will go before the King County Council shortly. The SEPA review process that was run by King County was in conjunction with their facility master planning process. The SEPA responsible official for the King County Solid Waste Department issued a threshold determination of non-significance, and this went forward with their process. When they applied for the development code amendment and the master plan that is before the Commission, rather than duplicating the SEPA process, they submitted their SEPA determination as part of their application package given that their facility master planning process and the proposed amendment for a master plan are essentially the same product (the preferred alternative).

Mr. Thomas said that Commissioner McClelland has noted that the actual amendment includes some language about SEPA project actions, with the City of Shoreline being the lead agency. That is absolutely true. If the master plan becomes part of the Development Code, when the construction phase starts, the County will come before the City with permit applications for specific components of the master plan. All of the individual components of the master plan will require additional permitting requirements—specifically a building permit. In Section 3 of the City's Development Code there are SEPA thresholds where construction might be exempt from project action SEPA review. If any of the proposed projects (most of them will) exceed the exemption thresholds, a project action SEPA review will be triggered for that individual component. At that time, the City would receive a building permit application, along with a project action SEPA checklist specifically for that project.

Commissioner Kuboi requested that representatives from King County address the following questions:

- What is the County's overall solid waste plan, and how does the proposal fit into that plan?
- There have been a number of comments related to the increase in usage. What are the projected increases and what are the growth patterns and projections beyond 2030?
- What is the area served by the Northeast King County Transfer Station?
- What were the results of the citizens advisory committee, and what impact did this committee have on the final proposal?
- Why hasn't feasibility or non-feasibility of access for private solid waste vehicles off of I-5 been addressed in the proposed plan?

Mr. Kiernan said that his understanding was that he was supposed to talk about the history of the process, but he can provide additional information if the Commission desires. He said he tried to be responsive to what he thought the interests of the Commission would be.

Commissioner Gabbert questioned the purpose of the hearing since there was a declaration of non-significance. Mr. Thomas explained that the purpose of the public hearing and Commission deliberation is to allow the Commission to accept public comment and then move forward with a recommendation to the City Council. Again, he explained that the Commission has three options. They can recommend approval of the application as proposed, approval of the application with some conditions, or denial of the application.

Mr. Kiernan explained that King County has an adopted Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan that is referred by State law and by the King County Code.

One of the main requirements is that they provide a detailed secure capital plan for their facilities, and then look out to twenty years. One element of the plan is related to disposal, which includes using the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. Within the 20-year lookout of that plan, the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill will reach capacity and close. The other element is the transfer system. There are currently eight transfer stations, with two drop boxes in rural areas. Six of the transfer stations are in the urban area, and the other two are located in Enumclaw and Vashon. They have proposed a plan to upgrade five of the transfer stations that are currently based on 60's technologies. They are also planning for the closure of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill and the export of solid waste from the County since the determination has been made that they will not be able to site a new landfill in King County. They expect to haul their refuse somewhere else. He said they have also been researching the option of an intermodal facility where the garbage would be taken from trucks, put on trains and shipped off.

Mr. Kiernan said that there are different plans at the various facilities. Some are proposed to be upgraded in place, while others are proposed to be replaced. Plans for the Northeast King County Transfer Station are constrained because they do not plan to expand their property boundaries. Regarding the service area, Mr. Kiernan said that they do not direct residents to any particular site. They come to whichever site they find is convenient. Generally, the service area is the County line to the City limit for commercial haulers. To the east, people make their decision based on convenience. But self-haulers are not limited to a specific location. There has been densification in the Shoreline area, so they are looking to accommodate that growth, as well. While people may choose to come to this site from other areas, it is a discretionary choice.

Mr. Kiernan said that the result of the citizen advisory committee process is the proposed plan before the Commission for consideration. While they started out reviewing four alternatives, they ended up considering fifteen different alternatives. One very clear result of the advisory committee was the concept of providing a natural corridor. There was also a lot of discussion around recycling.

Mr. Kiernan said the bottom line on the access situation is what the Federal Highway Administration will permit. They have told King County that absolutely, under no conditions, will they allow any additional traffic beyond what they are proposing for use of the ramps. In fact, allowing solid waste vehicles to use these ramps is not consistent with Federal policy and is a stretch. King County has worked ten years to get to the point where the State would allow transfer vehicles to use the ramps because they have asserted that transfer vehicles can be considered regional traffic (coming from one regional facility to another). They have done computer models of the use and invited representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation to visit the site and view the trucks making turns. After ten years, they believe the State will finally approve the use of the ramps for a solid waste facility. If they ask for the general public to use the ramps, as well, the State will likely reject the whole concept. They feel that they have done as much as they can to address the situation.

Commissioner MacCully said he understands that this is a non-project process, but the first statement in any project application in the future will be whether or not it is consistent with the master plan. The decision that is made related to the master plan will impact what takes place in the future.

Given the increase in population and solid waste that will take place over the next 20 years, how can this not have an impact on a facility that uses the same access as before?

Mr. Kiernan reminded Commissioner MacCully that the large truck trips would be reduced. He said the proposal would be more efficient in getting traffic through, so it would eliminate or greatly reduce back up.

Commissioner MacCully said that the Commission is hearing from the neighbors about the dramatic increase in traffic and trash. But the statistical data provided by King County to support their declaration of non-significance in the environmental checklist states that the traffic would only increase along with the population. Mr. Kiernan explained that, in spite of the anecdotal evidence, traffic has fallen 14 percent at this facility over the past ten years. This is based on actual gate data.

Commissioner Doering said that at the open house that was held on May 1st, the County provided a lot of information and experts were available to answer questions. They did a very nice job of presenting the project. She said that one issue she has not heard tonight, but that she spoke at length about with one of the consultants, was the fact that the facility would not only be for garbage, but also for recycling yard waste. There would be a separation of garbage and different methods for getting it in and out of the facility. There would also be different types of vehicles used. Mr. Kiernan said that, at this time, there are a few bins located at the facility to collect recyclable materials. They have attempted to get a yard waste collection facility on the site, but have been unsuccessful to date. He explained that yard waste is already going to this facility, but it is being taken to the landfill. They would like to provide recycling alternatives for these materials at perhaps some small charge. These materials are already coming to the facility, but they are going out to the landfills instead of being recycled. He said a compactor would reduce the number of large trips from the site.

Chair Doennebrink inquired if the transfer station would be closed during construction. Mr. Kiernan said that King County has not made this decision yet. If they close the facility, the construction could take place cheaper and more quickly. If they keep the facility open during construction, the costs would be greater and the duration of construction would be extended. He said they would work with the City when making this decision.

Chair Doennebrink inquired if there would still only be one lane of traffic in and out of the facility. Mr. Kiernan said they do have the ability to have more than one lane in and out because of the acquisition of the two properties. They have heard both sides. Some people want the access point widened and others do not.

Mr. Fuji inquired if the Commission was given a copy of the complete facility master plan for their review. Mr. Thomas said the preferred alternative is the product of King County's full report, and the preferred alternative was provided to the Commission for their review. Mr. Fuji pointed out that there were quite a few questions about community involvement in the master plan process.

He said that in the appendix of the full report, there is a whole chapter giving the detailed minutes, notes, attendees, etc. of the public meetings. In addition, a traffic signal analysis was completed for the intersection of Meridian Avenue North and Northeast 165th Street. After discussing the issue further with the City, it was determined that a signal was not warranted at this intersection. The data that was provided addresses the questions that were raised by the public regarding the intersection.

The issue of a left-turn lane was also addressed in the full report. Mr. Thomas suggested that copies of the 10-page executive summary of the full report could be provided to each of the Commissioners.

Commissioner Kuboi said that in the documents provided by Mr. Kiernan, there was a statement that in 2002, the First Northeast Transfer Station received 124,287 vehicle trips. Using the County's projections, he inquired how many vehicle trips per year they expect to receive. He noted that the 2002 projections equal about 300 trips per day. He said the public comments have noted that there would be more traffic. Therefore, the County cannot really say there would be no impact per the SEPA process. Mr. Kiernan said that an extensive traffic study was done as part of the process, and their traffic consultant would be able to speak to that issue best.

Commissioner Gabbert said he, too, is frustrated that the City did not do the SEPA review instead of the County. If the Commission makes a recommendation to approve the proposal, the master plan could become part of the Development Code. Their approval would be based on information that they do not fully trust in terms of SEPA regulations. He questioned what authority the City would have when dealing with each individual project associated with the master plan if they already have a SEPA determination for the master plan, as a whole.

Mr. Thomas answered that the SEPA process for a non-project action would be complete if the proposal is approved. The implementation of the individual components of the master plan would be considered project SEPA actions. The key issue is that the preferred alternative is a conceptual plan that would become part of the Development Code. Once they get to the finer detail below the conceptual level, the City would have the ability to use SEPA authority to further condition individual components to make sure that the details are compatible with the conceptual plans as well as the rest of the City's codes and policies.

Commissioner McClelland recalled two previous Commission experiences. One is the critical areas ordinance when they were being told the difference between procedure and substance, and it didn't fly. The other is the right-of-way map. She said that when the Growth Management Act was passed, cities and counties within the State were told that they would have to accept essential regional facilities. That does not mean that cities want these facilities, but they are obliged to accept them. She said that when Shoreline incorporated, they inherited the transfer station. There is not one thing about the facility that could, in the most stretch of the imagination, be considered compatible with the residential neighborhood. She said it is important for the Commission to address all of the public concerns during the master plan process rather than during the building permit stage where no public venue will be offered. She said the Commission's responsibility is to stand up for the citizens, and they should not be complacent about the impacts to the people who live in the City.

Commissioner McClelland said that she spoke with Mr. Thomas earlier in the day and suggested that the two issues that would be raised by the public at the hearing would be related to the SEPA review and nuisance, yet neither of these were adequately addressed by the applicant. She said it appears as though the Commission is being asked to accept a document that was written by the County without any evidence that the City staff has added anything to it to address their citizens' concerns.

Mr. Kiernan advised that City staff has attended all of the meetings related to the proposed master plan. They have participated on the advisory committee, as well. In addition all of King County's draft documents have been routed through the City. He said the County understands that, while they can assert lead agency status for SEPA for this project, everything that they do must meet the City's needs as well. They have worked with the City staff, and their comments have been integral to the process.

Regarding nuisance issues, Mr. Kiernan said it is difficult, on the planning level, to talk about the fact that they are going to enclose trucks or that the building will be completely enclosed. He said that perhaps the County staff misunderstood exactly what the Commission wanted to hear. He said the proposal would completely change the facility. Right now, it is a roof with no walls, and they are proposing an enclosed facility. In addition, the trucks would have canvas lids. With the compactors, the garbage would be pushed into the trailer and a door would close to completely enclose the contents. There would no longer be open access to the refuse. The nuisance issues would all be addressed.

Mr. Kiernan said that right now, the facility is located up against the property line, and the proposal would pull the facility back. They recognize that the noisiest activities are the handling of the refuse within the building. They will pull this further away and enclose it. The second noisiest activity is the maneuvering of trucks. Since this will be located between the building and the freeway, the impact should be minimized.

Mr. Kiernan said the County has attempted to respond to the concerns raised by the neighbors. The County has a litter crew, and residents can call this crew to pick up trash. In addition, enclosing the trucks will help eliminate the problem. They recognize the constraints of the site, and that it is located within a residential community, and they are doing their best to provide the essential facility.

Commissioner McClelland asked that Mr. Kiernan address the issue of public art associated with the project. Mr. Kiernan said there is a public art budget for the project, and they have been working with an advisory committee of Shoreline Citizens. Mr. Fuji said there has been an artist involved with the project from its inception. She has attended every citizen meeting that has been held to date. He explained that the artist does not work for the County. The Cultural Development Authority handles the integration of art into the public venue. One of the things this group does is consider opportunities for integrating art into public facilities. The proposed art plan is not definitive yet, but the artist will be presenting her ideas at an upcoming public meeting within the next few months.

Commissioner Sands inquired if the City of Shoreline would have the ability to shut the facility down because it is obsolete. Mr. Thomas said his initial response would be no. He said the City's building official does have the authority to evaluate structures, and she does have the right to declare a structure unfit for human habitation or not structurally sound and post the structure with "do not occupy" signs.

But there has been no evaluation completed by a City official of any structure at the transfer facility site. However, King County constantly evaluates their structures for public safety. Commissioner Sands suggested that if the City wanted to get nasty, they could come up with a bunch of reasons why the facility should be shut down.

Commissioner Sands said that because he finds it hugely annoying that no one can figure out how to get the big trucks in and out, he did not feel they should recommend approval of the master plan now. He said that many of the comments from the citizens suggested that if most of the traffic to the site could be provided from I-5, it would go a long way towards resolving most of the issues. It seems that they should not be approving a master plan that states only that permission to access from I-5 is currently being sought. The only way the master plan should be approved is if the County can find some way to get the trucks to the site from I-5. He said he does not feel the City should give in without getting something from the County in return. They should tell them to take their transfer station somewhere else unless they can meet the access requirement. He said another idea would be to put Shoreline police out on Meridian Avenue North during the peak times. Every truck that does not have their refuse covered could get a ticket. It would only take a short time for people to figure out that they need to cover their trash. He suggested that there are numerous things that can be done to satisfy the neighbors, and he can't see why the process is taking so long. King County is asking the City to approve a whole statutory section, and he said he does not know how they can do that now.

Commissioner MacCully summarized that the public comments appear to fall into two categories: One is the design of the master plan, and they have heard from the County's consultants that some of the suggested design elements cannot happen such as general purpose traffic coming in off of I-5. He said he, too, would like to see all access coming from I-5, but having spent 15 years in the transportation industry, he can understand how it can easily take ten years to get agreement between two agencies at different levels. The second category of comments are related more to current operations than to the design of the master plan. Rodent control cannot be addressed in the master plan. This is an operational issue that, if addressed adequately with the neighborhood, would probably help. They could also get a few service clubs to cut the lawns on the vacant properties. He said he can understand why the properties would probably stay vacant, but the County could do something to address the concerns of the neighborhood. He said that trash along the street is also an operational concern. He said he concurs with Commissioner Sands' comment that enforcement could probably resolve many of these issues. He said that if the operational concerns are addressed, many of the questions being raised now could be resolved. But they will not be able to address the issue related to general purpose traffic accessing the site from I-5. Commissioner MacCully said he is feeling much better about the process now, after having listened to the County staff's explanation.

Mr. Kiernan apologized for neglecting the lawns on the vacant properties. While the engineers were responsible for acquiring the properties, they never told operations that the County was responsible for maintenance. He said he would take responsibility for this and try to resolve the situation. Regarding rodents, Mr. Kiernan said the site is inspected weekly by the Health Department, and this information can be shared with the Commission. When there are issues, the Health Department requires action. Because there is a natural area with a stream, it will be difficult to manage the possums. Rodent control is handled by the County and inspected by an outside agency.

Mr. Kiernan said that citizens can call 206-296-4490 to contact the litter crew to pick up trash along the roadway. He said he would respond to the concerns raised by the citizens during the public hearing. Mr. Fugi added that the operations personnel have already been directed to expand the litter pickup in the area.

Commissioner Kuboi inquired what the future vehicle trip number would be. Mr. Kiernan referred to the data that was provided in the report for projected trips. He said that by the year 2030, they project the average weekday traffic to be 422 vehicles, which is up from 299. They are projecting the average weekend traffic to be 617 vehicles per day, which is up from 438. The annual total vehicle trips is projected to be 175,000 by the year 2030.

Commissioner McClelland said that the projected increase does not appear to be that large over 28 years. She questioned if this is based on residential growth or garbage demand. Mr. Fuji said that the economist incorporated a number of things into his projections. One has to do with the estimated population growth, but he also factors in how the economy might be doing, historical rates, etc.

The Commission agreed to extend the meeting to 9:30 p.m.

Commissioner Gabbert inquired why the height was arbitrarily set at 85 feet in the proposed master plan. Mr. Thomas said the structure that currently exists is slightly less than 55 feet. The County has proposed an 85-foot height limit to accommodate the specific design of the new transfer station to make sure there would be adequate room to meet the standards proposed.

Jim Pensiero, KPG Consultants, said he has been working with the County on the proposed project. He explained that the height is reflective of the County's plan to add a compactor. There is a tunnel going underneath the current transfer station building that is 18 feet below the floor level. This adds about 20 feet to the existing building height of 55 feet. They added another ten feet to make sure that they did not exceed whatever the guideline ends up being. The building has not been designed yet, so they do not know exactly what the height will be.

Mr. Pensiero said that the building would be depressed 18 feet from where the existing grade is. This will further limit the amount of noise coming from the site. Commissioner Gabbert noted that the 85-foot height would be measured from the lowest point of the depressed area. It would not be 85 feet measured from the grade level.

Commissioner Gabbert inquired why King County purchased all but one of the three houses located adjacent to the site. Mr. Kiernan answered that King County purchased two of the adjacent residential properties because they wanted to be able to provide a significant recycling area since this has been identified as a real need. They also wanted to be able to buffer the neighboring residential properties from the recycling facilities. In addition, they wanted people to be able access the recycling area without entering the solid waste handling area. Acquisition of the third property was not necessary to accomplish their goals.

Commissioner Gabbert noted that construction materials are identified on the list of the types of waste that will be accepted at the new facility but is not accepted at the existing facility. Mr. Kiernan said that, at the present time, the County has a contract for acceptance of commercial quantities of construction and demolition wastes, so this type of waste does not go through the Northeast King County Transfer Station. But personal construction waste is accepted at this site.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that it is important that a footnote be added to the proposal to indicate that the 85-foot height would not be measured from grade level, but from underground. If they were both being compared at grade, there would be a huge difference, but people reviewing the project are more interested in the visual difference from grade. Mr. Kiernan agreed that this should be clarified.

Commissioner McClelland referred to the last page of the determination of non-significance and said she counted several different physical projects that the County would be seeking building permits for. There are also other projects that could take place on the site that are not specifically listed. She inquired what guarantee the City would have that the County would actually see the master plan through to fruition rather than picking and choosing only the most expedient projects.

Mr. Kiernan said that the City would have the ability to include conditions as part of a use permit that would require the County to do specific things. For example, they could require that the buffers be maintained. He noted that they are the first to go through the City's master plan process, so they must rely on the City staff for clarification. Mr. Thomas clarified that the Planning Commission would have the option of requiring that buffer enhancement restoration mitigation be completed up front prior to any project action. Alternatively, it could also be implemented through project action, and most likely completed through phases in the project action process. He said the Commission could recommend that the City Council require that all of the mitigation be completed on some sort of time frame or entirely up front before any project construction takes place.

Commissioner McClelland pointed out that the existing facility is a legal non-conforming use. It cannot possibly conform with the zoning district in which it sits. Therefore, all of the permitting processes must be conditional use processes. Mr. Thomas said the alternative to completing a master plan and adopting it as an amendment into the Development Code would be to require a conditional use for each project proposed on the site by King County. Commissioner McClelland said she is not suggesting an alternative to the master plan. But she inquired if the applications could be conditioned when King County comes in for building permits. Mr. Thomas said the applications can be conditioned, but they would not require a conditional use permit. They could be conditioned through either a building permit or through SEPA review. Commissioner McClelland noted that the Commission would have nothing to do with reviewing a building permit or a SEPA permit. Therefore, if they want to list the sequence in which they would like the mitigation measures completed, they should include that as part of their recommendation.

Mr. Kiernan advised that the budget proposal they plan on presenting to the King County Council later this year includes funding to do the entire master plan proposal. They will not propose a piece meal process. However, he cannot guarantee that the Council would agree.

He noted that Shoreline's County Councilmember is recommending that they go through with the entire project, and that usually carries some weight.

Mr. Yakoff said he feels that the design is flawed, and hopes that the Commission also recognizes this. He encouraged them to read the entire document before they make a recommendation. He does not believe that the statistics provided by King County are accurate. He urged the Commission to make sure that the citizens' concerns are addressed.

d. Close Public Hearing

Because the Commissioners still had numerous questions, they agreed that the public hearing should be continued to a future date. They particularly expressed a desire to extend the public hearing until after the County resolves the issue of accessing the site from the I-5 ramps.

Ms. Markle advised that the July 10th and July 17th meetings agendas are full. Because the County has not indicated a date for completing their agreement to use the ramps for access, it might not work to attach the continuation of the hearing to the ramp issue. Because this is a legislative hearing, she said the Commission could close the hearing and then schedule a second hearing after the ramp issue is resolved. However, she noted that King County would be acting on their master plan in July or August. She suggested that perhaps a special meeting should be scheduled for later in July.

Commissioner MacCully inquired what would happen if King County acts on their master plan before the City of Shoreline acts on the proposal before them. Mr. Thomas said the preferred alternative is identified in the County's 2003 Facilities Master Plan Update. Therefore, he said he assumes that the King County Council would be putting their support behind the preferred alternative with the adoption of the facility master plan update. The City could still proceed with their master plan process, but if the end result is substantially different than what is adopted by the County, the situation would definitely be interesting.

The Commission discussed the possibility of holding a special meeting on July 24, 2003.

Commissioner McClelland said it is important for the Commission to clearly identify their concerns so that the City and County staff can be prepared to adequately address each one. For example, either the Commission needs to review the SEPA checklist or the City staff needs to identify how they should deal with the environmental issues. Mr. Thomas suggested that the individual Commissioners forward their thoughts and concerns to the staff. Staff could then break these issues down and identify the specific mitigation measures that have been proposed to address each one.

Commissioner McClelland suggested that the tone of the staff report should be different. This is not a very appealing use, but they all have to live with it. Since the City has some opportunity and authority to make sure that the citizens are no worse off with the improvements than they are now, they need to show how they will mitigate each of the impacts and assure the citizens that they are on top of the situation. They need to identify how they will deal with King County when something does not go right. She suggested that this should be the tone of the staff report rather than merely cooperating with the County.

Ms. Markle suggested that the public hearing could be continued to a date that is selected at the July 10th meeting.

Commissioner Kuboi inquired if the access off of I-5 would be a "deal breaker" as far as the Commission making a decision. The majority of the Commissioners indicated that the absence of an access agreement would not necessarily be a "deal breaker."

The Commission agreed to leave the public hearing open until the July 10th meeting, when a date certain for the continuation would be identified.

7. COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS: KING COUNTY FIRST NORTHEAST TRANSFER STATION MASTER PLAN

The Commission continued the public hearing to a future date. Therefore, there was no Commission deliberation.

8. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONERS

None of the Commissioners provided reports during this portion of the meeting.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business scheduled on the agenda.

10. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business scheduled on the agenda.

11. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements were made during this part of the agenda.

12. AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Ms. Markle advised that a legislative public hearing on the 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is scheduled for the July 10, 2003 meeting. She explained that, technically, the CIP is a component of the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, adoption of the new CIP requires an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, and the Planning Commission is required to review all amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. This is the first year the Commission has been asked to review the CIP. She urged the Commissioners to call staff with any questions they might have before the public hearing.