

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Status of Comprehensive Plan Update & Master Plans
DEPARTMENT:	P&DS, PW, and PRCS
PRESENTED BY:	Tim Stewart, Director P&DS Paul Haines, Director PW Dick Deal, Director PRCS

PROBLEM/ISSUE STATEMENT:

Cities and counties fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are to review their comprehensive plans and ordinances at least every seven years to see if their plans and regulations comply with the GMA. The deadline to complete this requirement varies from county to county; the schedule is established by RCW 36.70A.130 (4) (a). This section of the RCW establishes the deadline of December 1, 2004 for King County and the cities within it. The City began the process to update its Comprehensive Plan in mid 2003 and at that time also embarked on a process to adopt the City's first master plans for Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks Recreation & Open Space.

The purpose of this briefing is to update the Council on the status of the project, to review the public comments to date, and to review the schedule for Planning Commission review of the revised Comprehensive Plan and Master Plans.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required; staff is providing a briefing on the issues that have received the most public comment on to date, and a summary of the upcoming Planning Commission review process.

Approved By: City Manager  City Attorney 

This page intentionally left blank.

BACKGROUND

Cities and counties fully planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are to review their comprehensive plans and ordinances at least every seven years to see if their plans and regulations comply with the GMA. The deadline to complete this requirement varies from county to county; the schedule is established by RCW 36.70A.130 (4) (a). This section of the RCW establishes the deadline of December 1, 2004 for King County and the cities within it. The City began the process to update its Comprehensive Plan in mid 2003 and also embarked on a process to adopt three master plans for Transportation, Surface Water, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. The required update and the adoption of the master plans should be coordinated and processed together to take advantage of the benefits (environmental, fiscal) of coordinated planning. In addition, the adoption of the master plans also meets several of the City's Strategic Plan's (2003-2009) goals and City Council Goals (2003-2004), including:

- Adopt strategic plans for major facilities and services.
- Enhance our program for safe and friendly streets.
- Update elements of the Comprehensive Plan including environmental, surface water, transportation and parks and open space.
- Provide safe, secure and attractive neighborhoods for residents, motorists, and pedestrians.
- Provide park and open space recreational opportunities within a safe walking distance of each neighborhood.
- Provide and maintain excellent public utilities and infrastructure for each neighborhood.

DISCUSSION

Release of Draft Plans

The City staff and consultant team began the process of updating the Comprehensive Plan and developing the master plans last fall, holding public open houses on September 24th and 25th to collect initial input on the project. Subsequently, the Planning Commission divided into three workgroups and reviewed public comments, existing policies and policy options during a series of informal work sessions. Between October and December of last year, 19 workgroup meetings were held, each open to the public.

During the first few months of the update process, the City received several comment letters. Early themes that seemed to repeat themselves in many of the comment letters included:

- Business access on Aurora
- Street classification and speed limits
- Basin-wide improvements to Thornton Creek
- Enhanced environmental protection

There are many more areas that were also recognized to be of interest. The issues list used to drive the development of the plans was extensive and derived from many years of community meetings, project development, Council Policy & Priorities, regulatory mandates, operation and maintenance needs, professional experience, and good fiscal management practices. Following the meetings with the Planning Commission workgroups, staff and consultants worked to develop draft plans that responded to all of these issues to the extent feasible.

First Drafts of the Comprehensive Plan Update, Transportation Master Plan, Surface Water Master Plan, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan were released to the public on May 6, 2004, along with an invitation to comment. A review matrix was also distributed that illustrated in legislative format (underlined text to show word additions and ~~striketrough-text~~ to show word deletions) how the proposed changes compare to the goals and policies of the current Comprehensive Plan.

Public Open House and Public Comments

Concurrent with the release of the draft plans, the City mailed a project newsletter and open house announcement. The announcement, which was mailed to all listed addresses in the City, provided information about the plans and the planning process and advertised the open house date and location: May 13, 2004, at the Shoreline Center. The open house served to provide copies of the draft plans to the public, display the key elements of the plans, answer questions, and to accept comments. Korean translating services were also available.

The public meeting had stations for the following topics: project overview; comprehensive plan; transportation master plan; surface water master plan; and parks, recreation and open space master plan. Information was presented on boards, including maps, statistics, existing conditions, and proposed revisions. Handouts and a computer animated transportation model were also provided.

The public provided input at the public meeting in several ways, including

- *Comment forms*, which asked for comments on specific sections of the comprehensive and master plans.
- *Conversing with project team* members at each staffed station. Flipcharts were available for team members and the public to write their questions and comments.
- *Capital project questionnaires*: the public was invited to prioritize proposed projects related to each plan.

- *Emails and letters* to city staff were received following the open house.

More than 50 comments, including comment forms, project questionnaires, letters, and emails, and two typed pages of station flipchart notes were submitted at the open house or shortly following the meeting. Though not summarized here, capital project questionnaires were received in the following quantities:

- Capital Facilities – 6
- Transportation – 4
- Parks and Recreation – 5
- Surface Water – 2

The comments received at and following the open house were sorted by category and summarized. The summary of comments is included in Attachment A.

Planning Commission Review

Based on public input and continued staff analysis, the staff and consultant team is preparing a recommendation to the Planning Commission that includes the draft plans and a draft 20-year Capital Facilities Program. The Planning Commission is scheduled to review the draft plans through a combination of workshop and hearing meetings. Each of these meetings will be open to the public and accept public comments.

Planning Commission Review Schedule

Workshops

7/22 Comprehensive Plan update workshop

7/29 Transportation Master Plan workshop

8/5 Surface Water Master Plan workshop

8/12 Parks, Recreation and Open Space workshop

A public hearing before the Planning Commission may begin on September 16th if the workshops are completed as planned. The release of the Planning Commission's recommended draft Comprehensive Plan & Master Plans is expected to be in September 2004. City Council public hearings may begin November 22nd.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required; staff is providing a briefing on the issues that have received the most public comment on to date, and a summary of the upcoming Planning Commission review process.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Public Comment Summary from May 2004 open house

ATTACHMENT A

PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY FROM MAY 2004 OPEN HOUSE

City of Shoreline Master Plans and Comprehensive Plan Update

Open House Public Comment Summary

May 13, 2004

The City of Shoreline is progressing on an update of its comprehensive plan and development of surface water, parks/recreation/open space, and transportation master plans. As a follow up to introductory public meetings held on September 24 and 25, 2003, a public open house was held on May 13, 2004, to ask for input on proposed comprehensive plan and master plan revisions.

PURPOSE

Hosting a public open house ensured that Shoreline citizens had the opportunity to review and comment on proposed revisions to the existing comprehensive plan and master plans. The public meeting objectives were to:

- Publicize that draft plans are available for public review.
- Provide the public with an explanation of process and context.
- Demonstrate how previous input has been used to shape draft plans.
- Solicit input on the plans
 - Educate the public on how to read the drafts.
 - Inform the public about comment mechanisms.
 - Demonstrate how comments will be used to shape the final plans.

NOTIFICATION

Residents of Shoreline were notified of the public meeting in several ways:

- Notification in the *Shoreline Enterprise*
- Mailed newsletter to Shoreline residents
- Website notification
- Press release
- E-mail alert

PARTICIPATION

Approximately 40 people attended the open house (although not all individuals attending signed in), which ran from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at the Shoreline Conference Center.

MEETING FORMAT

The public meeting had stations for the following topics: project overview; comprehensive plan; transportation master plan; surface water master plan; and parks, recreation and open space master plan. Information was presented on boards, including maps, statistics, existing conditions, and proposed revisions. Handouts and an animated transportation segment were also provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Methods to Capture Comment

The public provided input at the public meeting in several ways, including

- *Comment forms*, which asked for comments on specific sections of the comprehensive and master plans.
- *Conversing with project team* members at each staffed station. Flipcharts were available for team members or the public to write their questions or comments.
- *Capital project questionnaires*: the public was invited to prioritize proposed projects related to each plan.
- *Emails and letters* to city staff were received following the open house.

Comments Received By Project

More than 50 comments, including comment forms, project questionnaires, letters, and emails, and two typed pages of station flipchart notes were submitted at the open house or shortly following the meeting. Though not summarized here, project questionnaires were received in the following quantities:

- Capital Facilities – 6
- Transportation – 4
- Parks and Recreation – 5
- Surface Water - 2

The comments received at and following the open house were sorted by category and summarized below. Numbers (#) at the end of comments indicate the number of people making similar statements.

Comments by Topic Area

General

Public Involvement

- Great that Shoreline continues to solicit public input in this process.
- Appreciate City's care in making presentations and listening to citizens – Responses to comments have been seen clearly.
- Please identify citizen input options gained/lost/timed differently with Planned Action EISs.

Format

- One person strongly protested lack of legislative format markup used in Comprehensive Plan – not user friendly. (*Documents in Legislative Format were released at the same as the other documents – in the future we will advertise more clearly how to read the documents*).
- PDF format makes electronic commenting impossible. Hand-written comments are difficult for many.
- Information is presented in a way that is not user friendly. Way too much information, and genuine citizen input is nearly impossible with the volume of information. Should provide a list of major changes and their effect in plain language.
- The original intent of the 1998 comp plan development was to give citizens control over changes in their city's planning. This update and format restricts Shoreline citizens from making meaningful comments on these documents. Extend the amount of the comment period to allow citizens and groups to meet and discuss impacts due to staff changes. Due to these issues:
 - Restore the Comprehensive Plan to its approved 1998 format and content, and
 - Restore the Development Code to its format and content as it existed in June 2000

Funding

- Tax dollars should be spent on infrastructure maintenance and improvements and on parks. New infill should pay mitigation fees to help pay for infrastructure improvements necessitated. New bonds and taxes and LIDs should be a last resort and bonds and taxes should require a citizen vote.

Miscellaneous

- Generally well organized, though more socio-demographic data in the introduction would be helpful.
- Use green building and Leeds Standards, as well as "renewable energy solutions," when possible in the master plans.
- #117 – Need to mention existing programs, such as LEED and BuiltGreen here. Otherwise it is not clear what "green building" is. May need to include incentives.
- Prohibit use of "toxics" in critical areas, including roadways.
- Adopt Master Plans and Comp Plans before the City undertakes any other code changes.
- Use Best Available Science standards in creating policies outlined in the Comp and Master Plans.
- Consider and discuss public health in more detail.

- Remember to consider people with disabilities – cognitive and physical – when planning. Use as many sidewalks as possible, as they make the difference between life stuck at home and freedom to enjoy the world.

Comprehensive Plan

Land Use, Development

- Acknowledge importance to residents of feeling a historical sense of place. The history of Shoreline did not begin with incorporation.
- Placement of Civic Hub/City Hall between N 175th and N 185th will continue conversion of tax generating commercial land into non-tax-dollar generating grandiose public buildings.
- Build City Hall before interest rates rise.
- Buildable Lands Inventory should be included as part of the Comprehensive Plan (pg 8)
- Support that Shoreline doesn't require a base density of R-4 or R-6 because it may force staff to choose between meeting minimum density requirements and following municipal code. (pg 24)
- LU 47, 60, 64, and 66 – We must respect current property owners and only use land condemnation when unavoidable to complete major public projects fully supported by citizens.
- LU71 – The propensity for planning chaos under LU71 is truly exciting. I prefer boring and predictability.
- #34 LU30 – How will this be achieved: the protection of existing stands of trees and vegetation? It seems like the city would have to do an inventory and work on protection before these stands are all removed.
- Zoning question about properties in 600 block of 185th, and suggestion to consolidate into one large parcel for senior housing.
- Zoning/Building codes should not allow big houses on small lots to the extent possible. Privacy of homeowners is impacted.
- Cottage housing needs careful consideration. Trial and error should not be used (and has been shown to fail), but this kind of development can be successful.

Surface Water

- 1) Alderwood soils don't absorb water well, and 2) Shoreline's image is closely tied to existing mature evergreen trees. Both closely relate to existing and future problems with surface water flooding. Shoreline needs to increase standards to 50-year storm systems. (pg 86-87)
- Specifically list Thornton Creek and Chinook salmon in the Comprehensive Plan. (pg 88)

Environment

- What does CP2 mean? It refers to both policy and project changes. So far, almost all changes adopted by City of Shoreline planning have weakened environmental protections and increased density and impacts. The most honest way to identify support/opposition for changes in policy is to allow citizens to vote. (pg 13)
- EN1, 15, and 17 – City violates own city code under these rules.
- EN3, ENb – Add solar power and solar lights.
- #118 ENb – Ought to be better connected to incentives. (pg. 108)
- Plan should address larger socio-environmental issues: Global warming, natural resource depletion, etc.
- #103 EN1 – The city should make use of neighborhood groups to achieve this goal: "A readily available forum for public education and outreach."
- #114 EN10 – Reword policy: "*Prohibit* the creation of new lots in critical areas. Restrict the creation of new lots in critical area buffers."
- #118 EN11: Add, at end of sentence "by restricting disturbance and development." Without this clarifier, it sounds like the city will protect people from natural disasters, which is probably beyond the capability of the city.
- #120 EN15 – It's not OK to delete steep slope reference given that specific language is not being carried over to EN15.
- #132 EN22 – As the staff comments, we need to retain mature trees (whether native or not) and regardless of whether they are located in an environmentally critical area or not.

- #154 EN59 – This policy should remain unchanged. Omit workgroup comment.
- #130 EN111: This goal has to do with vegetation retention/protection. Keep phrase “protection of native vegetation” and delete “critical areas.” Shoreline needs to address tree retention!
- #143 – Seem to be watering down wetlands protection, which is not OK.
- Prevent “deigned-in” water pollution by planting street trees on the backside of sidewalks, so that leaf waste doesn’t go into storm drains.
- #170 – Green streets: Good to see pointing to ways we can improve protection of neighborhoods and habitat.
- Have policy to not water landscaping in street medians and design medians so they won’t need watering.
- #195 – Permit streamlining ought to be combined with direction on “green building.” Incentives for BuiltGreen housing ought to be mentioned.
- Trees are an important part of the City’s identity. Protect them and work protection into zoning and development requirements.
 - 571 CD 24 – Delete phrase “that contribute to the aesthetic character of the community.” This is too subjective. We need to retain mature vegetation and significant trees wherever possible, period.
 - Excellent in providing focus to City’s support of natural environments, though it’s not clear why “sensitive” has been switched to “critical”? Sensitive still appears at least once.
 - While good that Shoreline wants to protect trees, looks like the City is losing them at an alarming rate.

Economic Development, Growth, and Planning

- Encourage density given urban definition.
- Jobs will be lost if Fircrest, Cingulair, and Franks Lumber are displaced. Shoreline does not act business-friendly to existing businesses. (pg 16)
- Support for impact fees, but opposition to two-tiered system. Shoreline has met all growth targets and does not require reduced fees to encourage more growth. Reduced fees are fees that are subsidized by general Shoreline taxpayers. (pg 23)
- Goal ED III – Don’t burden taxpayers with subsidizing tax breaks to “encourage economic growth.” Growth is market driven.
- Let neighborhood plans remain optional. Mandatory neighborhood plans mean that if we don’t actively participate in neighborhood planning, then city development code can be weakened when we’re not paying attention. (pg 24)
- Opposition to required minimum density requirement. Page 44 and page 24 base density definitions differ.
- EDe – Change to read “Encourage and support EXISTING retail within the City.”
- ED19 – Appears you want to create a special “club” of those who get special benefits. Clarify what this means.
- ED33 – Don’t supplant the real estate industry with this policy.
- Plan’s goal to grow and expand Shoreline is counter to historic quality of life and values in the City (e.g., lower cost of living, outside of city proper, etc.).

Transportation and Transit

- Bus Transportation – Adequately moves people, but what about other goods? Inadequate cost/benefit analysis.
- Our first responsibility is to today’s residents and businesses who pay taxes to keep our city healthy and vibrant.
- T3 – Strong opposition – Use the GMA concurrency requirement to improve traffic mess (consider requiring per dwelling unit impact fees to improve intersections).
- T28 – Except for where Interurban Trail crosses Aurora, please install at-grade crossings for safe use by pedestrians. Physically disabled find above- and below-grade crossings difficult and dangerous.
- T76 – Strong support for creating a “residential parking zone” option.
- Th – Streamlining the NTSP process requires too much jumping through hoops and won’t see many changes.

- Tm – Language about “working with developers” has proven in reality to be more like coercion, blackmail, and hostility.
- Figure TR4 – Map shows NO peak transit service coverage on Aurora south of 175th – is this an error?
- Figure TR5 – There is no sidewalk on 165th west of Aurora, and is not on the “to be constructed list.” Please add this to the TOP of the to-be-constructed-immediately list.
- Table TR5 – Our most deadly accident locations are not on Aurora. Council should re-evaluate strong opposition to including more left-hand turn lanes along Aurora.
- Lowering LOS to F (the poorest LOS) won’t fix transportation problems. (pg 129)
- Include information on intersection LOS for 160th and 165th. (pg 132)
- “Fixes” near Top Foods violate the “protect the neighborhoods from spillover/pass-through traffic” standard, penalizing abutting neighborhoods due to sloppy traffic planning. (pg 134)
- Does employment increase of 2,200 jobs account for loss of 760 Fircrest workers and possible loss of Franks Lumber employees? (pg 141)
- TR14 – Request that Shoreline impose the lower speed limit for every class of street.
- It is disruptive and expensive to build business access roads or alleyways on developed properties. (pg 162)
- Table TR18 – predicts that half of needed transportation funding will come from grants – this is too optimistic.
- Oppose funding city hall from general fund via bonds – tax dollars and bond capacity needs to be used/saved for basic infrastructure repairs and maintenance.
- Road Impact Fees – Support impact fees to help pay for infrastructure improvements – growth should pay to fix problems aggravated by growth. (pg 198)
- Consider a walking route from west of freeway at 205th to the eastside shopping district. It’s impossible to walk or ride bikes there safely.

Utilities

- Evaluation is too brief and doesn’t take into account key factors (e.g., predicted natural gas shortages, etc.).

Housing

- H7 and 9 – If Shoreline begins to look at costs to developers (LID), also look at costs to businesses, residents, etc.
- H15 – Don’t create new low-income housing program, join an existing program and cut overhead participation costs.
- Housing – Encourage multi-unit, single family housing because studies show home ownership is the healthiest alternative for any community. Cottage or condo housing should be strongly encouraged, and low-income should be mixed with any new development.

Capital Facilities

- If we cannot afford to pay for needed capital facilities, re-evaluate needs. (pg 61)
- CF6 – Disagree – our priority should be to first maintain what we have, and to protect and serve our existing taxpaying citizens and businesses.
- T32 and CF26 – The Bond Committee strongly recommended that the City live within its budget and spend current tax dollars on current infrastructure needs. Don’t be extravagant.
- Add incentives for permitting new commercial construction that utilizes LEED or other sustainable building approaches (ED27?)
- Community Design should support walkable community design.
- Section is well organized and well written.
 - More completely describe City Hall plans.
 - How will capital facilities handle projected growth in next 20 years?
 - The Council and Planning Commission need to listen to and respond to citizen input on environmental concerns.
 - Funding should be a separate section, though seems complete and comprehensive.
 - Prioritizing of projects is too brief. Discuss criteria, etc.

- Include information about City staffing, consultants used for this project, etc.

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

- Parks section has very little supporting analysis from which to base a comp Plan update / Master Park planning.
- #384 – Preserve natural features: This was not done in adding trail by Echo Lake – Introducing with paving within shoreline buffer.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan

- Would like a dog park in Shoreline.
- Thornton Creek Legal Defense Fund (TCLDF) comments:
 - Disagrees with priorities raised on the Creek Habitat section. Many sections beyond Littles Creek and other streams in Shoreline deserve attention for restoration and preservation.
 - Disagree with use of “artificial open watercourse” designation – term has been discredited many times by the Planning Commission and has no basis in Best Available Science. (3)
 - Thornton Creek should be designated as salmonid habitat (designated as Class II Salmon stream by Seattle Public Utilities, and as fish habitat by WDFW).
- Add to Echo Lake Park the following long-term recommendations: picnic shelter, barbecues, fishing pier, and boat launch access (for carry-in boats).
- Funding park improvements will be a big issue. Work with neighborhood groups on funding drives, asking neighbors to take responsibility for their parks, providing volunteer labor, seeking donations from businesses, and conducting surveys to see what improvements are desired.
- Improvements merit allocations from the City’s general fund.
- Agree that the trail system and pond at Twin Ponds Park should be improved, and the approach to Ronald Bog Park improvements is good.
- Discuss plans for future parks, not just existing facilities.
- Before deciding to implement “improvements” in park natural areas, a goal of the city should be outreach and cooperation with groups that have already been restoring the natural areas.

Transportation Master Plan

General

- Transportation master plan is impressive in size – do we need that much detail?
- Extensive comments from Kenneth Cottingham, P.E., Transportation Engineer, are not summarized here. Please see his letter for detailed Master Plan critique.
- Standardize format and confirm numbers used throughout plan. (pg 2-6).
- Like seeing thought given to reclassifying streets (2)
 - Especially Dayton – a single family avenue
- Improve bus/vanpool rapid transit within Shoreline and to LFP and Richmond Beach. Metro service is inadequate

Sidewalks, Pedestrian Facilities

- Sidewalks in 2400-2600 blocks of NW 196th Street are heavily traveled by pedestrians and meet the criteria for sidewalk improvements.

Bicycles and Paths

- Meridian would be a great road for a bike lane.
- Traffic has increased while bicyclists have not – we don’t need that many lanes, but do need street parking on arterials like Meridian.

Roundabouts

- Dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Roundabout are OK, but (1) Increase noise and pollution at entry and exit, (2) aren't safe for pedestrians, (3) aren't safe for bicycles (U.S. Department of Transport. Guide).
- Ignore this (*previous statement*) they don't give full picture, before and after roundabouts.
- Carefully consider safety for cyclists and seniors – only place them where requested by users..
- A roundabout at 160th/Greenwood/Innis Arden Way does not have community support. Refer to Shoreline Community College Community Task Force Access Working Group minutes.
- Investigate roundabouts at 183rd/Stone and 183rd/Wallingford, where there is community support.

Ashworth

- North of 175th, speed limit should be reduced. (2)
- Do not support signal at 175th. (2)
- Include a policy that states: "The City shall work with residents along collector arterials, neighborhood collectors, and local streets before making any street designation or design changes." [Could be added to general transportation policies]
- Think long and hard about improving access to Ashworth, as this will have major safety and "friendliness" impacts.

Aurora

- Don't support Aurora corridor upgrade.
- Apparent goal to beautify Aurora misses point of why we have highways. Highways are for major bypass routes, while neighborhood streets are for visiting. We should never do anything to compromise the safety of neighborhood streets by creating less efficient situations on highways and arterials.
- Incomplete analysis in comp plan –
 - Where will money come from for remaining \$3.25 million for Aurora corridor plan?
 - What will be done in areas outside targeted two-mile corridor (from 145th to 65th)?
- Make more public the plans for "traffic calming" to mitigate Aurora spillover traffic.
- Support everything being done to improve Aurora, especially the flexibility in planning to accommodate business while maintaining the project.

Dayton

- Reduce speed to 25-30 (2)

Hamlin Park

- No: proposed "CA" through Hamlin Park/City Light Prop.
- Need bike/pedestrian trail to Hamlin Park from south side (150th).
- What property is the City planning to purchase?

Stone Avenue

- Oppose extending (9)
 - Will destroy neighborhood feel and create many impacts. (4)
 - Several other solutions proposed to help ease Top Foods traffic on 175th – the City knew of impacts ahead of time and must find a *mutually* acceptable solution now.
 - Cut-through traffic will increase, and cars often travel at excessive speeds. (5)
 - Creates danger for children and pedestrians – negatively impacts safety. (6)
 - Will require extensive upgrades, property owners will lose parking spaces.
 - Poor return on investment. (3)
 - Moving traffic light from 175th/Midvale to Stone Avenue would not help.
 - Will hurt property values.
 - Doesn't make sense with Ashworth, an arterial, one block away.
 - Displaces workers and worshippers just north of 175th where Stone Ave begins.
 - Degrades the environment.
 - Is at cross-purposes with Plan's goals.

5th Ave NW

- Oppose two-lane connector between Meridian and 5th Ave NE
 - Too much traffic into neighborhood.
 - Traffic impacts on 194th.
 - Drive down property values.

8th Ave NW

- Highly in favor of project to add curb lanes for pedestrians and cover ditches.
- Do not allow parking, or problem will not be solved.
- Increase to “priority 1” status based on high traffic situation and affected number of children.
- Lower speed limit to 25 mph.

145th

- Make 145th safer by adding left turn lanes/signals – accidents can endanger pedestrians in busy areas because cars go over sidewalks in accidents

160th

- Intersection at 160th and Greenwood Ave North: How can the flow of traffic be controlled to improve safety for drivers, pedestrians, and the school children at Highland Terrace Elementary School?
 - Roundabouts are questionable as to pedestrian safety and for bicyclists.
 - A coordinated traffic lighted system/plan – provides “traffic-flow” versus the stop-and-go currently in existence.
 - People are used to the habit of working with traffic lights to control their driving habits.
 - Diverting traffic across the Highland Terrace School yard will only further endanger the school children!
 - Fixing the problem should include opening the campus in another area(s).
- Traffic data and planning must start for this street now. (Figure 3-2)

165th

- Scheduled to become stoplight at Aurora, so traffic data and planning must start for this street now (see Shoreline Community College Master Plan data). (Figure 3-2)
- Will become dangerous without a sidewalk if stoplight is included. Please add 165th from Aurora to Dayton to Table 6-5/First and Second Priority Projects.

185th

- Reduced capacity on 185th and 15th don’t meet local needs. Another north-south arterial is needed.

195th

- Oppose extension between 1st NE and Meridian N. (5)
 - Unacceptable to go through greenbelt. Development will ruin the natural habitats and beauty. (3)
 - Will reduce property values (3)
 - Ballinger Terrace Apartments EIS calls for a perpetual greenbelt between that development and the homes on N. 194th St. (2)
 - What method was used to contact residents near greenbelt about this proposal? Make an effort to engage potentially impacted residents in meaningful conversation.

Transportation Goals and Policies

- Change Ti: “Monitor traffic growth on minor arterials, collector arterials, and neighborhood collectors.”
- TR19 – Remove the roundabout at St. Luke’s from the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update and supporting documents.
- 303 – Make reduced bus fare tickets available to Shoreline Community College students. Also work to reduce the number of students driving to Shoreline School District schools. Students create parking and traffic problems.

- Th – New policy to provide “Safe and Friendly” streets for all Shoreline residents. Replace the NTSP with a plan to make all streets in Shoreline “Safe and Friendly,” regardless of where they live (e.g., Closing Dayton eliminated 600-800 vehicles from that area, but moved them to other streets). Transferring is not solving the problem.
- TR15 – Remove restriping on Richmond Beach Road that would take it from four to three lanes – the road has too much traffic to make this change.
- T79 – New Policy – Ensure the current existence of adequate parking in driveways before allowing any change of Right of Way which can compromise safety. This includes any effect on the proper function of the driveways as they connect to the roadway.
- Additional transportation project to consider for the master plan: Explore the option for additional freeway access at 185th due to high-volume backup on 175th.

Appendixes

- 2-13, Bicycle Systems – Doesn’t support City policy.
- 5-1, Bicycle Project Evaluation – There aren’t many bike riders left, and bike lanes aren’t really necessary. Curb-side parking is essential in many of the areas designated for bike lanes.
- 5-2 – Bicycle Evaluation Chart – This impressive list of bike improvements does not tell us who will pay for them (bikers don’t pay road tax), or how property owners will find out they lose their curb.
- 5-3 – On Meridian Ave N from 145th to 205th, allow parking unless during 7-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m. time periods. The City should develop an Arterial Traffic Safety Program similar to the NTSP.
- 6-1 – On N 167th, from Ashworth to Meridian – Keep as street steep hill, do not change to neighborhood collector.
- 6-1 – Remove #330 as written and replace with the following: “Lower our existing minor arterials to 30 mph.” Make the same change to city documents. Higher speeds conflict with safety, environmental health, and pollution.

Surface Water Master Plan

- Look to SEA streets for good environmental practices and ways to calm traffic.
- Educate the public concerning surface water quality and how to avoid using surface water pollutants. Use *Shoreline Enterprise* articles and Shoreline “Currents.”
- How are you taking into consideration global warming (evident now in Shoreline), decreased snow pack, and decreased fresh water?
- At Echo Lake – upstream = auto repair shop at Aurora Ave and Holiday Resort has oil slicks – are they draining/getting into the lake?
- Encourage tree/vegetation, planting.
- We must insist that any new construction does not aggravate existing flooding problems, and we should require that it improves them.
- Surface water requirements are a fast changing target and our City needs to provide friendly guidance.
- Remove sentence “However, it is recognized that in some locations it may be cost prohibitive or physically impossible to provide this degree of protection. The City will determine the level of protection to be provided on a case-by-case basis.” This will better conform with legal requirements. (pg. 49-50)
- Do not reduce street width again. (pg. 66)
- Table 5-2: Flood Protection Problems (pg 45) and Table 5-4: Flood Protection Priority Level 2 Projects, and related costs estimates for the N 167th Street and Wallingford Ave North drainage – Strongly encourage adoption of plan that includes proposed solution for the flooding that plagues the area.
- Shoreline should adopt drainage strategies, which embody the “SEA streets concept” (used by Seattle Public Utilities). Daylight creeks and enhance wetlands by removing fill wherever and whenever opportunities arise
- Adopt State Stormwater Manual wherever possible into code to increase infiltration and reduce impervious surfaces. Pervious pavements should be recommended for new development along with “natural drainage strategies.”

- Thornton Creek Alliance comments:
 - Strong support for Goal EN VI (#139), EN57 (#153), EN39 (#170), EN42 (#173), and EN43 (#174).
 - Amend Goal ENV (#164) so it does not limit stormwater management solutions to only two options. Natural approaches are encouraged and possible.
 - Doesn't appear that this master plan includes a "recommended plan;" encourage the city to provide early opportunities for comment and discussion.
 - Disappointed that the draft plan's identification of habitat problems is "limited to a cursory review of information provided by the City," with "no field reconnaissance or engineering analysis...to assess specific problems." (pg. 79) This is a serious deficiency.
 - Agree that major drainage improvements are needed near Ronald Bog.
 - Correct statement that only McAleer and Boeing Creeks support salmonid species other than cutthroat trout. WDFW have identified steelhead in Thornton Creek, while Washington Trout have found juvenile Chinook and coho.
 - Don't use "artificial open water course" term.