

ORDINANCE 118197

1
2
3 AN ORDINANCE amending the Seattle Comprehensive Plan.

4 Whereas, on April 2, 1996, the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board
5 remanded amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan which were adopted in Ordinance
6 117735, and

7 Whereas, the Board directed the City to provide additional public notice and process regarding the
8 proposed amendments and to repeal or amend Land Use policy "L-127", and

9 Whereas, the City has provided the additional public notice and process prescribed by the Board, as
10 described in Attachment 1 hereto, and

11 Whereas, the City Council has determined that L-127 should be repealed, and that the other
12 amendments contained in Ordinance 117735 should be ratified, as updated and modified herein,

13 NOW, THEREFORE,

14 BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

15 Section 1. The Seattle Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended as shown on Attachment 2 to this
16 ordinance.

17 Section 2. The record developed for Ordinance 117735, as supplemented by proceedings herein,
18 is incorporated as a basis for adoption of this ordinance.

19 Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after its
20 approval by the Mayor, but if not approved and returned by the Mayor within ten (10) days after
21 presentation, it shall take effect as provided by Municipal Code Section 1.04.020.
22
23
24

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Passed by the City Council the 1 day of July, 1996, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its passage this 1 day of July, 1996.

Jan Diego
President of the City Council

Approved by me this 9 day of July, 1996.

Mouran Rice
Mayor

Filed by me this 10 day of July, 1996.

Judith Ed Pope
City Clerk

(Seal)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PROCESS

On April 2, 1996, the Growth Management Hearings Board directed the City of Seattle to provide for additional public review on amendments to the Comprehensive Plan adopted in July of 1995, prior to readopting them.

In complying with this direction, the City Council held two widely publicized public workshops, a public hearing, and two discussions in joint committee meetings prior to taking action on the amendments. The intent of the first workshop was to inform people about the proposal, answer questions, and hear comments and suggestions in a more informal setting than a public hearing. Opportunities for written comments were also available. The second workshop was added in response to citizen requests.

Following is the schedule of public meetings, availability of reports on the amendments, and the public noticing that was done for the meetings.

Public Meetings:

May 23, 1996
6:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Seattle Central Community College
Public Open House and Workshop held by the joint Business, Economic and Community Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees

May 30, 1996
7:00 - 9:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
Public Hearing conducted by the Seattle City Council Committee of the Whole

June 4, 1996
9:30 a.m.
City Council Chambers
Public Workshop held by the Business, Economic and Community Development Committee

Reports and Availability:

May 9, 1996
Mayor's Report and Recommendations on the Growth Management Hearings Board Response
Mailed to the appellant, appellant's attorney, and to individuals as requested.
Available at branch libraries, Neighborhood Service Centers, Office of Management and Planning and Council offices, and on the City's Public Access Network (Internet).

June 11, 1996
Report Back on Public Comments Regarding the City's Growth Management Hearings Board Response
Mailed to all individuals that attended the workshops and/or hearing, or who received the May 9 report.
Available at branch libraries, Neighborhood Service Centers, Office of Management and Planning and City Council offices.

Public Notice:

The City provided extensive notice on the May 23 workshop and May 30, 1996 hearing on these amendments, as follows:

- a display ad was placed in both the Seattle Times and the Post Intelligencer newspapers on May 16, 1996, a week before the workshop;
- notice was mailed to approximately 500 individuals who: attended the hearing on these amendments last June; participated on one of the Committees that helped develop the Comp Plan; commented on the environmental impact statement for the Plan; or are on the Department of Neighborhoods Community Contacts list (which includes community newspapers, community councils, and interested individuals);
- articles were placed in the May issues of widely distributed city newsletters -- the Neighborhood Planning Newsletter (circulation 5,000) the DCLU Info (circulation 1,085) and the DON Community Calendar (circulation 1,600);
- Detailed notice of the workshop and hearing were contained in the Council's Hearings Calendar, which is mailed to approximately 800 individuals and groups; and
- legal notice was placed in the Daily Journal of Commerce and the DCLU General Mail Release on April 18, 1996.

Notice of the June 4 public workshop, added at the request of the public, was distributed by Council President Drago's Office to those attending the May 23, 1996, workshop and those on the Department of Neighborhood's Community Contacts List.

g:\projects\compplan\gnhb\wsdf3\attach1-2.doc

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 2

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

LAND USE ELEMENT

Text changes have been shown in strike-out/underline. Some information has been updated where circumstances have changed since July of 1995 or where additional information is being added. This is shown in double underline or, for Land Use Appendix F, is indicated by a note that the entire section is new.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

LAND USE ELEMENT

C. DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH

GOALS

G31 Encourage Distribute the additional 50,000 - 60,000 households (52,500 - 63,000 dwelling units) and 131,400 - 146,600 jobs, the city-wide growth targets called for in this plan, to locate in among the various areas of the city as shown in Figure 7 follows: Figure 7 indicates the intended distribution of growth over this Plan's 20-year life. Prior to the adoption of neighborhood plans and the designation of all the urban village boundaries, the proportion of growth that occurs in village areas is likely to be different from the percentages shown in the figure. Projected annual growth is shown in Land Use Appendix F. Over the first six years of the period covered by the Plan, the City expects to add about 10,700 households and 48,000 jobs.

Land Use Figure 7
20-YEAR GROWTH GOALS TARGETS
GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH
INSIDE AND OUTSIDE CENTERS AND VILLAGES

Category Location	% of Citywide Residential Growth	% of Citywide Employment Growth
In Urban Centers	45% (22,500 - 26,700 hshlds)	65% (85,410 - 95,500 jobs)
In Manufacturing/Industrial Centers	No Housing <u>target Goal</u>	10% (13,140 - 14,660 jobs)
In Hub and Residential Urban Villages (adopted and unadopted)	30% (15,000 - 18,000 hshlds)	No <u>target Goal</u> for Residential Urban Villages Hub Urban Villages Only; 15% (19,700 - 21,990 jobs)
Remainder of City	25% (12,500 - 15,300 hshlds)	No Specific <u>Target Goal</u>
Totals	50,000 - 60,000 hshlds	131,400 - 146,600 jobs

B. CATEGORIES OF URBAN VILLAGES

URBAN CENTERS POLICIES

L21 Promote the balance of uses in each urban center or urban center village indicated by one of the following functional designations, assigned as follows:

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Functional Designation

Urban Center/Urban Center Village

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Primarily Residential | Denny Regrade
Capitol Hill
Pike/Pine |
| 2. Mixed, with a residential emphasis. | |
| 3. Mixed residential and employment. | Westlake
Pioneer Square
International District
First Hill
South Capitol Hill
University District NW
University Village
Northgate*
Seattle Center* |
| 4. Mixed, with an employment emphasis. | Downtown Commercial Core
University Campus |

*These Urban Centers are not divided into urban center villages

RESIDENTIAL URBAN VILLAGES

POLICIES

L44 Preliminarily designate as residential urban villages the 18 areas identified in Land Use Figure 1, above, subject to further objective analysis through the neighborhood planning process.

OVERLAY AREAS

POLICIES

L126.5 - Generally, Council approval of a plan or program that lacks city-wide application will not be included within or entail amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. However, when the Plan is amended, plan maps or text may be updated to reflect Council action, as appropriate. For example, when the Council approves a local plan, such as that for an urban village, the final boundaries for the village may be depicted on Plan maps.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

LAND USE APPENDIX

Land Use Appendix B

Format changes were made to Land Use Appendix B to make it more readable. No information contained in the Table adopted 7/25/94 is altered.

Land Use Appendix F

A new Land Use Appendix is recommended to incorporate yearly growth projections from the report *Growth Management Projections for the City of Seattle* prepared for the City by Dick Conway and Associates, October 1993. These projections form the basis of our 6-year growth projections.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

LAND USE APPENDIX B

Growth Planning Estimates for Urban Centers, Center Villages, Hub Urban Villages, and Residential Urban Villages

Village	Land Area Acres	Households (HH)				Employment (Jobs)			
		Existing	Existing Density (HH/Acre)	Planning Estimate (HH Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density	Existing	Existing Density (Jobs/Acre)	Planning Estimate (Job Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density
URBAN CENTERS/CENTER VILLAGES									
Downtown Urban Center Total	945	7,421	7.9	NA¹	23.4	165,119	175	NA¹	241
<i>Denny Regrade Village</i>	216	3,492	16.2	6,500	46.3	22,699	105	4,500	126
<i>Westlake Village</i>	143	514	3.6	3,500	28.1	22,010	154	23,600	319
<i>Commercial Core Village</i>	275	1,435	5.2	1,300	9.9	106,823	388	27,000	487
<i>Pioneer Square Village</i>	142	376	2.6	2,100 ²	17.4	9,113	64	4,800 ²	33
<i>International District Village</i>	169	1,604	9.5	1,300	17.2	4,474	26	2,800	43
First Hill/Cap. Hill Center Total	912	21,673	23.8	NA¹	30.0	33,393	37	NA¹	50
<i>First Hill Village</i>	225	5,896	26.2	2,400	36.9	20,626	85	6,100	119
<i>Capitol Hill Village</i>	396	12,450	31.4	1,980	36.4	5,284	13	3,000	21
<i>Pike/Pine Village</i>	131	2,349	18.0	620	22.7	3,963	30	1,400	41
<i>South Capitol Hill Village</i>	160	978	6.1	540	9.5	3,520	22	1,200	30
Univ. Dist. Urban Center Total	770	11,611	15.0	NA¹	17.8	31,427	41	NA¹	52
<i>University Dist. NW Village</i>	289	4,324	14.9	1,630	20.5	8,625	30	3,000	40
<i>University Village Village</i>	122	973	8.0	480	12.0	1,580	13	700	19
<i>University Campus Village</i>	359	6,313	17.6	0 ³	17.6	21,222	59	4,800	72

LAND USE APPENDIX B

Growth Planning Estimates for Urban Centers, Center Villages, Hub Urban Villages, and Residential Urban Villages

Village	Land Area Acres	Households (HH)				Employment (Jobs)			
		Existing	Existing Density (HH/Acre)	Planning Estimate (HH Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density	Existing	Existing Density (Jobs/Acre)	Planning Estimate (Job Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density
Northgate Urb. Center Total	410	3,291	8.0	NA'	15.3	11,366	28	NA'	60
Sea. Center Urb. Center Total	297	3,138	10.6	NA'	15.0	19,000	64	NA'	75
HUB URBAN VILLAGES'									
Ballard	323	4,279	13.2	1,520	17.9	3,518	11	3,700	22
Fremont	339	3,766	11.1	820	13.5	6,937	20	1,700	25
Lake City	310	2,740	8.8	1,400	13.3	2,827	9	2,900	18
W. Seattle Junction	225	1,835	8.2	1,100	13.0	3,108	14	2,300	24
Aurora Ave N @ 153th St	344	2,271	6.6	1,260	10.3	4,027	12	2,800	20
Rainier Ave @ I-90	415	2,043	4.9	1,200	7.8	3,371	8	3,500	17
South Lake Union	446	461	1.0	1,700'	4.8	15,230	34	4,500	44
RESIDENTIAL URBAN VILLAGES'									
Aurora N @ 97th St	288	2,106	7.3	900	10.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
Greenwood	202	1,283	6.3	350	8.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
Upper Queen Anne	103	1,063	10.3	300	13.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Eastlake	205	2,423	11.8	380	13.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
23rd Ave S @ S Jackson St	485	3,186	6.6	900	8.4	NA	NA	NA	NA

LAND USE APPENDIX B

Growth Planning Estimates for Urban Centers, Center Villages, Hub Urban Villages, and Residential Urban Villages

Village	Land Area Acres	Households (HH)				Employment (Jobs)			
		Existing	Existing Density (HH/Acre)	Planning Estimate (HH Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density	Existing	Existing Density (Jobs/Acre)	Planning Estimate (Job Growth)	Estimated 2010 Density
Admiral District	103	798	7.8	340	11.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
Green Lake	107	1,439	13.4	400	17.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
Roosevelt	160	1,007	6.3	340	8.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wallingford	245	1,973	8.1	200	8.9	NA	NA	NA	NA
Rainier Beach	227	1,482	6.5	740	9.8	NA	NA	NA	NA
Columbia City	313	1,639	5.2	740	7.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
SW Barton St @ 25th Ave S	278	1,654	6.0	700	8.5	NA	NA	NA	NA
Beacon Hill	171	1,844	10.8	550	14.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Crown Hill	173	929	5.4	310	7.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
MLK Jr Wy S @ Holly St	380	1,247	3.3	800*	5.4	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Park	264	997	3.8	350	5.1	NA	NA	NA	NA
21st Ave E @ E Madison St	145	1,486	10.3	400	13.0	NA	NA	NA	NA
California @ SW Morgan St	139	1,104	8.0	300	10.1	NA	NA	NA	NA

LAND USE APPENDIX F
Growth Management Projections for the City of Seattle
 (Entire Appendix is new)

The following annual population and employment projections reflect the City's 20 year population and employment growth assumptions. These figures are projections, or what is predicted to occur over the life of the Plan. These figures will be revised periodically to reflect changes in assumptions and/or actual growth.

Population and Household Growth Projections

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Resident Population (in '000's)	527.2	526.9	527.6	528.4	529.9	532.2	536.0	541.1	546.2	549.8	552.7	556.0	559.6	564.6	569.4	573.7	578.1	582.6	587.4	592.6	598.4
Households (in '000's)	245.4	246.3	247.6	249.0	250.9	253.1	256.1	260.1	264.0	267.0	269.6	272.3	275.4	279.1	282.9	286.4	289.8	293.4	297.1	301.2	305.7
Avg. HH Size	2.06	2.05	2.04	2.04	2.03	2.02	2.01	2.00	1.98	1.98	1.97	1.96	1.95	1.94	1.93	1.92	1.91	1.91	1.90	1.89	1.88

Employment Growth Projections

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Employment (in '000's)	549.4	554.6	560.4	568.0	576.8	586.4	597.4	607.0	616.0	623.7	629.1	634.2	640.3	647.1	654.1	661.1	668.1	674.3	681.1	688.7	696.9

Source: Growth Management Act Projections for the City of Seattle; Dick Conway and Associates, October 1993

CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

Text changes have been shown in strike-out/underline. Some changes were adopted to the Capital Facilities Element in November, 1995. These amendments have been reflected in this attachment. Where this has occurred, it is noted by an amendment date in parenthesis at the end of the section.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

Table of Contents

A. CAPITAL FACILITIES POLICIES.....	93
1. Strategic Capital Investment	93
2. Facility Siting.....	94
3. Relations With Other Public Entities Including the Seattle School District, the Port of Seattle, the Regional Transit Authority, Metropolitan King County, and the State of Washington.....	95
4. Regional Funding Policy	95
B. INVENTORY OF EXISTING PUBLIC CAPITAL FACILITIES.....	95
C. FORECAST OF FUTURE NEEDS FOR CAPITAL FACILITIES.....	96
D. PROPOSED NEW OR EXPANDED CAPITAL FACILITIES.....	96
E. SIX-YEAR FINANCING PLAN.....	97
F. CONSISTENCY AND COORDINATION	97
G. SITING PROCESS FOR ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES.....	97

****(NOTE: Page numbers refer to pages in the Comprehensive Plan,
not to pages in this attachment)****

A. CAPITAL FACILITIES POLICIES

This section does not apply to transportation or utilities capital facilities; please see those elements of the Plan for pertinent policies.

Goals:

- G1. Provide capital facilities that will serve the most pressing needs of the greatest number of Seattle citizens, and that will enable the City to deliver services efficiently to its constituents.
- G2. Preserve the physical integrity of the City's valuable capital assets and gradually reduce the major maintenance backlog.
- G3. Make capital investments consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan, including the urban village strategy.
- G4. Site and design capital facilities so that they will be considered assets to the communities in which they are located.
- G5. Provide capital facilities that will keep Seattle attractive to families with children.
- G6. Encourage grass-root involvement in identifying desired capital projects for individual neighborhoods.
- G7. Encourage community input to the siting of public facilities.

Policies:

1. Strategic Capital Investment

- C1. Plan capital investments strategically. The City will develop and begin to use by the middle of 1995 a new process by which it can make use fiscal notes and policy analysis to assist in making informed capital investment choices to achieve the community's long-term goals. This process provides guidance for capital budgeting and long-term capital facilities planning across all city departments, for identifying and balancing competing needs, and for developing short and long term capital finance plans for all of the City's capital investments. This process will include defining desired outcomes of capital investments, evaluating potential investments on a citywide basis, applying standard criteria for assessing alternative investments, and making more efficient use of all potential resources.

- C2. ~~Develop and begin using by the middle of 1995~~ Continue to use a framework for assessing policy and fiscal implications of potential major new and expanded capital facilities, as part of the City's new process for making capital investment choices. The framework will apply standard criteria, including the consideration of issues such as a capital project's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood plans, and its effects on Seattle's quality of life, the environment, social equity, and economic opportunity.
- C3. Emphasize the maintenance of existing facilities. The City will budget sufficient funds to perform major and preventive maintenance of existing facilities that is considered cost effective. The City will use maintenance plans for capital facilities and a funding allocation plan for such maintenance, and may revise these plans from time to time ~~by the end of 1995~~. In general, the City will not acquire or construct major new capital facilities unless the appropriation for the maintenance of existing facilities is consistent with the funding allocation plan. (Amended 7/95, 11/95)
- C4. Require fiscal impact analyses of all major capital projects considered for funding. Such analyses will include, but not be limited to, one-time capital costs, life-cycle operating and maintenance costs, revenues from the project, and costs of not doing the project.
- C5. Make major project specific capital decisions by the Mayor and the Council through the adoption of the City's operating and capital budgets, and the six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP).
- C5.5 As neighborhood plans are prepared, the City will consider neighborhood identified capital facility improvements in light of other facility commitments and the availability of funding and will consider other funding sources such as a neighborhood capital facility bond.

2. Facility Siting

- C6. Encourage the location of new community-based capital facilities, such as schools, libraries, little city halls, parks and playgrounds, community centers, clinics and human services facilities, in urban village areas. Written justification will be provided for proposals to locate a major capital facility outside of an urban village area. The City will consider providing capital facilities or amenities in urban villages as an incentive to attract both public and private investments to an area.
- C7. Seek to locate capital facilities where they are accessible to a majority of their expected users by walking, bicycling, car-pooling, and/or public transit. Other pedestrian or transit-oriented urban village strategies are included in the Transportation Element.

- C8. Consider the recommendations from the neighborhood planning process in making locational decisions for new or expanded facilities. The needs of facility users will also be considered in making these decisions.
- C9. Encourage quality development by requiring major City-funded capital improvement projects or projects proposed on City property located within the City of Seattle to be subject to a design review process of the Seattle Design Commission.

3. Relations With Other Public Entities Including the Seattle School District, the Port of Seattle, the Regional Transit Authority, Metropolitan King County, and the State of Washington

- C10. Work together with other public and non-profit entities toward coordinated capital investment planning, including coordinated debt financing strategies, to achieve the goals of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.
- C11. Work together with other public and non-profit entities to include urban village location as a major criterion for selecting sites for new or expanded community-based facilities or public amenity related facilities.
- C12. Work together with the School District to encourage siting, renovation, and expansion of school facilities in areas that are best equipped to accommodate growth.
- C13. Work cooperatively with other public or non-profit agencies to identify and pursue new co-location and joint-use opportunities for the community's use of public facilities for programs, services, and community meetings.

4. Regional Funding Policy

- C14. The City will work with other jurisdictions in King, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties to explore regional funding strategies for capital facilities, particularly for those that serve or benefit citizens throughout the region.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

B. INVENTORY OF EXISTING PUBLIC CAPITAL FACILITIES

The inventory of public capital facilities that is required by the Growth-management Act (GMA) is contained in Appendix A to this element of the Plan, and for utilities (including water and drainage and wastewater) and transportation, in the appendices to those elements of the Plan. This inventory is provided both at a citywide level and for each of the Urban Centers.

C. FORECAST OF FUTURE NEEDS FOR CAPITAL FACILITIES

This section does not apply to transportation capital facilities; please see that element of the Plan for pertinent discussion.

Seattle is a highly urbanized area with a fully developed citywide network of the types of capital facilities necessary to accommodate growth already a well-built urban area. New households that are projected to locate in Seattle could occupy existing dwellings or new buildings. New buildings can be constructed in Seattle, and be served by the existing network of streets, water and sewer lines, drainage facilities and electrical grid. In addition, new residents can be served by existing and funded police, fire and school facilities. Forecasted future needs for police and fire protection and schools both for the six and twenty year timeframes are listed in Appendix A to this element of the Plan. Forecasted future needs for water, drainage and wastewater, City Light and solid waste facilities are discussed in Appendix A of the Utilities Element. The capital programs to meet these forecasted six year needs are included in the *City of Seattle Adopted 1996-2001 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)*. The basic infrastructure necessary to serve the current population and the small amount of growth expected in the next six years already exists. Significant major maintenance needs for our existing facilities have been identified, and the City is exploring ways to remedy the existing backlog over the next six years.

The City currently provides a good citywide system of libraries, parks and recreation facilities which are available and accessible for use by all the City's residents. An inventory of these facilities is also contained in Appendix B to this element. While additions to these facilities would enhance the City's quality of life, such additions are not necessary to accommodate new households. It is expected that during the neighborhood planning process, additions or expansions of these facilities may be identified. The City's ability to add to or expand these facilities will depend on neighborhood prioritization, funding availability and the willingness of residents to approve financing.

The City also provides other facilities, such as general government buildings, Seattle Center and Public Health facilities that are of a citywide or regional benefit. While upgrading or replacement of some of these facilities may be funded over the next six years, such improvements are not necessitated by projected growth. (Section amended 11/94, 7/95, 11/95)

~~In addition, various departmental and citywide planning efforts in recent years have identified many capital enhancements that would be desirable in order to increase the services and opportunities that city government provides to our citizens. The city will seek additional resources to fund some of these desired amenities.~~

D. PROPOSED NEW OR EXPANDED CAPITAL FACILITIES

The project or program descriptions marked with a * in the 1996-2001 CIP identify the proposed locations and capacities of the new or expanded capital facilities the City contemplates funding in the next six years, and that designation of facilities is incorporated herein. Consistent with the overall plan, emergencies, other unanticipated events or opportunities, and voter approvals of ballot measures, may result in some departure from the adopted CIP. Other potential capital improvements that the City may fund over the next six years are found in Appendix D to this element. Additional information for transportation is found in that element. (Amended 11/94, 7/95, 11/95)

E. SIX-YEAR FINANCE PLAN

The project information summaries (Six Year Financing Plan) in the 1996-2001 CIP show, for each capital project or program proposed by the City, the sources of funding the City anticipates using. For projects or programs identified in the Comprehensive Plan as needed within the next six years, the project information summaries (Six Year Financing Plan) are incorporated herein. These allocations may change over time. Emergencies and unanticipated circumstances may result in allocating resources to projects not listed. This six-year finance plan shows full funding for all improvements to existing facilities and for new or expanded facilities the City expects to need to serve the existing and projected population through 2001. Additionally, the CIP contains substantial funding for major maintenance and some funding for other improvements that will both maintain and enhance the City's existing facilities. Additional information for transportation is found in that element. (Amended 11/94, 7/95, 11/95)

F. CONSISTENCY AND COORDINATION

Current projections show that probable funding will be sufficient to meet all the currently identified needs for new or expanded city capital facilities through the year 2001 to accommodate planned growth. Should anticipated funding not materialize, or should new needs be identified for which no funding is determined to be probable, the City will reassess the land use element of this Plan to ensure that it is coordinated with and consistent with this element, and in particular with the six-year finance plan. A review for coordination and consistency between this Element and the Land Use Element will be part of the City's annual budget review and Comprehensive Plan amendment processes. (Amended 11/94, 7/95, 11/95)

G. SITING PROCESS FOR ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES

1. The Growth Management Act provides that no comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of an essential public facility. Accordingly this Plan and City zoning permit the establishment of public uses, consistent with the areas zoned for such uses and compliance with applicable development regulations.

2. The City will approve a specific list of essential public facilities by type, and facilities on the list will thereafter be subject to the siting process referred to in paragraph three below. In developing the list the City will consider: state and county lists of essential public facilities; and the extent to which the facility type has historically been difficult to site in the City of Seattle, based upon such factors as the availability of land, access to transportation, compatibility with neighboring uses, and impact upon the physical environment.

3. The City's siting process for essential public facilities on the City's specific list should contain the following components:

a. Interjurisdictional analysis: A review to determine the extent to which an interjurisdictional approach may be appropriate, including a consideration of possible alternative sites for the facility in other jurisdictions and an analysis of the extent to which the proposed facility is of a county-wide, regional or state-wide nature, and whether uniformity among jurisdictions should be considered.

b. Financial Analysis: A review to determine if the financial impact upon the City of Seattle can be reduced or avoided by intergovernmental agreement.

c. Special Purpose Districts: When the public facility is being proposed by a special purpose district, the City should consider the facility in the context of the district's overall plan and the extent to which the plan and facility are consistent with this Comprehensive Plan.

d. Measures to Facilitate Siting: The factors that make a particular facility difficult to site (e.g., see paragraph 2 above) should be considered when a facility is proposed, and measures should be taken to facilitate siting of the facility in light of those factors.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

CAPITAL FACILITIES APPENDICES

Text changes have been shown in strike-out/underline. Some information has been updated where circumstances have changed since July of 1995. This is shown in double underline.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

CAPITAL FACILITIES APPENDICES

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A: Inventory of Existing <u>Fire, Police and School</u> Capital Facilities, Supplemental Capacity Information, and <u>Anticipated Future Facility Needs</u>	A115
APPENDIX B: <u>Inventory of Parks & Recreation, Libraries, General Government, Seattle Center, Public Health and Publicly Assisted Housing Facilities and Supplemental Capacity Information</u>	A122
APPENDIX C: <u>Inventory of Facilities Serving Urban Centers and Villages</u>	A127
APPENDIX D: <u>Potential Future Discretionary Projects</u>	A 139

****NOTE: Page numbers refer to pages in the Comprehensive Plan,
not to pages in this attachment)****

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**APPENDIX A:
Inventory of Fire, Police and School Facilities, Supplemental Capacity
Information, and Future Facility Needs**

The following sections contain the inventory, planning goals and future needs for Fire, Police and Schools. Information for Water, Drainage and Wastewater, Seattle City Light and Solid Waste is included in the Utilities Element Appendix. The following matrix summarizes the information found in this Appendix, including a summary of the planning goals, existing facilities, and identified six and twenty year needs.

MATRIX OF FIRE, POLICE & SCHOOL FACILITIES (entire table is new)

Facility	Planning Goal	Existing Facilities	Six Year Needs	Anticipated Twenty Year Needs
Fire	Maintain a 5 minute or less response time for first response to fire emergencies	33 existing Fire Stations currently provide a citywide response time of 4.36 minutes (1994)	Current facilities are adequate. No six year facility needs.	New station in Northgate and possibly downtown.
Police	Patrol units allocated around-the-clock based on calls for service. Location and size of facilities not critical to service provision. Facilities planning is based on guidelines for public safety office space.	4 Precincts, 2 Mobile Mini-precincts, Mounted Patrol, Kennel, Harbor Unit	Replace West Precinct and 911 Center	Expand North and South Precincts
Schools	<i>Elementary School</i> - 380-535 students, 4 ac. site size <i>Middle School</i> - 600 - 800 students, 12 ac. site size <i>High School</i> - 1,000 - 1,600 students, 17 ac. site size	61 Elementary Schools, 10 Middle Schools, 10 High Schools, 13 Alternative Schools, Admin. Buildings, Memorial Stadium, Closed schools	Current Capital Improvement Plan will renovate, replace, and/or add to 20 schools and Memorial Stadium.	The District's Facility Master Plan calls for all schools built before 1973 to be modernized or replaced over the next 20 years.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

1. Fire Department

Inventory:

The Seattle Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services throughout the city from 33 fire stations and Harborview Medical Center. Headquarters for the department are located at Fire Station 10 in Pioneer Square. Fire Department facilities and capacities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-5 and the location list provided below.

Each station provides a full range of fire protective services including fire suppression, emergency medical and salvage. While each station is equipped with at least one fire engine (except Fire Station 14, which has limited space), other equipment varies by facility. The Fire Department has 33 engine companies, 11 ladder truck companies, six medical units, six paramedic units and other specialized units distributed to serve existing development.

Planning Goals:

In 1994, the Seattle Fire Department maintained an average first-arrival response time to fire-related calls of 4.36 minutes. The fire fighting industry has set 5 minutes as a desirable response time.

Response time is influenced more directly by the availability of fire personnel, equipment, and traffic conditions than by the number of fire stations. However, firefighter and equipment requirements indirectly affect station requirements. Buildings and associated densities are critical factors in estimating fire fighter requirements. These requirements are estimated on an annual basis through the City's budget process.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Locations and Capacities of Fire Department Facilities

Station	Address	Capacity (Equipment)	Medic & Spec. Units
SFD 2	2334 4th Ave	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Aid 2
SFD 5	925 Alaskan Way	1 Engine	Fireboat
SFD 6	101 23rd Ave S	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	
SFD 8	110 Lee St	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	
SFD 9	3829 Linden Ave N	1 Engine	Air 9
SFD 10	301 2nd Ave S	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Aid-5, Haz-Mat Van
SFD 11	1514 SW Holden St	1 Engine	
SFD 13	3601 Beacon Ave S	1 Engine	
SFD 14	3224 4th Ave S	1 Ladder	Aid-14, Gas Truck
SFD 16	6846 Oswego Pl NE	1 Engine	Medic 16
SFD 17	1050 NE 50th St	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Aid-17
SFD 18	1521 NW Market St	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Aid-18, Salvage-18
SFD 20	3205 13th Ave W	1 Engine	
SFD 21	7304 Greenwood Ave N	1 Engine	
SFD 22	901 E Roanoke St	1 Engine	Communications Van
SFD 24	401 N 130th St	1 Engine	
SFD 25	1300 E Pine St	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Aid-25, Power-25
SFD 26	800 S Cloverdale St	1 Engine	Air-26
SFD 27	1000 S Myrtle St	1 Engine	Foam-1
SFD 28	5968 Rainier Ave S	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Medic/Aid-28
SFD 29	2139 Ferry Ave SW	1 Engine	
SFD 30	2931 S Mount Baker Blvd	1 Engine	
SFD 31	1319 N Northgate Way	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Medic/Aid-31
SFD 32	3715 SW Alaska St	1 Engine, 1 Ladder	Medic/Aid-32, Air-32
SFD 33	9645 Renton Ave S	1 Engine	
SFD 34	633 32nd Ave E	1 Engine	Power-34A
SFD 35	8729 15th Ave NW	1 Engine	
SFD 36	3600 23rd Ave SW	1 Engine	Unit 99
SFD 37	7300 35th Ave SW	1 Engine	
SFD 38	5503 33rd Ave NE	1 Engine	
SFD 39	12705 30th Ave NE	1 Engine	
SFD 40	9401 35th Ave NE	1 Engine	
SFD 41	2416 34th Ave W	1 Engine	Medic 1, Medic 10

Existing Capacity and Anticipated Future Needs:

The current facilities and their distribution are adequate to maintain the desired response time to existing development and the small amount of new development expected over the next six years in the Urban Centers and throughout the City. In order to serve expected growth over the next 20 years, the Fire Department will need a new station in the Northgate area and may require one in the downtown area.

Over time, the Department may explore relocation options to promote service efficiencies or to address space needs for larger equipment. In addition, the Department is currently evaluating its emergency medical capabilities and staffing or equipment additions that may be desirable to improve emergency medical service.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

2. Police Department

Inventory:

The Seattle Police Department currently provides law enforcement patrol services to the city from four precincts each with its own police station. The locations and capacities of these precincts are shown in Figure A-30 and the list below:

1. North Precinct, at 10049 College Way North, serves the area north of the Ship Canal to the City limits and has a capacity of 16,779 square feet (sq ft).
2. West Precinct, located in the Public Safety Building, serves Queen Anne, Magnolia, the downtown core, and the area west of I-5 and north of Spokane Street, and has a capacity of 9,930 ~~45,000~~ sq ft for patrol headquarters, 180,086 ~~94,500~~ sq ft for other administrative/storage space in the Public Safety Building and five other adjacent/nearby buildings.
3. East Precinct, located at 1519 12th Avenue, serves the area north of I-90 to the Ship Canal and east of I-5, including ~~plus~~ the Eastlake Community and has a capacity of 40,000 sq ft of office space.
4. South Precinct, at 3001 South Myrtle Street, serves the Duwamish Waterway area, West Seattle, and in Southeast Seattle, the area south of I-90 to the City limits and has a capacity of 13,688 sq ft.

Other Police facilities owned and/or operated by SPD ~~or the City's Department of Administrative Services~~ include:

1. The Facility for Mounted Patrol Unit at Discovery Park has a capacity of 12 full-time stalls and ~~5 temporary stalls and the space for housing other related equipment and supplies.~~
2. The Kennel for the K-9 Unit of Police dogs, located at the SPD pistol range in south Seattle near Boeing Field, has a capacity of 6,464 sq ft, housing 6 dogs and 2 pups and related equipment and supplies.
3. The Harbor Unit facility on the north shore of Lake Union has a capacity of 3,706 ~~4,000~~ square feet for offices, shop, dock, and two boat sheds, plus docks which moor ~~housing nine~~ Patrol boats. The facility also has extra dock areas to moor temporary boats.
4. The Community Service Officer Unit, at 105 14th Avenue, has a capacity of 7,000 sq ft of office space.

The SPD offices at the Seattle Center component handles ~~, which make up the Special Activities Section for events at the Center, as well as the Police Reserves~~

Unit. In addition to these permanent facilities, the Police Department has two mobile mini-precincts that they locate in various areas as activities dictate. One of the mobile mini-precincts is permanently assigned to West Seattle. The Police Department facilities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-6.

Planning Goals:

Uniform patrol law enforcement services are generally allocated based on workload, time and location. The exact location of facilities is usually not critical to the provision of uniform patrol services, since police officers are on patrol in the various sectors and calls for service are dispatched by radio or officers handle situations "on view". However, the location of facilities can be important because of distance traveled at shift change time and because good locations can enhance Police/Community interaction and communication.

Because of the many and changing factors that affect staffing and space objectives of police departments, there are no universally accepted planning goals for police facilities related to performance measures. The forecast of future needs is therefore based on guidelines for office space that incorporate special space requirements related to public safety, using the East Precinct as a model.

Existing Capacity and Anticipated Future Needs:

The West Precinct is currently overcrowded and does not satisfy the Police Department's desire for additional space. Replacement of Plans are being considered to replace the current West Precinct and 911 Center with a new building at 9th and Lenora in the South Lake Union neighborhood has been approved and funded. Construction is expected to be completed in 1998. With the replacement of the West Precinct building, police facilities are expected to be adequate to serve the existing population and that expected over the next six years.

In order to serve the growth forecast under the Comprehensive Plan over the next 20 years in the Urban Centers and throughout the City, it is anticipated that additional space may be required in the North and South Precincts. However, these improvements are not expected to be needed over the next six years. At this time the exact space requirements are not known and will depend on a variety of factors, as discussed under Planning Goals. As the City further considers community policing options the long range plans for police facilities may change.

3. Public Schools

Inventory:

District facilities include 10 high schools, 10 middle schools, 61~~2~~ elementary schools, 13~~0~~ alternative schools and Memorial Stadium. In addition, the District has six buildings used primarily for administration and a number of closed schools. Many of the school closures occurred during the 1970s and 1980s as a result of low enrollments. The closed schools are used for administration, as temporary schools

during remodeling construction, leased to other organizations on a short- or long-term basis or remain unused. School locations are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-10.

The capacity for school facilities varies by school type as follows: 380-535 students for elementary schools; 600-800 ~~700-900~~ students for middle schools; and 1,000-1,600 ~~1,200~~ students for high schools. Memorial stadium has a seating capacity of 12,000.

Planning Goals:

The School District has established the following planning goals for new or modernized school facilities:

	<u>School Size</u>	<u>Site Size (Minimum)</u>
Elementary School	380, 445 or 535 students	4 acres
Middle School	600 to 800 students, except for alternative programs, which could be smaller	12 acres
High School	1,000 to 1,600 students, except for alternative programs, which could be smaller	17 acres

The District plans facilities based on where growth is expected in school age populations of children that would be expected to attend public school. Through the current "choice" student assignment plan, about 50% of the children that attend public schools choose and attend the school in their neighborhood and 50% choose other schools.

Existing Capacity and Anticipated Future Needs:

In 1991, the School District completed a six-year capital improvement program, known as CIP I. In preparation for the next CIP, the School Board adopted the long-range Facilities Master Plan and Capital Improvement Program. The Capital Improvement Program was divided into several phases. Funding for the CIP was approved by the voters in February 1995.

The current CIP covers six years, 1995-2000, and contains 21 projects. The projects are for modernization, historic renovation, replacement and/or expansion of elementary and secondary schools and Memorial Stadium, to meet existing requirements. These improvements will add some capacity which will reduce the dependency on portable buildings to meet the expected population in the next six years.

For all Urban Centers except the University District, there is sufficient capacity to serve the existing student population. No capital improvements are slated for these areas in the next six years. According to the District's Facility Master Plan, it is

expected that over the next six years there will be sufficient capacity for expected growth. For the University District Urban Center, the current shortfall of capacity to serve student population is being addressed through the use of portable buildings and capacity in nearby schools. Latona and Bryant Elementary schools are scheduled for increased capacity in the current Capital Improvement Program. With expected population growth, according to the District's Facility Master Plan, any shortfall of localized capacity will be handled through the use of portable buildings and capacity in nearby schools.

The School District's Facilities Master Plan (FMP) guides facilities decisions through the year 2010. Over the course of the next several anticipated capital improvement programs, capacity will be added to eliminate the need for portable buildings.

The schools outlined in the FMP are in locations that can serve Urban Centers, Urban Villages and the remainder of the city. The FMP recognizes that the shift in trends, as Urban Centers and Villages develop, could be gradual or rapid and will vary throughout the city. The District is committed to reviewing and adjusting its FMP every three years, as necessary, to be responsive to changing conditions.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

APPENDIX B:
Inventory of Park & Recreation, Library, General Government, Seattle Center,
Public Health and Publicly Assisted Housing Facilities and Supplemental
Capacity Information

1. Parks and Recreation Facilities

The City maintains a system of parks and open areas that includes 6,189 acres, or about 10% of the City's total land area. This includes 5,343 developed acres. Over 6,000 acres of parks and open space are deemed adequate capacity to serve a population of at least 600,000. Planned open space capacity will increase by 210 acres over the next six years and will include natural areas, greenbelts, and parks expansions. Parks and open areas owned by the City and their capacities are summarized below:

Parks and Open Space	Size of Facility
61 Local parks	834 acres
17 Major urban or regional parks	2,554 acres
62 Squares, places, triangles	27 acres
33 Playfields	413 acres
38 Neighborhood playgrounds	135 acres
8 Shorelines (including 11 swimming beaches)	24 miles
Biking and pedestrian trails	8 miles
18 Boulevards	22 miles (396 acres)
20 Green spaces	421 acres
18 Natural areas	69 acres

The City also owns a number of recreational facilities within the parks system. These structures total over a million square feet of building space. Five new community centers will expand the capacity by over 70,000 sq ft. Following is a list of park system structures:

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

- 24 Community centers
- 9 Swimming pools (including 1 outdoor), 27 wading pools
- 1 Waterfront aquarium
- 1 Zoo: 90 acres, 45 major exhibits and buildings
- 1 Stadium
- 1 Indoor tennis center (10 indoor courts and 4 outdoor courts)
- 151 Outdoor tennis courts (71 with lights)
- 185 Athletic fields
- 33 Playfields
- 5 Golf courses, including pitch/putt (449 acres)
- 2 Boating and sailing centers
- 2 Nature interpretive centers (Discovery Park and Camp Long)
- 6 Performing and visual art facilities
- 7 Historic buildings
- 90 Comfort stations
- 16 Residences and cabins
- 80 Picnic shelters and houses
- 12 Concession facilities
- 22 Administrative offices and headquarters
- 2 Museums
- 2 Amphitheaters
- 52 Miscellaneous facilities (including storage, maintenance, warehouses, chapel, visitor centers, beach/bath facilities, a rifle/pistol range and a police horse patrol barn, viewpoints and nature trails)

Parks facilities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-1 and most recreation facilities are included within the areas of the parks.

2. Seattle Public Library

The Seattle Public Library (SPL) operates the downtown library, 22 neighborhood libraries and a fleet of five bookmobiles. The State-funded Washington Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (WLBPH) is also administered by the SPL. The SPL rents space for three of the five facilities it does not own, and is provided with free space by the Seattle Housing Authority for two facilities. Locations of library facilities and their capacities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-2 and in the location list of Library facilities provided below.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Locations and Capacities of Library Facilities

Library Name	Address	Capacity Sq. Ft.
Broadview	12755 Greenwood Av N	8,405
Lake City	12501 28th Av NE	9,013
Ballard	5711 24th Av NW	7,296
Magnolia	2801 34th Av W	5,859
Queen Anne	400 W Garfield St	7,931
Fremont	731 N 35th	6,060
Green Lake	7364 E Green Lake Dr N	8,690
Greenwood	8016 Greenwood Av N	7,094
Henry	425 Harvard Av E	4,904
University	5009 Roosevelt Wy NE	8,140
Downtown	1000 4th Av	166,092
Mobile Services	425 Harvard Av E	5,056
West. Library for the Blind & Physically Handicapped	821 Lenora St	10,000
Madrona-Sally Goldmark	1134 33rd Av	1,701
Montlake	2300 24th Av E	1,535
North East	6801 35th Av NE	8,690
High Point	6338 32nd Av SW	2,067
South West	9010 35th Av SW	7,557
West Seattle	2306 42nd Av SW	10,007
Beacon Hill	2519 15th Av S	3,328
Columbia	4721 Rainier Av S	5,838
Douglass-Truth	23rd Av / E Yesler Wy	8,008
Holly Park	6805 32nd Av S	1,924
Rainier Beach	9125 Rainier Av S	9,006
Wallingford-Wilmet	N 45th St / Densmore	2,147

3. General Government

The City of Seattle currently owns six primary buildings with a capacity of 2.149 million square feet (sq ft) in the downtown core: the Municipal Building (238,000 sq ft), Public Safety Building (291,000 sq ft), City Light Building (200,000 sq ft), Dexter-Horton Building (350,000 sq ft), Arctic Building (101,000 sq ft), and Alaska Building (147,000 sq ft), and the Key Tower (1 million sq ft, of which 195,000 sq ft are currently used for City office space). The City also leases about 80,000 square feet in nearby buildings downtown. In addition, the City owns more than 100 other facilities located outside of downtown. The major general government facilities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-3.

The City also leases 10 storefront Neighborhood Service Centers located throughout the city. These offices range in size from 750 square feet to 2,000 square feet and serve as City information and community contact points, as well as bill payment depositories. These are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-4.

4. Seattle Center

There are 24 buildings on the 74 acre Center grounds with a capacity of over 250,000 square feet of meeting and exhibition space in three dozen separate facilities that meet the cultural, educational, and recreational needs of the region. The Center House Conference Center, Mercer Forum, and Northwest Rooms host gatherings up to 800, and the Opera House has seating for 3,100. The Coliseum is currently under construction and its capacity will be expanded from approximately 15,000 to 17,000 seats.

The Fun Forest Amusement Park is located on the grounds, along with the International Fountain, Pottery Northwest, Northwest Crafts Center and various gardens. The Center has seven parking lots and a parking garage with a combined parking capacity of 2,800 stalls. Seattle Center facilities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-7

5. Public Health

The Health Department is a joint enterprise of the City of Seattle and the Metropolitan King County and is responsible for the supervision and control of all public health and sanitation affairs in Seattle/King County. The Seattle Division maintains a system of personal health services through seven health centers/clinics located in downtown, north and south Seattle. These health care facilities have a total capacity of 73,735 square feet. The capacity and ownership of individual facilities are listed below.

Health Facility	Size	Tenancy
Columbia Health Center	28,094 sf	own
Odessa Brown Building	3,810 sf	own
Downtown Public Health Center	19,078 sf	lease
North District Health Center	11,953 sf	owned by King Co.
Northwest Family Center	5,426 sf	owned by King Co.
Prefontaine Building	5,374 sf	owned by King Co.

Public Health facilities are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-8.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

68. Publicly-Assisted Housing

The following summary describes the publicly-assisted housing inventory of low- and moderate-income rental units that were built or preserved within the City of Seattle through 1992. The Comprehensive Plan Housing Element estimates that there were 25,744 publicly assisted housing units with a capacity for 25,744 households in the city. Of these units, 86% receive project-based assistance, where the subsidy is linked to a specific project and unit, regardless of the tenant. The remaining 14% receive tenant-based assistance, where the subsidy is linked to a specific tenant, not a specific unit.

Publicly Assisted Housing Facility	Number of Units
Project-Based Assistance:	
SHA Public Housing	6,927
SHA Other Housing	1,493
Federally Subsidized Housing*	4,942
DHHS Multifamily**	4,593
State Housing Program (HAP)	582
State Housing Bonds (WSHFC)	290
Federal Tax Credits (WSHFC)	3,436
Tenant-Based Assistance:	
Section 8 Certificates	2,590
Section 8 Vouchers	891
Total Units Assisted	25,744

- * Federally subsidized projects include Section 8 (project based) Certificates, Section 202 Elderly, Section 811 Disabled, 221(d)(3), and 221(d)(4) projects.
- ** Levy Trust Fund assistance is included in the DHHS project based assistance count above.

The housing units tabulated above include both publicly and privately-owned units. The existing public housing facilities operated by the Seattle Housing Authority are shown in Capital Facilities Figure A-9.

**APPENDIX C:
Inventory of Facilities Serving Urban Centers and Villages**

Following is an inventory of facilities that serve Urban Centers and Urban Villages. Facilities do not have to be located within the boundaries or potential boundaries of the Centers or Villages in order to serve those areas. [Entire section is new]

URBAN CENTERS

Northgate			
Existing Households (HH):	3,291	Existing Jobs:	11,366
Expected 6-yr. HH Growth:	599 830	Expected 6 yr. Jobs Growth:	2,038 3,520
Expected 20-yr. HH Growth:	3,000	Expected 20 yr. Job Growth:	9,300
Land Area:	410 Acres		

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 31	1319 N. Northgate Way	4.7 minute response time Engine, Ladder Co., Medic/Aid
Police Station	North Precinct	10049 College Way N.	32.04 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 228,659
Schools ¹	Olympic View Elementary Northgate Elementary Sacajawea Elementary All 10 Middle Schools All 10 High Schools	504 NE 95th St 11725 1st Ave. NE 9501 - 20th Ave. NE	414 students 299 students 230 students
Library	Lake City Branch	12501 28th Ave NE	9,013 sq ft 1990 pop 35,008; .26 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita for citywide facilities
Parks:	Thorton Creek Park #6 North Seattle Park Pinehurst P-Patch Lichton Springs Park	In Center Within 1/8 mi Within 1/8 mi Within 1/2 mi	5.0 ac 6.8 ac 2 ac 6.3 ac

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

¹ Through the student assignment plan, several other Elementary Schools also serve the Center, as well as several alternative schools.

Seattle Center
 Existing Households (HH): 3,138
 Expected 6 Yr. HH Growth: 241,363
 Expected 20 Yr. HH Growth: 1,312
 Land Area: 297 Acres

Existing Jobs: 19,000
 Expected 6 Yr. Job Growth: 1,078,1250
 Expected 20-Year Job Growth: 3,300

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 8	110 Lee St.	#8 - 4.7 minute response time, Engine Co., Ladder Co.
	SFD 2	2334 4th Ave.	#2 - 3.8 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Aid Car
Police	West Precinct	600 3rd Ave	11.59 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 64,699
Schools ¹	John Hay Elementary	201 Garfield St	414 students
	All 10 Middle Schools All 10 High Schools		
Library	Queen Anne Branch	400 W. Garfield St	7,931 sq ft 1990 pop served 30,977 or .26 sq ft/capita + .32 citywide
	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq. ft.: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Community Center	Queen Anne	1901 1st Ave. W	15,337 sq ft, includes pool
Parks:	Elliot Bay Park	Within 1/8 mi	31.20 ac
	Myrtle Edwards Park	Within 1/8 mi	3.7 ac
	Kerry Park	Within 1/8 mi	1.4 ac
	Kinnear	Within 1/8 mi	14.0 ac
	Observatory Park	Within 1/8 mi	0.8 ac
	BhyKracke Park	Within 1/8 mi	1.5 ac
	Denny Park	Within 1/8 mi	5.0 ac
Queen Anne Playground	Within 1/2 mi	7.4 ac	

¹ Through the student assignment plan, several other Elementary Schools also serve the Center, as well as several alternative schools.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

University Urban Center

Some facilities serve the entire Urban Center. These facilities are listed first. Facilities specifically serving the Urban Center Villages are listed under each village below.

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 17	1050 NE 50th St.	#17 - 4.7 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Aid Unit, Battalion
	SFD 38	5503 33rd Av. NE	#38 - 5.2 minute response time Engine Co.
Police	North Precinct	10049 College Way N.	32.04sq mi service area, 1994 pop 228,659
Schools ¹	Green Lake Elementary	2400 N. 65th St.	230 students
	Latona Elementary	401 NE 42nd Ave	276 students
	Bryant Elementary	3311 NE 60th St.	483 students
	Laurelhurst Elementary	4530 NE 46th Ave..	299 students
	All 10 Middle Schools All 10 High Schools		

University Campus

Existing Households:	6,313	Existing Jobs:	21,222
Expected 6 Yr. Growth:	0	Expected 6 Yr. Job Growth:	1,566 1,816
Expected 20-Yr. HH Growth:	0	Expected 20-Yr. Job Growth:	4,800
Land Area:	359 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Library	University Branch	5009 Roosevelt Wy. NE	8,140 sq ft; 1990 pop served
	University of Washington Library		22,714 or .27 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita citywide
Parks:	N. Passage Point Park	In Center Village	.79 ac
	Burke-Gilman Trail	Within 1/8 mi	--
	17th Av NE Centerstrip	Within 1/8 mi	.89 ac
	P-patch	Within 1/8 mi	--

¹ Through the student assignment plan, several other Elementary Schools also serve the Center, as well as several alternative schools.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

University District NW

Existing Households: 4,324
 Expected 6 Yr. HH Growth: 296 451
 Expected 20 Yr. HH Growth: 1,630
 Land Area: 289 Acres

Existing Jobs: 8,625
 Expected 6Yr Job Growth: 229 1,135
 Expected 20 Yr. Job Growth: 3,000

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Library	University Branch	5009 Roosevelt Wy. NE	8,140 sq ft; 1990 pop served 22,714 or .27 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita citywide
Parks:	University Playground	In Village	2.8 ac
	Message Point Park	In Village	.79 ac
	17th Ave NE Centerstrip	In Village	1.78 ac
	Patch	In Village	--
	Castie Park	In Village	.11 ac
	Ravenna Blvd.	Within 1/8 mi	29.3 ac
	Cowen Park	Within 1/4 mi	8.4 ac

University Village

Existing Households: 973
 Expected 6 Yr HH Growth: 229 153
 Expected 20 Yr HH Growth: 480
 Land Area: 122 Acres

Existing Jobs: 1,580
 Expected 6 Yr Job Growth: 229 265
 Expected 20 Yr Job Growth: 700

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Library	Northeast Branch	6801 35th Ave NE	7,042 sq ft; 1990 pop served 37,787 or .19 sq ft/capita
	University Branch	5009 Roosevelt Wy. NE	8,140 sq ft; 1990 pop 22,714 or .36 sq ft/capita Both +.32 sq ft/capita citywide
Parks:	Burke-Gilman Trail	In Village	--
	Ravenna Blvd.	Within 1/8 mi	29.3 ac
	Ravenna Park	Within 1/8 mi	52.7 ac

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
 IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Downtown Urban Center

Some facilities serve the entire Urban Center. These facilities are listed first. Facilities specifically serving the Urban Center Villages are listed under each village below.

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 10	301 2nd Ave. S	#10 - 3.7 minute response times Engine Co., Ladder Co., Battalion, Aid Co., Hazmat Van,
	SFD 5	925 Alaskan Way	# 5 - 3.6 minute response times Engine Co., Fireboat;
	SFD 2	2334 4th Ave.	#2 - 3.8 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Aid Co.
	SFD 25	1300 E. Pine St.	#25 - 4 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Battalion, Aid Car, Power Unit
Police	West Precinct	Public Safety Bldg., 610 3rd Ave.	11.59 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 64,699
Schools ¹	John Hay Elementary	201 Garfield	414 students
	Lowell Elementary	1058 E. Mercer St.	391 students
	Minor Elementary	1701 E. Union St.	391 students
	Gatzert Elementary	1301 E. Yesler Way	414 students
	All 10 Middle Schools All 10 High Schools		

Pioneer Square/Kingdome

Existing Households:	3,762	Existing Jobs:	9,113
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>947,501</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>1,568,1817</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	2,100	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	4,800
Land Area:	142 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop
			21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Parks:	Pioneer Square	In Village	.10 ac
	City Hall Park	In Village	.70 ac
	S. Washington Boat Dock	In Village	.43 ac
	Occidental Square	In Village	.61 ac
	Occidental Square Mall	In Village	.88 ac

¹ Through the student assignment plan, several other Elementary Schools also serve the Center, as well as several alternative schools.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Denny Regrade

Existing Households:	3,492	Existing Jobs:	22,699
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>4,673 1,799</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>4,470 1,701</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	6,500	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	4,500
Land Area:	216 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Parks:	Regrade Park	In Village	.3 ac
	Myrtle Edwards	In Village	3.7 ac
	Belltown P-patch	In Village	.13 ac
	Victor Steinbreuck Park	Within 1/8 mi	82 ac
	Denny Park	Within 1/4 mi	5.0 ac
	Westlake Park	Within 1/4 mi	1.0 ac
	Pier 61 & Aquarium	Within 1/4 mi	--

Westlake

Existing Households:	514	Existing Jobs:	22,010
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>578 969</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>7,710 8,930</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	3,500	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	23,600
Land Area:	143 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Parks:	Westlake Park	Within 1/8 mi	1 ac
	Denny Park	Within 1/8 mi	5.0 ac
	Boren-Pike-Pine	Within 1/8 mi	.6 ac
	McGraw Square	Within 1/8 mi	.02 ac
	Regrade Park	Within 1/4 mi	.3 ac
	Freeway Park	Within 1/4 mi	5.0 ac

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

International District

Existing Households:	1,604	Existing Jobs:	4,474
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>214,360</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>915,1060</u>
Expected 20 Yr. HH Growth:	1,300	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	2,800
Land Area:	169 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Community Center	Yesler Playfield & Comm. Center	903 Yesler Way	4,771 sq ft, 1.7 ac (SHA property)
Parks:	Kobe Terrace	In Village	1.1 ac.
	Hing Hay Park	In Village	.33 ac
	International Children's Park	In Village	.23 ac
	Beacon Place	In Village	.25 ac
	City Hall Park	Within 1/8 mi	.70 ac
	Prefontaine Place	Within 1/8 mi	.05 ac.
	Harborview Park	Within 1/8 mi	3.6 ac
	Greenbelt (Beacon Hill N.	Within 1/4 mi	4.47 ac

Commercial Core

Existing Households:	1,435	Existing Jobs:	106,823
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>214,360</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>8,821,10,216</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	1,300	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	27,000
Land Area:	275 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Parks:	Freeway Park	In Village	5.00 ac
	Victor Steinbreuck Park	In Village	.82 ac
	Westlake Park	In Village	1.0 ac
	Waterfront Park	In Village	10.40 ac (includes underwater)
	Aquarium	In Village	--
	Piers 62 & 63	In Village	1.14 ac
	Kobe Terrace	Within 1/8 mi	1.1 ac
	City Hall Park	Within 1/8 mi	.70 ac
	Pioneer Square	Within 1/8 mi	.10 ac
	So. Washington Boat Dock	Within 1/8 mi	.43 ac
	McGraw Square	Within 1/4 mi	.02 ac
	Harborview Park	Within 1/4 mi	3.6 ac
	Occidental Parks	Within 1/4 mi	.61 ac

Capitol Hill/First Hill Urban Center

Some facilities serve the entire Urban Center. These facilities are listed first. Facilities specifically serving the Urban Center Villages are listed under each village below.

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 25	1300 E. Pine St	#25 - 4 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Battalion, Aid Unit, Power Unit
	SFD 10	301 2nd Ave. S.	#10 - 3.7 minute response time Engine Co., Ladder Co., Deputy Chief, Aid Co., Hazmat Van
	SFD 22	901 E. Roanoke St.	#22 - 5.4 minute response time Engine, Communications van
Police	East Precinct	1519 12th Ave	8.45 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 82,265
Schools ¹	Lowell Elementary	1058 E. Mercer St	391 students
	TT Minor Elementary	1701 E. Union St.	391 students
	Gatzert Elementary	1301 E. Yester Way	414 students
	All 10 Middle Schools		
	All 10 High Schools		

South Capitol Hill

Existing Households:	978	Existing Jobs:	3,520
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>99,149</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>992,454</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	540	Expected 20 Yr. Job Growth:	1,200
Land Area:	160 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
	Douglass Truth Branch	2300 E. Yesler Way	8,008 sq ft: 1990 pop served 21,101 or .38 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita citywide
Comm. Ctr.	Yesler Playfield/Comm Ctr.	903 Yesler Way	4,771 sq ft, 1.7 ac (SHA property)
Parks:	McGilvra Place	In Village	.07 ac
	Spring Street Park	Within 1/8 mi	.33 ac
	Harborview Park	Within 1/4 mi	3.6 ac
	Park at Langston Hughes	Within 1/4 mi	1.2 ac
	Pratt Park	Within 1/2 mi	5.5 ac
Other	Firehouse Mill Park	Within 1/2 mi	.33 ac
	Langston Hughes Cult. Ctr.	16th & Yesler	8,418 sq ft

¹ Through the student assignment plan, several other Elementary Schools also serve the Center, as well as several alternative schools.

Capitol Hill

Existing Households:	12,450	Existing Jobs:	5,284
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>361,548</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>988,135</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	1,980	Jobs Growth:	3,000
Land Area:	396 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Henry Branch	425 Harvard Ave E	4,904 sq ft: 1990 pop served 30,709 or .16 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita citywide
Community Center	Yesler Playfield & Community Center	903 Yesler Way	4,771 sq ft, 1.7 ac
Parks:	Tashkent Park	In Village	.46 ac
	Thomas St Park (Summit)	In Village	.32 ac
	Volunteer Park	In Village	44.5 ac
	Bobby Morris Playfield	Within 1/8 mi	4.5 ac
	Miller Playfield	Within 1/4 mi	7.9 ac
	Greenbelt along I-5 at N end of village	Within 1/4 mi	12.00 ac (10% public area)

First Hill

Existing Households:	5,896	Existing Jobs:	20,626
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>498,684</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>1,998,238</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	2,400	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	6,100
Land Area:	225 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Downtown Main Library	1000 Fourth Ave.	166,092 sq ft: Downtown pop 21,904 Citywide pop 1990 516,334 or .32 sq ft/capita
Community Center	Yesler Playfield & Community Center	903 Yesler Way	4,771 sq ft, 1.7 ac
Parks:	Freeway Park	In Village	5.0 ac
	Harborview Park	In Village	3.6 ac
	First Hill Park	In Village	.2 ac
	Boren-Pike-Pine Park	Within 1/8 mi	.6 ac
	Kobe Park	Within 1/8 mi	1.1 ac

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Pike/Pine

Existing Households:	2,349	Existing Jobs:	3,963
Expected 6 Yr HH Growth:	<u>119,172</u>	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>457,530</u>
Expected 20 Yr HH Growth:	620	Expected 20 Yr Job Growth:	1,400
Land Area:	131 Acres		

The following facilities are in addition to those listed under the Urban Center, above:

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Library	Henry Branch	425 Harvard Ave E	4,904 sq ft: 1990 pop served 30,709 or .16 sq ft/capita + .32 sq ft/capita citywide
	Downtown Main Library	1000 4th Ave.	166,092 sq ft: 1990 Downtown Pop 21,904, Citywide pop 516,334, or .32 sq ft/capita
Parks:	Bobby Morris Playfield	In Village	4.5 ac
	Boren-Pike-Pine Park	In Village	.6 ac
	Thomas St Park (Summit)	Within 1/8 mi	.32 ac
	McGilvra Place	Within 1/8 mi	.07 ac.
	First Hill Park	Within 1/4 mi	.2 ac
Other	Reservoir	By Bobby Morris	
	Seattle Central Community College	Playfield (Water Dept.)	

MANUFACTURING/INDUSTRIAL CENTERS

Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center

Existing Households:	469	Existing Jobs:	65,442
Land Area:	4,936 Acres	Expected 6 Yr Job Growth:	<u>3,552,414</u>
		Expected 20 Yr Jobs Growth:	10,860

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 5, 10, 11, 14, 26, 27, 29, 36	925 Alaskan Way, 301 2nd Ave. S, 1514 SW Holden St, 3224 4th Ave S, 800 S, Cloverdale St, 1000 S Myrtle St, 9645 Renton Ave S, 3600 23rd Ave. SW	Citywide average response times 4.36 minutes 8 Engine Companies, 2 Ladder Companies, Battalion 1 & 7, Fireboat, 3 Aid Units, HazMat Van, Foam, Marine Response Van, Heavy Rescue Equipment, Confine Space Equipment, Mobile Air Supply
Police	South Precinct	3001 S. Myrtle St.	31.87 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 155,777
Parks	Georgetown Playfield	In Center	5.4 ac

North Seattle Manufacturing/Industrial Center

Existing Households: 389
Land Area: 971 Acres

Existing Jobs: 15,113
Expected 6 Yr Job Growth: 1,224 1,446
Expected 20 Yr Job Growth: 3,800

Facility Type	Name	Location	Capacity
Fire Station	SFD 2,8,9,18,20	2334 4th Ave, 110 Lee St., 3829 Linden Ave. N, 1521 NW Market St, 3205 13th Ave W	Citywide average response time 4.36 minutes 5 Engine Companies, 3 Ladder Trucks, Battalion, 2 Aid Units, Salvage, Air
Police	West Precinct	Public Safety Bldg., 610 3rd Ave.	11.59 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 64,699
	North Precinct	10049 College Way N	32.04 sq mi service area, 1994 pop 228,659
Parks	Interbay Playfield	In Village	10.2 ac
	Interbay Golf Course	In Village	29.0 ac

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

APPENDIX D:
Potential Future Discretionary Projects
(New Appendix Added 7/95, Amended 7/96)

Besides the facilities that are included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), there are a number of prospective discretionary-capital projects that the City might undertake in the future is considering and for which various levels of planning have been done. They are listed below in alphabetical order to provide included herein to give a broad view of the City's potential future capital spending. Projects are not listed in any priority order. Funding for these projects is not yet identified, and no decisions have been made to go forward with funding these projects.

African-American Museum*
Aquarium Redevelopment
Baseball and Football Stadiums*
Central Waterfront Bike Path
City projects included in a potential new 1996 Countywide Parks Bond Issue
Citywide Seismic Improvements
Convention Center Expansion*
Duwamish Coalition
Fiber-Optic Expansion
Gas Works Park Environmental Clean-up
Holly Park
Homeless Day Center
Library Master Plan
LINC expansion
New Memorial Stadium Relocation
Municipal Court Facilities
Neighborhood Planning Capital Projects
Parks Master Plan
Sand Point Redevelopment
Seattle Center Bus Barn Demolition and Environmental Clean-up
Seattle Center Master Plan
Sobering Center
South Downtown Study Area Improvements
Southwest Harbor Project (APL)*
Spokane Street Viaduct Safety Improvements
Systems Garage
Telecommunications Improvements

* Projects with an * are not under the jurisdiction of the City, but are owned or sponsored by another government agency or private organization. It is possible that the City might participate in funding for these projects.

[Projects that are being removed from the list either because funding has been approved or they are no longer being considered:]

Frederick & Nelson Parking Garage
Pike/Pine Corridor Improvements
Promenade 23 Improvements
Dearborn/Hawthorne Property
Housing Levy
National Mobile Home Park
South Lake Union Plan Improvements (e.g., park, transportation improvements)
Green Lake Path

Attachments
Page 44
6/24/96

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Hendrix Museum
SPU Stadium
UJATF (People's Ledge)
Open Space
Galer St. Gradecrossing
Multi-modal Terminal
Downtown Criminal Justice Facilities
Mounted Patrol
Neighborhood Public Safety Facilities
City Downtown Office Buildings (e.g., Gateway Center)
Kingdome Repairs

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES ELEMENT

Text changes have been shown in strike-out/underline. Some changes were adopted to the Utilities Element in November, 1995. These amendments have been reflected in this attachment. Where this has occurred, it is noted by an amendment date in parenthesis at the end of the section.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES ELEMENT

Table of Contents

A.	INTRODUCTION.....	100
B.	GOALS	100
C.	<u>UTILITIES POLICIES</u>	101
	1. Utility Service	101
	2. Utility Infrastructure.....	101
	3. Utility Capital Expenditure Planning.....	101
	4. Environmental Stewardship	101
	5. Utility Facility Siting and Design.....	102
	6. Utility Relationships	102
D.	<u>INVENTORY OF EXISTING PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE</u>	103
E.	<u>FORECAST OF FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS</u>	103
F.	<u>PROPOSED NEW OR EXPANDED CAPITAL FACILITIES</u>	103
G.	SIX YEAR FINANCE PLAN	104
H.	ADDITIONAL RESOURCES.....	104

****(NOTE: Page numbers refer to pages in the Comprehensive Plan,
not to pages in this attachment)****

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES ELEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the utilities element of the Comprehensive Plan to include the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities (Section 36.70A.070(4)). Seattle is served by the following City utilities: Seattle City Light, Seattle Water Department, Drainage and Wastewater Utility, and Solid Waste Utility (the Street Utility is mentioned in the Transportation Element). Seattle is served by the following investor-owned utilities: Washington Natural Gas, US WEST Communications, US WEST/New Vector and McCaw Cellular; Viacom Cablevision, TCI Cablevision and Summit Cablevision, and Seattle Steam.

City utilities are overseen by the Mayor and the City Council. The Council establishes operational guidelines and requirements for City utilities through various resolutions and ordinances. Investor-owned utilities, on the other hand, are regulated by various public entities. The natural gas and telephone utilities are regulated by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, while the cellular telephone communication companies are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. Franchise agreements with the City shape the operation of the cable communication companies and Seattle Steam.

B. GOALS

- G1 Provide reliable service at lowest cost consistent with the City's aims of environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic development.
- G2 Maintain the service reliability of the City's utility infrastructure.
- G3 Maximize the efficient use of resources by utility customers.
- G4 Minimize the cost and public inconvenience of road and right-of-way trenching activities.
- G5 Operate City utilities consistent with regional growth plans.
- G6 Achieve universal access to state-of-the-art telecommunication services. (Policies relating to telecommunication technology and services are in the economic development element).

C. UTILITY POLICIES

1. Utility Service

Discussion: State law generally requires utilities to serve all customers requesting service. The following policies address utility service and recovery of the costs of meeting new growth.

POLICIES

- U1 Continue to provide service to existing and new customers in all areas of the city, consistent with the legal obligation of City utilities to provide service.
- U2 Consider financial mechanisms to recover from new growth, the costs of new City utility facilities necessitated by such service.

2.D Utility Infrastructure

Discussion: Adequate utility service relies on sound facilities. The following policies address the reliability and maintenance of the City's utility infrastructure.

POLICIES

- U3 Maintain the reliability of the City's utility infrastructure as the first priority for utility capital expenditures.
- U4 Continue to provide for critical maintenance of and remedying existing deficiencies in City utility capital facilities.

3.E Utility Capital Expenditure Planning

Discussion: City utilities plan their own capital expenditures. The following policies address coordination and the inclusion of recurring costs in utility capital expenditure planning.

POLICIES

- U5 Coordinate City utility capital expenditure planning with capital investment planning by other City departments.
- U6 Consider the operation and maintenance costs of new City utility facilities in developing such facilities.

4.F Environmental Stewardship

Discussion: Environmental sensitivity in developing new resources and the efficient use of services by utility customers are key elements of the City's commitment to environmental stewardship. The following policies address the implementation of these elements by City utilities.

POLICIES

- U7 Promote environmental stewardship in meeting City utility service needs and encourage the efficient use of resources by utility customers.
- U8 Use cost-effective demand-side management to meet City utility resource needs and support such practices by wholesale customers of City utilities.
- U9 Consider short-term and long-term external environmental impacts and costs in the acquisition of new resources.
- U10 Encourage waste reduction and cost-effective reuse and recycling through appropriate policies and programs.

5.G Utility Facility Siting and Design

Discussion: Public input in facility siting and design is a critical part of the business of City utilities. The following policies address siting and design of utility facilities in the city.

POLICIES

- U11 Work with neighborhood and community representatives in siting utility facilities.
- U12 Continue to subject all above-grade City utility capital improvement projects to review by the Seattle Design Commission.
- U13 Consider opportunities for incorporating accessible open space in the siting and design of City utility facilities.

6.H Utility Relationships

Discussion: Coordination of activities among utilities operating in the city can result in additional public benefits. The following policies address road and right-of-way maintenance and the operation of non-City utilities in Seattle.

POLICIES

- U14 Provide timely and effective notification to other interested utilities of planned road and right-of-way trenching, maintenance, and upgrade activities.
- U15 Promote the City's goals of environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic development in the operation of non-City utilities providing service in Seattle.

D. INVENTORY OF EXISTING PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE

The inventory of public infrastructure that is required by the Growth Management Act (GMA) is contained in Appendix A to this element of the Plan.

E. FORECAST OF FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Seattle is a highly urbanized area with a fully developed infrastructure network throughout the City. New buildings can be constructed in Seattle, and be served by the existing network of streets, water and sewer lines, drainage facilities and electrical grid. Forecasted future needs for the City owned utilities: Water, Drainage and Wastewater, City Light and Solid Waste both for the six and twenty-year timeframes are discussed in Appendix A to this element of the Plan. The capital programs to meet these forecasted six-year needs are included in the *City of Seattle Adopted 1996-2001 Capital Improvement Program (CIP)*. (Amended 7/95, 11/95)

F. PROPOSED NEW OR EXPANDED CAPITAL FACILITIES

The project or program descriptions marked with a * in the 1996-2001 CIP identify the proposed locations and capacities of the new or expanded capital facilities the City contemplates funding in the next six years, and that designation of facilities is incorporated here. Emergencies, other unanticipated events or opportunities, and voter approvals of ballot measures, may result in some departure from the adopted CIP; however, in such circumstances, the City shall favor decisions that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. (Amended 7/95, 11/95)

G. SIX YEAR FINANCE PLAN

The project information summaries (Six-Year Financing Plan) in the 1996-2001 CIP show, for each capital project or program proposed by the City, the sources of funding the City anticipates using. For projects or programs identified in the Comprehensive Plan as needed within the next six years, the project information summaries (Six-Year Financing Plan) are incorporated herein. These allocations may

change over time. Emergencies and unanticipated circumstances may result in allocating resources to projects not listed. The six-year finance plan shows full funding for all improvements to existing basic facilities and for new or expanded basic facilities the City expects to need to serve the existing and projected population through 2001. Additionally, the CIP contains substantial funding for major maintenance of the City's existing facilities. (Amended 7/95, 11/95)

H.I ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Consult the following resources for further information:

Seattle City Light 1990-91 Strategic Corporate Plan
Seattle City Light Capital Improvement Program

Seattle Water Department Water Supply Plan
Seattle Water Department Capital Improvement Program

Seattle Drainage and Wastewater Utility Comprehensive Drainage Plan
Seattle Drainage and Wastewater Utility Capital Improvement Program

Seattle Solid Waste Utility Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan
Seattle Solid Waste Utility Capital Improvement Program

Washington Natural Gas, Seattle, Washington

US WEST Communications, Seattle, Washington

Cellular One, Seattle, Washington
US WEST/New Vector Group, Seattle, Washington

Viacom Cablevision, Seattle, Washington
TCI Cablevision of Washington, Seattle, Washington
Summit Cablevision, Seattle, Washington

Seattle Steam Company, Seattle, Washington

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES APPENDICES

Text changes have been shown in strike-out/underline. Some information has been updated where circumstances have changed since July of 1995. This is shown in double underline.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES APPENDICES

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A:
Inventory of City Utilities, Capacity Information and Future
Facility Needs A136

APPENDIX B:
Description and Inventory of Investor-owned Utilities
Serving Seattle A142

****(NOTE: Page numbers refer to pages in the Comprehensive Plan,
not to pages in this attachment)****

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

UTILITIES APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:

Inventory of City Utilities, Capacity Information and Future Facility Needs

Seattle City Light

Seattle City Light (SCL) is the City-owned electric utility serving approximately 131 square miles, including all of Seattle and some portions of King County north and south of the City limits.

Inventory:

SCL generates 70% of the energy that it sells to retail customers from its own facilities. The largest facilities are the Skagit Project, which includes three dams on the Skagit River, Newhalem Dam on Newhalem Creek in the northwest part of the state, and Boundary Dam on the Pend Oreille River in northeast Washington. The Cedar Falls Dam on the Cedar River is a smaller generating facility. City Light also holds an 8% interest in the Centralia coal-fired generating plant in southwest Washington. In addition to these power sources, SCL purchases power from the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and holds firm power purchase contracts with a number of other suppliers in the Pacific Northwest.

SCL owns and maintains approximately 649,656 miles of transmission lines which carry power from the Skagit and Cedar Falls generating facilities to 14 principal substations. Power is distributed from these principal substations via high voltage feeder lines to numerous smaller distribution substations and pole transformers which reduce voltage to required levels for customers. SCL owns and maintains 2,750,250 circuit-miles of distribution lines within Seattle that deliver power from the 14 principal substations to 265,772,335,319 customers. A capacity addition is in progress at City Light's Canal substation. (See Utilities Figures A-1 and A-2).

Existing Capacity

SCL's current generation capability (owned and contracted) is adequate to serve existing customers. Because of the nature of City Light's hydro system, the utility is not presently constrained by its ability to meet peak loads (typically referred to as capacity), but rather by its ability to carry load over the 15 heavy load hours during the winter (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.). Even though there is sufficient generation capability to serve the peak load, the utility sometimes purchases energy on the spot market to meet its heavy load hour requirements.

The capability of SCL's transmission and distribution system to serve the demands of its customers is limited by the capacity of the distribution substations. Currently two substations, North and Viewland, have peak winter demands over 100 percent

capacity--A capacity addition is in progress at the Canal substation which will permit excess load to be transferred from the North and Viewland substations. [Reader Note: The Canal Substation capacity addition has been completed]

Anticipated Future Facilities:

SCL currently uses 100 percent of its firm (or guaranteed) owned and contracted generation capability to meet its own load, with Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) making up the balance. Under its current contract with BPA, which extends until 2001, Seattle is obligated to cover its own load growth.

For the transmission and distribution components of SCL's system, projected growth will be accommodated by planned transmission and distribution capacity additions. The addition of a transformer at the Bothell Substation in Snohomish County will serve the principal substations from the Snohomish County line to the Lake Washington Ship Canal. Within the Comprehensive Plan's 20-year timeframe a new principal substation will be necessary downtown, with an underground transmission line connection to the South substation. Capacity would also be expanded at the North and Creston substations (Figure 7-5).

Seattle Water Department

The Seattle Water Department (SWD) serves retail customers of Seattle and portions of King County. In addition, SWD sells wholesale water to more than two dozen suburban water districts, municipalities, and nonprofit water associations ("purveyors") which serve retail water customers in most of the urban areas in north, east, and south King County, and a small part of southwest Snohomish county. (See Utilities Figures A-3 and A-4). The City Water Department operates under an Operator's Certificate granted by the State Department of Health.

Inventory:

SWD supplies drinking water from three water supply sources--the Cedar River Watershed, the South Fork of the Tolt River Watershed, and the Highline Well Field. The Cedar River and South Fork of the Tolt River Watersheds are in the Cascade Mountains, while the Highline Well Field is located north of Seattle-Tacoma International Airport. Transmission pipelines carry the water to various reservoirs, standpipes, and tanks for further distribution. (See Utilities Figure A-4)

Existing Capacity:

The SWD service area extends beyond the City's boundaries, making it impossible to allocate capacity figures to the supply sources and transmission lines solely for in-city service. The snowpack level and temperature in the watershed areas are important natural factors that determine when and how much runoff will fill the reservoirs. Affecting SWD's water supply is the environmental impact of the dams on the stream flows. Business, environmental, agricultural, recreational, tribal, and fisheries groups all have interests in the level of water in the streams. The City, however, under normal

circumstances, expects water supply to be adequate to serve the City's existing and forecast population for at least the next six years.

Distribution and storage facilities that serve Seattle residents are located within and beyond the city limits. These facilities have adequate capacity to serve the city; however, some areas have substandard mains or experience low water pressure.

Low pressure areas include Scenic Heights (Charlestown Standpipe), Maple Leaf (Maple Leaf Tank), Phinney Ridge (Woodland Park Standpipe), and Queen Anne Hill (Queen Anne Standpipe). These areas are all located near or above the standpipe/tank overflow elevation and, therefore, receive water at below the design standard of 30 pounds per square inch (psi). New pump station construction for each of these areas is included in SWD's current six-year CIP.

Substandard mains in need of replacement have been identified and prioritized. The replacement schedule is included in the SWD six-year CIP. Potential substandard fire protection is a concern in various areas throughout the City, resulting from changes in standards. Deficiencies include aging pipes and inadequate pipe diameter. These improvements are also incorporated in the department's six-year CIP.

Anticipated Future Facilities:

A new water supply source is likely to be needed within the next ten to fifteen years. The City expects that population growth occurring outside the direct service area will be the primary determinant for the addition of a new source. Within the city, most of the new households that will be added will be in multifamily units, which have a much lower per capita water demand than single family households.

The major impact of the growth envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan on the City's Water facilities will be in the distribution system. Rehabilitation and improvements to the existing distribution system will be needed to support growth over the twenty year life of the Plan. Improvements to the capacity of the distribution facilities in the Urban Centers over the next six years are included in the current six-year CIP.

Seattle Drainage and Wastewater Utility

Seattle's Drainage and Wastewater Utility (DWU) was created in 1987 as a division of the Seattle Engineering Department (SED), adding drainage responsibilities to the existing SED sewer utility. DWU is charged with managing drainage, surface runoff, and sewer systems to meet public safety, water quality, and resource protection goals. DWU's service area includes covers the City of Seattle. Additionally, DWU provides sewer service to and some areas north of the city limits.

Inventory:

Although a few small areas are still served by septic systems, almost all areas of the city are served by sanitary sewers. Three types of drainage and waste water systems

are used in Seattle: combined sanitary/storm water sewer, partially separated sanitary/storm water sewer, and separate sanitary and storm water sewer systems. The DWU system collects residential, commercial, and industrial waste water and delivers it to interceptor lines operated by the regional sewage treatment agency. The sewage is then treated at the West Point Sewage Treatment Plant three major sewage treatment plants in the city before being discharged into Puget Sound. Two other plants, Alki and Carkeek, are being converted to treat wet weather flows only. (See Utilities Figure A-5).

Existing Capacity:

City Drainage and Wastewater System:

The capacity of the wastewater system in some areas is limited when peak stormwater flows enter the combined systems. During or following intense or prolonged periods of rainfall some of the systems cannot accommodate the combined runoff and sanitary sewage flows, resulting in combined sewer overflows (CSOs) being discharged into area waters. CSOs occur in both the regional and the City systems. Seattle's CSO Control Plan, adopted in 1988, addresses specific storage and separation projects to control CSOs and describes costs and schedules in a twenty-year timeframe. DWU has already completed improvements to 69 of the 83 CSO locations and by the year 2006, Seattle will have reduced CSO volumes by at least 79 percent. Funding for these improvements is included in the Department's six-year CIP.

Regional Wastewater Treatment System:

The West Point Treatment Plant is presently under expansion and conversion from a primary to a secondary treatment operation. Planned capacity is for the secondary treatment of 133 million gallons per day (MGD), monthly average flow. It is designed to handle a peak flow capacity of 440 MGD, with 300 MGD receiving secondary treatment and the remainder primary treatment.

The West Point Treatment Plant is projected to serve 1.3 million people including residents of Seattle, King County north of Seattle, and South Snohomish County.

Anticipated Future Facilities:

City Facilities: Generally, the drainage and wastewater facilities in Seattle have been planned and sized to serve the maximum or build-out conditions under existing zoning and will be adequate to serve the level of increased growth proposed in the Plan. The capacity of the wastewater system is limited only in specific areas of the city, where there have been historic hydraulic and system backup problems. These problems are being addressed by DWU programs in the Department's CIP.

Regional Facilities: Seattle's share of the increased wastewater flows would produce approximately an 8% increase in base flows over the current projected level. The estimated base flow for the Comprehensive Plan is limited to the service basins within the City of Seattle and to the 2010 planning horizon. The regional system design, however, requires consideration of all service basins which contribute to the base flows treated at any one plant and also consideration of residential, commercial, and

industrial growth for a much longer planning horizon. Thus, given the Plan's goals, a longer planning horizon and growth in all basins contributing to the treatment plants serving Seattle, it is likely that the West Point Treatment plant will need to be enlarged earlier than originally expected, and that construction of key conveyance facilities will be accelerated.

Seattle Solid Waste Utility

The Solid Waste Utility (SWU) was created in 1961 as a division of the Seattle Engineering Department (SED). SWU contracts with private firms for the collection of residential garbage, recyclables, and yard waste within the city. Collection of commercial solid waste is handled by private carriers and facilities; however, SWU provides for disposal of all garbage generated in the city.

Inventory:

The solid waste transfer system consists of four transfer stations. The two City-owned transfer stations receive residential solid waste, while the two privately-owned transfer stations receive both in-city commercial solid waste and solid waste from outside Seattle. Garbage is compacted into containers which are trucked to the Argo Intermodal Facility; from there, the containers are loaded onto trains for long-haul transport to the a landfill owned and operated by Oregon Waste Systems in Gilliam County, Oregon. Most recyclable materials are handled by two privately-owned facilities. Household hazardous wastes can be brought to one of two facilities operated by SWU. (See Utilities Figure A-6).

Existing Capacity:

Solid Waste Collection and Transfer Facility Capacity:

The North and South Recycle and Disposal Stations have existing design capacities to handle 1,000 tons of garbage per day (or 365,000 tons per year). Approximately 267,500 tons of waste were disposed through the transfer stations in 1988. This decreased to 225,000 tons in 1990, largely as a result of increased recycling by City residents.

Commercial garbage generated in the City is delivered to the two private transfer stations. These two facilities handle garbage (as well as construction and demolition debris (CDL)) from both inside and outside Seattle. In 1988, these facilities handled approximately 198,200 tons of garbage from Seattle businesses, and another 80,000 of CDL from in-City construction activity. Despite substantial growth, commercial waste disposed in 1994 actually decreased from 1988 (196,000 tons), largely as a result of increased recycling in the commercial sector. CDL disposal has remained steady. The two private transfer facilities have the capability to handle 300,000-400,000 tons of waste per year including waste from Seattle's businesses. These facilities are located in South Seattle, near the City's South Recycling and Disposal Station.

Recycling Processing Facilities:

Two private "material recovery facilities" (MRFs) serve as the processing and transfer facilities for most of the recyclable materials collected from in-city residents and businesses. These facilities, Recycle Seattle and Recycle America, process and transfer a large proportion of the 300,000 tons of recyclable material that was collected through the City's solid waste system in 1994. Both of these facilities are located in South Seattle, near the City's South Recycling and Disposal Station.

Disposal Facilities:

Waste is compacted at the transfer stations into containers that are trucked directly to the railroad for long-haul to the landfill in Oregon. Presently, approximately 60 containers per day (each holding 25-28 tons), five days a week, are trucked to the railroad. The train to the landfill operates 3 times per week, with about 100 containers per trip. Seattle and Washington Waste Systems (WWS) have a contract extending through March 31, 2028, and the terms of the contract are more than adequate to handle the additional waste volumes generated by projected growth.

Anticipated Future Facilities:

The region's landfill capacity is large enough to last for at least the next 40-80 years. SWU and in-city private transfer facilities have the capacity to handle any amount of garbage that the planned population would generate. Although the overall amount of waste generated in the city will increase with projected residential and employment growth, the percentage of waste that will need to be hauled to Oregon is expected to decrease due to higher anticipated rates of recycling. Seattle has adopted goals to recycle 60 percent of its overall waste by 1998.

Residential waste is anticipated to comprise a decreasing share of the future combined waste stream. Commercial waste is projected to comprise a larger share of Seattle's waste stream in the future. Increased commercial sector waste disposal needs and an increased demand for recycling contractor services will be handled by private contractors and facilities. Representatives from both private transfer stations have indicated that the increased amount of waste can be handled within the existing facilities.

The two private materials processing facilities will handle a major share of the increase in volumes of recyclable material that will occur with projected growth. These businesses are dealing with services and markets at a regional level, so the specific impacts of increased Seattle tonnage are difficult to predict.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

APPENDIX B:

Description and Inventory of Investor-owned Utilities Serving Seattle

Washington Natural Gas

Washington Natural Gas Company (WNG) is an investor-owned natural gas utility serving more than 400,000 customers in five Western Washington counties--Snohomish, King, Pierce, Thurston, and Lewis. WNG is the largest of five subsidiaries that comprise Washington Energy Company. WNG's distribution of natural gas involves system pressure regulation and the development and maintenance of a network of gas mains to serve the utility's customers.

WNG is supplied by Northwest Pipeline Corporation, a natural gas wholesaler with interstate pipeline facilities extending from Canada to New Mexico. Two underground transmission lines branch off from the pipeline to serve the 108,942 customers in the Seattle area via 1,345 miles of underground gas mains. (See Utilities Figure A-7).

US WEST Communications

US WEST Communications (US WEST) is the telephone company subsidiary of US WEST, Incorporated--one of the seven regional holding companies resulting from the divestiture of AT&T. US WEST is the principal provider of local telephone and related services in Seattle.

Of the 11 central switching offices (COs) serving Seattle, 10 are located within the city limits (see Utilities Figure A-8). For local exchange, the COs switch calls in and between the line exchange groupings (these groupings are addressed uniquely by an area code and the first three digits of a phone number). For long distance, the COs switch calls and mediate between the long-distance network and the local originating/terminating network. Due to advances in technology, additional capacity is easily and quickly added to the system.

Four main cable routes emanate from each CO, running north, south, east, and west. Connected to these main feeder routes are branch feeder routes which support thousands of local loops providing dial tone service to individual subscribers. The COs are connected by inter-exchange trunk lines that may be aerial or buried, and copper or fiber optic line.

Cellular Communications

Seattle is served by two cellular telephone companies: Cellular One and US WEST/New Vector. Cellular telephones are radios which send and receive signals from low-power, ultra-high frequency antennas positioned at several cellular communication ("cell") sites. The "cellular" name is derived from the manner in which coverage is provided by the cell sites. Each cell site has a signal radius, or coverage area, of only a few miles (depending upon terrain and capacity demand for service). As a cellular

telephone user passes from one cell to the next, the call is transferred to an available channel at an adjacent cell site.

Cellular One currently has 22 cell sites in Seattle and US WEST/New Vector has 16 cell sites (see Utilities Figures A-9 and A-10). The cell sites are linked to a Mobile Telephone Switching Office which ties the cellular network into the conventional telephone system.

Cable Television

Three cable communications companies hold City franchises for serving Seattle residents--Viacom Cablevision, TCI Cablevision of Washington, Inc., and Summit Cablevision. The City has begun a franchise renewal process with Viacom and TCI involving negotiations over future capacity, number of channels, construction schedules, and other criteria. The Summit franchise expires in February 1998. (See Utilities Figure A-11).

One of the primary components of a cable system is the head-end site--an electronic control center where the information signal is processed for distribution through the cable system. This signal can be received off a hard line (cable), a satellite dish, microwave antennae, and/or a TV antenna. Viacom has three head-end sites in Seattle and 545 miles of distribution lines serving 55,374 households. TCI has one head-end site in Seattle, along with 541 miles of coaxial cable plant and 21 miles of fiber-optic cable serving 76,054 households. Summit has one receive site/head-end site in Seattle, along with 110 miles of coaxial cable and 15 miles of fiber-optic cable serving 9,200 households.

Seattle Steam

Seattle Steam is a district heating utility franchised by the City. Its service area encompasses roughly a square-mile area of the Central Business District, extending from Blanchard Street to King Street and from the waterfront to 14th Avenue, crossing over First Hill (see Utilities Figure A-12). The company provides steam to commercial, residential, and institutional customers for space and hot water heating, along with other uses.

Two steam-generating plants supply the network. The primary plant is located on Western Avenue at University Street. The secondary plant is located on Western Avenue near Yesler Way--the site of the original plant built in 1893. Total steam generation capacity is 850,000 pounds per hour, with boilers designed to burn either natural gas or residual oil. The network of insulated steel pipe encompasses a total length of over 18 miles beneath city streets and currently serves 240 customers.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

TRANSPORTATION APPENDICES

In Transportation Appendix A, new text and two new Figures are being added as shown below; no text or Figures are being deleted.

In Transportation Appendix B, references to the Mayor's Recommended Plan are deleted. These changes are shown in double underline.

In Transportation Appendix C, all the existing text of the Appendix is being deleted, and new text and two new Figures are being substituted as shown below.

In Transportation Appendix D, the existing text under the heading "Impacts on Adjacent Jurisdictions" is being deleted, and new text and one new Figure are being substituted as shown below.

NOTICE : IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**TRANSPORTATION APPENDIX A:
Inventory of Existing Facilities and Services**

[Add the following new text on page A3U, at the end of the first paragraph of Appendix A (after "... and 7,029 non-arterial intersections.").]

Transportation Figure A-1a shows the locations of traffic and pedestrian crossing signals in Seattle. The "state signals" are managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation and are located mostly at freeway on- and off-ramps. Fire station signals and railroad crossing signals are not included. Transportation Figure A-1b shows the distribution of the more than 60,000 street lights along rights-of-way in, and along the borders of, Seattle. The numbers in the Figure indicate the number of city-operated street lights in each one-quarter-square-mile area.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

TRANSPORTATION APPENDIX B:

Seattle Land Use Assumptions: Mayor's Recommended Plan

Within Seattle, the upper limits of the planning growth targets in the adopted Plan Mayor's recommended plan (March 1994) for population, households, and employment were used to estimate future travel. These targets call for an additional 72,000 people, 60,000 households and 146,600 jobs over the 20-year life of this Plan. This growth was allocated within the city as follows (using locations and adopted or unadopted boundaries of centers and villages as in the Mayor's recommended adopted Plan):

	Household Growth	Employment Growth
Urban Centers	27,000 (45%)	95,300 (65%)
Hub Urban Villages	9,000 (15%)	22,000 (15%)
Residential Villages	9,000 (15%)	14,700 (10%)
Areas outside centers and villages	15,000 (25%)	
Manufacturing/Industrial Centers	--	14,700 (10%)
TOTAL	60,000 (100%)	146,600 (100%)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**TRANSPORTATION APPENDIX C:
Traffic Forecasts**

[Delete all the existing text of Transportation Appendix C on page A47, and substitute the following new text.]

To analyze the traffic impacts of the Comprehensive Plan, the City modeled both the Plan itself and an Alternative Scenario. The Alternative Scenario assumes the same total growth in population and employment Citywide as in the Plan, but distributes that growth based on zoning capacity alone, without regard to Urban Center or Urban Village designations. In addition, the Alternative Scenario excludes policies included in the Plan that discourage use of single-occupant cars and encourage transit and non-motorized modes, which affect mode split assumptions.

Region-wide and city-limit traffic volume forecasts for the Comprehensive Plan and for the Alternative Scenario are as follows:²

Total vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) for the region (per day):		
1990 estimate		70 million
2010 forecasts:	Comprehensive Plan	93 million (+ 33%)
	Alternative Scenario	100 million (+ 43%)
Traffic volume at north city limit (vehicles per day):		
1990 estimate		327,000
2010 forecasts:	Comprehensive Plan	374,000 (+ 14%)
	Alternative Scenario	430,000 (+ 31%)
Traffic volume at south city limit (vehicles per day):		
1990 estimate		409,000
2010 forecasts:	Comprehensive Plan	476,000 (+ 16%)
	Alternative Scenario	564,000 (+ 38%)
Traffic volume at east city limit (SR 520 and I-90) (vehicles per day):		
1990 estimate		237,000
2010 forecasts:	Comprehensive Plan	271,000 (+ 14%)
	Alternative Scenario	290,000 (+ 22%)
Regional transit trips as a percent of total motorized trips:		
1990 estimate		3 percent
2010 forecasts:	Comprehensive Plan	6 percent
	Alternative Scenario	3 percent (no change)

To analyze the transportation effects of the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies on the City's arterial streets in Urban Centers and in Urban Village areas, traffic conditions

² The 1990 estimates shown differ slightly from the 1990 estimates included in the Comprehensive Plan as adopted in 1994 because of updates to the transportation model, including a revised zone structure and revised employment estimates.

were analyzed for a system of 42 screenlines, shown in Transportation Figure A-12. These screenlines functionally cover the entire City, including Urban Centers and areas identified for future designation as Urban Villages. The Comprehensive Plan's level-of-service (LOS) system uses a similar screenline system, with 30 of the same screenlines. Twelve screenlines were added for this traffic forecast analysis to supplement the data in Urban Centers.

Traffic volumes were forecasted for arterial streets for the year 2010 under both the Comprehensive Plan and the Alternative Scenario. These forecasted volumes were summed for all arterials crossing a particular screenline, and this screenline volume was compared to the sum of the "planning capacities" for the arterials crossing the screenline, yielding a ratio of volume-to-capacity (v/c) for each direction of traffic for each screenline.

The screenline methodology was used both for the Comprehensive Plan's level-of-service system to judge the performance of the arterial system, and for the traffic forecast analysis described in this Appendix. This system was selected because it steps back from the micro-level focus of traditional intersection LOS analysis, and recognizes explicitly the broader geographic impacts of development and travel patterns. The system recognizes that no single intersection or arterial operates in isolation. Motorists have choices, and they select particular routes based on a wide variety of factors. If traffic congestion on one arterial increases, it may not make sense to expand the capacity of that arterial. The City, instead, may want to shift traffic to a nearby under-used arterial, or to expand capacity on a different nearby arterial, or to implement measures to reduce travel demand -- or a combination of these strategies. Accordingly, this analytic methodology focuses on a "traffic-shed," an area where arterials among which drivers logically can choose are organized for functional analysis.

Transportation Figure A-13 lists, for each screenline, the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratio with the Comprehensive Plan, and the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratio with the Alternative Scenario. (This Figure supplements the more limited information provided in Transportation Figure 3 in Section E. of the Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.³)

As can be seen in Transportation Figure A-13, the forecasted screenline v/c ratios for the year 2010 under the Comprehensive Plan range from 0.23 to 1.13. For each screenline that serves as a level-of-service (LOS) screenline, the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratio is below the LOS standard established for that screenline. For all screenlines, the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratio under the Alternative Scenario is higher than the corresponding v/c ratio under the Comprehensive Plan. For some screenlines, the year

³ As with the region-wide and city-limit traffic volume forecasts described earlier in this Appendix, the v/c ratios in Transportation Figure A-13 are based on the output of the City's transportation model. The traffic volume values produced from the model for this analysis differ slightly from values produced in preparing the Comprehensive Plan adopted in July 1994 because of updates to the model, including a revised zone structure and revised employment estimates.

2010 v/c ratio values under the Alternative Scenario exceed the established LOS standards.

By analyzing the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratios under the Comprehensive Plan at screenlines in or near Urban Centers, one can evaluate the effects of the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies on the transportation systems in the Urban Centers. Each of the five Urban Centers is addressed below.

Downtown: Screenlines 10.11, 12.12, A1, A2, and A3 pass through or along the edge of the Downtown Urban Center, some encompassing north-south avenues, and some encompassing east-west streets. For all five of these screenlines, the year 2010 v/c ratios under the Comprehensive Plan are below 1.0. This means that for screenlines 10.11 and 12.12, the year 2010 v/c ratios are also below the established LOS standards of 1.0 for screenline 10.11 and 1.2 for screenline 12.12.

Seattle Center: For the Seattle Center Urban Center, screenline A4 is an east-west screenline while screenline A5 is drawn north-south through the Urban Center. For both of these screenlines, the year 2010 v/c ratios under the Comprehensive Plan are well below 1.0.

First Hill/Capitol Hill: Screenlines A7, A7, and A8 are drawn through the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center. Screenline 12.12, on the east edge of the Downtown Urban Center, is on the west edge of the First Hill/Capitol Hill Urban Center. For all four of these screenlines, the year 2010 v/c ratios under the Comprehensive Plan are well below 1.0.

University District: For the University District Urban Center, screenlines 5.16 and 13.13 cover the south and west boundaries of the Urban Center, while screenline A9 passes east-west through the Center and screenline A10 is drawn north-south through the Center. The year 2010 v/c ratios under the comprehensive Plan for all four of these screenlines are below 1.0. The forecasted year 2010 v/c ratios for screenline 5.16 are nearly 1.0, compared to the LOS standard of 1.2. These high v/c ratios reflect traffic congestion around the University District, much of which is due to through traffic.

Northgate: For the Northgate Urban Center, screenline A11 is drawn east-west through the Center, while screenline A12 passes north-south through the Center. The year 2010 v/c ratios for both of these screenlines are well below 1.0.

The Comprehensive Plan includes policies to improve transit service and related transit capital facilities, as well as to improve non-motorized transportation facilities, to afford ways for people to avoid the traffic congestion inherent in dense Urban Centers and Urban Village areas. In this way, people may avoid the congestion reflected in higher v/c ratios across some screenlines.

As this analysis of transportation impacts demonstrates, the forecasted year 2010 screenline volume-to-capacity ratios under the Comprehensive Plan do not exceed the

established LOS standards for any screenlines. For the additional screenlines created for this traffic forecast analysis, the forecasted year 2010 v/c ratios are similarly within acceptable ranges. As provided in Comprehensive Plan Policy T23, when the calculated v/c ratio for a screenline approaches the LOS standard for that screenline, the City will pursue strategies to reduce vehicular travel demand across the screenline and/or increase the operating capacity across the screenline. Based on the analysis of screenlines described here, there are currently no additional capacity or facility needs necessitated by the Plan.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

**TRANSPORTATION APPENDIX D:
Intergovernmental Coordination Efforts**

[Delete the existing paragraph on page A49 under the heading, "Impacts on Adjacent Jurisdictions," and substitute the following new text.]

Impacts on Adjacent Jurisdictions

Four jurisdictions are adjacent to the City of Seattle: the City of Shoreline, King County, and the City of Lake Forest Park along Seattle's north boundary, and the City of Tukwila and King County along Seattle's south boundary. In consultation with adjacent jurisdictions, several major arterials that lie within these jurisdictions near the Seattle border were selected for analysis. For each arterial, the existing p.m. peak hour traffic volume and forecasted year 2010 traffic volume were compared to the "planning capacity" of the arterial, yielding a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio. The results of this analysis are shown in Transportation Figure A-14.

For all but one of the arterials shown in Transportation Figure A-14, the p.m. peak hour v/c ratio is below 1.0, indicating that there is remaining traffic capacity currently and forecasted for the future. The exception is Bothell Way N.E. just north of N.E. 145th Street, where the existing v/c is estimated to be 1.03, and the forecasted year 2010 v/c is estimated to be 1.10.

These traffic volume and v/c figures reflect not only growth under Seattle's Comprehensive Plan, but also growth in the adjacent jurisdictions and throughout the central Puget Sound region. Much of the traffic on these arterials is through traffic, with neither an origin nor a destination near the arterial.

In addition to the City of Seattle's analysis of transportation impacts on adjacent jurisdictions, as described in this section, Seattle continues to work with the adjacent jurisdictions to coordinate traffic operations and to minimize cross-boundary impacts.

Transportation Figure A-13
SCREENLINE VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIOS

Level-of-Service Screenline No.	Screenline Location	Segment	LOS Standard	Direction	2010 V/C Ratios	
					Comp Plan	Alter- native
1.11	North City Limit	3rd Ave NW to Aurora Av N	1.20	NB	1.05	1.29
				SB	0.57	0.70
1.12	North City Limit	Meridian Av N to 15th Av NE	1.20	NB	0.86	1.12
				SB	0.36	0.41
1.13	North City Limit	30th Av NE to Lake City Wy NE	1.20	NB	1.02	1.20
				SB	0.66	0.72
2	Magnolia		1.00	EB	0.52	0.58
				WB	0.68	0.74
3.11	Duwamish River	West Seattle Fwy and Spokane St	1.20	EB	0.50	0.59
				WB	0.91	1.09
3.12	Duwamish River	1st Ave S and 16th Ave S	1.20	NB	0.55	0.66
				SB	0.86	1.05
4.11	South City Limit	ML King Jr Wy to Rainier Av S	1.00	NB	0.33	0.39
				SB	0.49	0.77
4.12	South City Limit	Marine Dr SW to Meyers Wy S	1.00	NB	0.28	0.33
				SB	0.42	0.52
4.13	South City Limit	SR 99 to Airport Wy S	1.00	NB	0.24	0.31
				SB	0.54	0.78
5.11	Ship Canal	Ballard Bridge	1.20	NB	1.13	1.33
				SB	0.72	0.81
5.12	Ship Canal	Fremont Bridge	1.20	NB	1.00	1.29
				SB	0.75	0.99
5.13	Ship Canal	Aurora Av N	1.20	NB	0.95	1.18
				SB	0.67	0.80
5.16	Ship Canal	University and Montlake Bridges	1.20	NB	0.98	1.19
				SB	0.96	1.13
6.11	South of NW 80th St	Seaview Av NW to 15th Av NW	1.00	NB	0.47	0.54
				SB	0.32	0.37
6.12	South of N(W) 80th St	8th Av NW to Greenwood Av N	1.00	NB	0.47	0.65
				SB	0.27	0.37
6.13	South of N(E) 80th St	Linden Av N to 1st Av NE	1.00	NB	0.65	0.78
				SB	0.48	0.55
6.14	South of NE 80th St	5th Av NE to 15th Av NE	1.00	NB	0.81	0.99
				SB	0.36	0.41
6.15	South of NE 80th St	20th Av NE to Sand Point Wy NE	1.00	NB	0.43	0.57
				SB	0.28	0.35
7.11	West of Aurora Ave	Fremont Pl N to N 65th St	1.00	EB	0.48	0.49
				WB	0.62	0.70

Attachments
Page 71
6/24/96

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Transportation Figure A-13 (con't)
SCREENLINE VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIOS

Level-of-Service Screenline No.	Screenline Location	Segment	LOS Standard	Direction	2010 V/C Ratios	
					Comp Plan	Alter- native
7.12	West of Aurora Ave	N 80th St to N 145th St	1.00	EB	0.40	0.46
				WB	0.57	0.64
8	South of Lake Union		1.20	EB	0.86	0.92
				WB	0.94	1.01
9.11	South of Spokane St	Beach Dr SW to W Marginal Wy SW	1.00	NB	0.48	0.52
				SB	0.69	0.81
9.12	South of Spokane St	E Marginal Wy S to Airport Wy S	1.00	NB	0.44	0.53
				SB	0.58	0.76
9.13	South of Spokane St	15th Av S to Rainier Av S	1.00	NB	0.44	0.57
				SB	0.79	1.02
10.11	South of S Jackson St	Alaskan Wy S to 4th Av S	1.00	NB	0.68	0.78
				SB	0.66	0.80
10.12	South of S Jackson St	12th Av S to Lakeside Av S	1.00	NB	0.39	0.50
				SB	0.71	0.93
12.12	East of CBD		1.20	EB	0.59	0.67
				WB	0.55	0.58
13.11	East of I-5	NE Northgate Wy to NE 145th St	1.00	EB	0.74	0.83
				WB	0.61	0.70
13.12	East of I-5	NE 65th St to NE 80th St	1.00	EB	0.46	0.55
				WB	0.49	0.58
13.13	East of I-5	NE Pacific St to NE Ravenna Blvd	1.00	EB	0.59	0.69
				WB	0.76	0.88

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Transportation Figure A-13 (con't)

SCREENLINE VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIOS

Traffic forecast Analysis Screenline No.	Screenline Location	Segment	Direction	2010 V/C Ratios	
				Comp Plan	Alternative
A1	North of Seneca St	1st Av to 6th Av	NB	0.82	0.92
			SB	0.93	1.12
A2	North of Blanchard	Elliott Av to Westlake Av	NB	0.39	0.46
			SB	0.40	0.53
A3	East of 9th	Lenora St to Pike St	EB	0.40	0.53
			WB	0.23	0.29
A4	South of Mercer	Elliott Av W to Aurora Av N	NB	0.71	0.82
			SB	0.63	0.75
A5	East of 5th Av N	Denny Way to Valley St	EB	0.35	0.40
			WB	0.44	0.51
A6	North of Pine St	Melrose Av to 15th Av	NB	0.56	0.64
			SB	0.48	0.59
A7	North of James St-E Cherry St	Boren Av to 14th Av	NB	0.64	0.73
			SB	0.79	1.00
A8	West of Broadway	Yesler Wy to E Roy St	EB	0.63	0.75
			WB	0.56	0.59
A9	South of NE 45th St	7th Av NE to Montlake Blvd NE	NB	0.78	0.93
			SB	0.55	0.64
A10	East of 15th Ave NE	NE 45th St to NE 52nd St	EB	0.66	0.79
			WB	0.83	0.98
A11	South of Northgate Wy-N 110th St	N Northgate Wy to Roosevelt Wy NE	NB	0.51	0.73
			SB	0.47	0.49
A12	East of 1st Av NE	NE 100th St to NE Northgate Wy	EB	0.69	0.86
			WB	0.44	0.50

(Figure 13 added 7/95)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Transportation Figure A-14.
Adjacent Jurisdiction Major Arterials: PM Peak Hour Capacities, Volumes and v/c Ratios

A. Major arterials just north of Seattle / King County-Shoreline-Lake Forest Park Border (145th St)

Arterial	Existing - PM Peak Hour						Comprehensive Plan - PM Peak Hour					
	Outbound			Inbound			Outbound			Inbound		
	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio
Greenwood Ave N	760	430	0.57	760	340	0.45	760	700	0.92	760	620	0.82
Westminster Way N	2600	1710	0.66	2600	930	0.36	2600	2030	0.78	2600	1000	0.38
Aurora Ave N	3060	1720	0.56	3060	910	0.30	3060	1660	0.61	3060	1000	0.33
Meridian Ave N	1030	820	0.80	1030	380	0.37	2160	930	0.43	2160	310	0.14
5th Ave NE	760	580	0.76	760	300	0.39	2160	660	0.31	2160	160	0.07
15th Ave NE	2160	1520	0.70	2160	500	0.23	2160	1830	0.85	2160	670	0.31
25th Ave NE	740	420	0.57	740	200	0.27	740	490	0.66	740	190	0.26
Bothell Way NE	2450	2520	1.03	2450	1650	0.67	2450	2690	1.10	2450	1910	0.78

B. Major arterials just south of Seattle / King County Border

Arterial	Existing - PM Peak Hour						Comprehensive Plan - PM Peak Hour					
	Outbound			Inbound			Outbound			Inbound		
	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio
SW 106th St	1030	330	0.32	1030	550	0.53	1030	340	0.33	1030	530	0.51
26th Ave SW	760	590	0.76	760	380	0.50	760	630	0.83	760	400	0.53
17th Ave SW	1930	110	0.06	1930	110	0.06	1930	270	0.14	1930	190	0.10
16th Ave SW	2160	410	0.19	2160	270	0.13	2160	460	0.21	2160	390	0.16
4th Ave SW	760	590	0.76	760	410	0.54	760	650	0.86	760	480	0.63
Myers Way S	1320	280	0.21	1320	90	0.07	1320	630	0.48	1320	120	0.09
8th Ave S	760	280	0.37	760	120	0.16	760	350	0.46	760	100	0.13
Military Rd S	2600	440	0.17	2600	350	0.13	1930	480	0.25	1930	250	0.13
14th Ave S	2600	1050	0.40	2600	540	0.21	2600	1250	0.48	2600	390	0.15
Beacon Ave S	760	140	0.18	760	40	0.05	760	160	0.21	760	50	0.07
Renton Ave S	1930	500	0.26	1930	210	0.11	1930	530	0.27	1930	230	0.12
Cornell Ave S	760	20	0.03	760	20	0.03	760	20	0.03	760	20	0.03
Rainier Ave S	2160	1120	0.52	2160	560	0.26	2160	1300	0.60	2160	680	0.31

Transportation Figure A-14. (Continued)
Adjacent Jurisdiction Major Arterials: PM Peak Hour Capacities, Volumes and v/c Ratios

C. Major arterials just south of Seattle/Tukwila Border

Arterial	Existing - PM Peak Hour						Comprehensive Plan - PM Peak Hour					
	Outbound			Inbound			Outbound			Inbound		
	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio	Capacity	Volume	v/c Ratio
E Marginal Way S	1800	670	0.37	1800	740	0.41	1800	740	0.41	1800	640	0.36
Airport Way S	2200	1250	0.57	2200	690	0.31	2200	1620	0.69	2200	400	0.18
M.L. King Jr Way S	2700	1200	0.44	2700	1100	0.41	2700	1610	0.60	2700	1150	0.43
51st Ave S	1980	250	0.13	1980	320	0.16	1980	280	0.14	1980	320	0.16

Notes:

1. Outbound and inbound directions relative to Seattle.
2. Capacities for King County, Shoreline and Lake Forest Park are from King County traffic model, Forecast Years 1993 (Existing) and 2012 (Comp Plan).
3. Capacities for Tukwila are from Seattle traffic model - Forecast Years 1990 (Existing) and 2010 (Comp Plan).
4. All volumes are from Seattle traffic model - Forecast Years 1990 (Existing) and 2010 (Comp Plan).
5. v/c ratio = volume divided by capacity.
6. 5th Ave NE location north of I5 on-ramp.
7. Volumes rounded to nearest ten.

Sources: Seattle OMP;
 King County Transportation Planning Section

UNDERSTANDING THESE AMENDMENTS

In response to a challenge to the process and content of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan adopted by Council in July of 1995, the Growth Management Hearings Board directed the City of Seattle to undertake additional public review of the amendments, and to delete or amend one policy. Following is a summary of the Board's ruling, what was originally in the Comp Plan, and how the City addressed the Board's decision.

ADOPTED COMP PLAN	HEARINGS BOARD RULING	HOW THE CITY RESPONDED
<p>LAND USE The text and table in Land Use Goal 31 showed that the city was <i>distributing</i> 45% of new growth to Urban Centers, 30% to other urban villages, and 25% to the remainder of the city.</p> <p>Land use Policy L127 was added during the amendments in July of 1995. The policy states that, generally, plans or programs that lack citywide application will not be included in, or necessarily result in amendments to, the Comp Plan. It was intended to provide direction on the types of future city actions that would become part of the Comp Plan.</p>	<p>The Board concluded that, since hub and residential village boundaries are not adopted, all growth that would have been directed there will go to the Urban Centers (4/95 decision)</p> <p>The Board found that Land Use Policy L127 should be deleted or amended to clarify that neighborhood plans that guide land use decisionmaking must be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan. (4/96 decision)</p>	<p>Amendments to Land Use Goal 31 clarify that the City is <i>encouraging</i> growth to be distributed in this way - recognizing that city government does not have the ability to <i>make</i> growth occur in this way. Also clarified that, with adopted or unadopted boundaries, over the twenty year life of the Plan we still are encouraging growth to locate in this pattern.</p> <p>Delete Policy L127 (now 126.5). The City proposes to work with neighborhoods over the summer to better define what parts of a neighborhood plan must be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, and to develop recommendations to bring forward as part of the annual amendments or as guidelines.</p>
<p>CAPITAL FACILITIES/ UTILITIES Plan contained analysis of capital facilities infrastructure at a <i>citywide</i> level.</p> <p>The Utilities Element contained a discussion of water, storm and sanitary sewer systems, as well as the other city and non-city owned utilities. It did not, however, contain information on existing capacity, anticipated future facilities, or a 6-year finance plan.</p> <p>The Plan and its conclusions that growth could be accommodated by existing or planned facilities were based on a number of analyses performed by City departments for the EIS and the Comp Plan. These analyses were not included in the adopted Plan.</p>	<p>The Board found that, since growth is being concentrated in centers & villages, the City should provide an inventory and analysis of the adequacy of capital facilities and transportation infrastructure for these areas -- particularly for the Urban Centers, where boundaries have been established. (4/95 decision)</p> <p>The Board found that capital facilities includes water, storm and sanitary sewer systems, and that they were therefore subject to the requirements for the Capital Facilities Element. (4/95 decision)</p> <p>The Board found that the Plan should contain more information showing that growth can be accommodated by the City's capital facilities. (4/95 decision)</p>	<p>Amendments contain an inventory and analysis of capital facilities infrastructure by Urban Center.</p> <p>Amendments contain an analysis of the existing capacity, anticipated future facilities with special focus on urban centers, and a 6-year finance plan for needed facilities for the City-owned utilities. This information had been included in earlier drafts of the Comp Plan. The 6-year finance plan (CIP) shows a number of utility projects to expand capacity and better serve centers & villages.</p> <p>Amendments add discussion of the capacity of city facilities, and anticipated future facilities, and clarifies those facilities necessary to accommodate growth (e.g., utilities, fire, police, schools) and those that enhance quality of life but are not essential to accommodate the additional households (e.g., parks & recreation, libraries, city administrative buildings). Added matrix showing W. Precinct/911 center and schools CIP projects as being necessary.</p> <p>The City has concluded, based on this analysis and back-up letters from City departments, that existing and planned city facilities are adequate to serve expected growth both citywide and in urban centers. This conclusion has not changed from the adopted Plan.</p>

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ADOPTED COMP PLAN	HEARINGS BOARD RULING	HOW THE CITY RESPONDED
<p>TRANSPORTATION</p> <p>The transportation analysis in the Plan was conducted based on the Mayor's Recommended Plan.</p> <p>Analysis of the Plan's transportation impacts on adjacent jurisdictions was not included in the adopted Plan.</p> <p>The transportation analysis within the City's EIS was citywide and not focused on urban centers.</p>	<p>The Board requested that the City provide additional analysis of the transportation impacts of the urban village strategy and other Plan policies to reduce reliance on single occupant vehicles, based on the adopted Plan.</p> <p>The Board found that the City did not include an analysis of the impacts of the transportation plan and land use assumptions on the transportation systems of adjacent jurisdictions.</p> <p>The Board requested an analysis of transportation impacts within the adopted urban centers.</p>	<p>To show the transportation impacts of the adopted Plan, the City prepared a traffic forecast for the adopted Plan, and created a new alternative in order to compare impacts of having this Plan to those from not having this Plan. The alternative shows growth distributed by zoning capacity alone, with no special allocations to urban centers or villages. In almost all locations, this analysis showed lower traffic volumes with the Plan than without it.</p> <p>The amendments include an analysis of impacts on all key arterials that King County, Tukwila and Shoreline identified within those areas near the Seattle border. The analysis found that these impacts were at acceptable levels.</p> <p>The amendments include an analysis of the impacts defined along screenlines in or near each urban center. This analysis found that volume to capacity ratios for these screenlines are acceptable.</p>
<p>OTHER CHANGES</p> <p>Plan did not contain the annual growth projections the City is using.</p> <p>The Plan used 6-year growth projections for 1994-2000 as basis for capital facilities analysis.</p> <p>The inventories and facility descriptions were done in July 1995.</p> <p>Plan did not contain an inventory of street lighting and traffic signals.</p> <p>Transportation Appendix B made reference to the Mayor's Recommended Plan.</p> <p>Several Plan policies in the Capital Facilities Element made reference to work that was to be completed in 1995.</p>	<p>These changes were not directed by the Hearings Board, but were recommended for consistency with the Plan or to provide more information.</p>	<p>Add Land use Appendix F that details the City's annual growth projections.</p> <p>Update to 1996-2002 for analysis.</p> <p>Updated facility descriptions to May, 1996.</p> <p>Added maps showing street lights and traffic signals</p> <p>Delete reference to Mayor's Recommended Plan</p> <p>These policies were amended to delete the reference to 1995. The work prescribed by these policies has been completed, and this is reflected in the new policy language.</p>

The Hearings Board did not rule on the substance of the amendments in this matrix when it directed the City to conduct further public review. For a determination by the Board on whether these amendments meet their direction and the requirements of the GMA, an appeal must be filed with the Board after the City takes action on the amendments in late June/early July.

G:\projects\cor-nplan\gmb\bw\sd\3\undrstdm.doc

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.



Legislative Department
Seattle City Council
Memorandum

Date: June 28, 1996

To: All Councilmembers

From: Jan Drago and Tina Podlodowski, Chairs
Joint BECD/N&NP Committee

Subject: Comprehensive Plan Remand Amendments, Item #2, CB 111306

Item #2 on the full Council agenda for Monday July 1 would make amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan. The amendments respond to the orders of the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) that result from appeals by the West Seattle Defense Fund (WSDFF).

In July of 1995 the Council adopted amendments to the Comprehensive Plan in response to a March 1995 order of the GMHB. This year, the GMHB ruled that the public process conducted in 1995 for the City's first response to the Board's order was not sufficient. The Board remanded the amendments to the City for additional public process. There were several substantive issues in the WSDFF appeal upon which the Board did not rule pending completion of additional public process on the City's amendments.

We have now completed a very extensive public process on the amendments before you. The process is described in detail in Attachment 1 to CB 111306, in your notebooks. The process included two public workshops by the joint BECD/N&NP Committees and a Committee-of-the-Whole public hearing. The second workshop was added in response to requests made during the first workshop. Documents were made widely available, and extensive notice of the initial workshop and the public hearing was given. We sent notice of the added workshop to all participants of the first workshop, and to those on the DON community contacts list.

In addition, OMP produced a written report and recommendation concerning the public comments and briefed the joint Committee on this report. This report can be found in your Council bill books. Comments on the OMP report were solicited from the participants in the process. Two letters were received by the Committee after the OMP report. They are included in the bill books. As a result of the public comments OMP recommended, and the joint BECD/N&NP Committee accepted, two changes to the amendments. These are described in the OMP report on public comments. Also in response to public comment the Committee added language to further clarify that the City would not require growth targets in urban villages pending adoption of those villages and the conduct of required analyses.

We believe this responds quite well to the Board's order for additional public process.

C:\CURRENT\APPEALS\PLAN\CHIEF\PT2.DOC

An equal opportunity-affirmative action employer
600 Fourth Avenue, 1100 Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104-1876
Office: (206) 684-8888 Fax: (206) 684-8587 TTY: (206) 233-0025
email: council@ci.seattle.wa.us Page 1

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

The Board did rule sua sponte that the City needed to either delete or amend policy L126.5. Policy L126.5 was added in 1995 in an attempt to clarify what portions of neighborhood plans would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. (See p.5 of the attachments to CB111306 behind Tab 2 in your bill books.) Policy L126.5 has created confusion, and is not required to be in the Comprehensive Plan. It would be deleted by the amendments before you. The GMHB and the Growth Management Act give direction as to what must be incorporated into the plan. The NPO and OMP are working with community groups to develop a better understanding of the Board's ruling pertaining to this issue.

A summary of significant issues relating to the amendments and a more detailed summary of the proposed amendments (prepared by OMP staff on the pink sheet) are attached to this memorandum. In addition, a copy of the Council Bill (CB 111306) and the full text of the amendments can be found in your Council bill books under Tab 2.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

C:\CURRENT\APPEALS\PLAN\CMTRPT2.DOC

An equal opportunity-affirmative action employer
600 Fourth Avenue, 1100 Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104-1876
Office: (206) 684-8888 Fax: (206) 684-8587 TTY: (206) 1-0025
email: council@ci.seattle.wa.us Page 2

Significant Issues of the Comprehensive Plan Demand Amendments

Some of the more significant issues raised by the proposed amendments are discussed below. More detail on public comments on the proposed amendments can be found in the Executive report and recommendation in your bill books, from Tom Tierney, dated June 11, 1996. Also the pink-sheet summary prepared by OMP staff gives more detail on the proposed amendments.

Capital Facilities Approach

The GMHB ordered in 1995 that the City better document how it concluded that capital facilities are adequate to accommodate planned growth and that the City conduct localized transportation and capital facilities analyses for each urban center.

The City's response identifies those facilities required to accommodate growth including water, drainage, wastewater, electricity, solid waste, fire protection, police protection and schools. The analysis in the amendments documents the adequacy of such existing or funded facilities and for each urban center describes facilities serving the Center and their capacities.

The analysis also identifies other facilities such as libraries, parks and recreation facilities, and city government facilities that the City considers enhancements to the quality of life, but not required to accommodate additional growth. The City intends to continue to provide and expand such facilities as it is practical.

This approach of the capital facilities element is one with which several people took issue in the public process, but is retained in the amendments before you. Public comments on this issue are discussed in the OMP written report dated June 11, 1996.

Localized Capital Facilities Analysis for Urban Villages

The GMHB ruled that the City was not required to conduct localized capital facilities analyses for urban villages until the City finally adopts the villages by establishing boundaries. Comments in the public process suggested that such analysis is required because the current plan includes a 20 year plan for distribution of growth into urban villages. The amendments clarify that the 20 year growth distribution goals for urban villages would not be implemented until the villages are adopted, and that prior to their adoption, the distribution of growth is likely to be different.

C:\CURRENT\APPEALS\PLAN\MTRPT2.DOC

An equal opportunity-affirmative action employer
600 Fourth Avenue, 1100 Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104-1876
Office: (206) 684-8888 Fax: (206) 684-8587 TTY: (206) 233-0025
email: council@ci.seattle.wa.us Page 3

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Transportation Analysis

Mode Split Assumptions: Public comment questioned the transit/auto mode split assumptions used in the analysis which compares the adopted plan to an alternative. The mode split used in the model of the adopted plan was developed by PSRC for the Seattle plan, using a regionally agreed upon methodology.

LOS Standards: Public comment also questioned those level-of-service (LOS) standards for which the ratio of the volume of vehicles to an arterial's "capacity" exceeds 1.0. The City's LOS standards were specifically upheld by the GMHB and are not germane to the remand from the Board.

The Comprehensive Plan LOS standards exceed "capacity" in some locations. "Capacity" in this context is a technical transportation analysis concept which is not the same as the maximum number of vehicles that can pass a given point in a given amount of time. Instead it is the number of vehicles per hour which theoretically would create a defined condition given the roadway in question. Experience proves such capacity can be exceeded.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

C:\CURRENT\APPEALS\PLAN\CMT\RP72.DOC

City of Seattle

Executive Department - Office of Management and Planning



June 11, 1996

TO: Interested Parties
Mark Avery

FROM: Tom Tierney, Director

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK ON PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING THE
CITY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD
RESPONSE

Attached is the Executive's Report and Recommendations on the comments you and others made at the recent workshops and hearing on the proposed amendments to Seattle's Comprehensive Plan in response to the April 2, 1996 Growth Management Hearing Board's decision. A number of people attended at least one of the meetings or sent in letters, many with similar concerns. We appreciate the time and energy you took to provide feedback to the City on issues that many feel strongly about, and want to assure you that we have reviewed and considered your comments in making our recommendations to the City Council.

This report summarizes the comments we heard, the Executive's response to the comments, and several proposed revisions to the amendments based on what we heard. I am hopeful that, with these revisions and responses to comments, we can continue to move forward with implementing the Plan.

These comments and recommendations will be discussed at the joint meeting of the Business, Economic and Community Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees at 9:30 a.m. on June 18, 1996, in City Council Chambers. Please call Theresa Cherniak (684-8573) or Tom Hauger (684-8380) if my staff if you have questions or comments on this report.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

City of Seattle

Executive Department—Office of Management and Planning

Thomas J. Tierney, Director
James B. Rice, Deputy Director



June 11, 1996

TO: Council President Jan Drago
Councilmember Tina Podlodoski
City Councilmembers

FROM: Tom Tierney, Director *Tom Tierney*

SUBJECT: MAYOR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PUBLIC
COMMENT REGARDING THE CITY'S GROWTH
MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD RESPONSE

Attached with this letter is the Executive's report on the public comment received at the City Council public hearing on May 30 and the workshops on May 23rd and June 4th, regarding the City's response to the April 2, 1996, Growth Management Hearings Board decision. Based on the comments we heard, we are recommending several changes to the package of amendments currently being considered. These are summarized and discussed in the attached report.

This Report has been sent to all people who attended the workshops or hearing, or who requested to be placed on the mailing list. In addition, the report has been distributed to all Neighborhood Service Centers and City Libraries.

We will be happy to discuss these responses and recommendations with you at your next meeting on this topic -- the joint meeting of the Business, Community and Economic Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees on June 18. Final Council action on these amendments needs to be taken before August 12 in order to meet the timeline established by the Hearings Board.

cc: Marty Curry, Planning Commission
Bob Morgan, Norm Schwab, Martha Lester, Council Central Staff
Bob Tobin, Law Department
Nancy Ousley, Theresa Cherniak, Tom Hauger, Eric Chippis, Eric Tweit, OMP

For more information, please contact the office of the Director of Management and Planning at the following address:
Office of Management and Planning, 300 Municipal Building, Seattle, Washington 98104-1626
206-464-6260 • TDD: 624-6118 • FAX: 206-233-0965

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

MAYOR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE CITY'S
GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD RESPONSE

June 11, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mayor's Report and Recommendations	Page 2
Attachment 1 Attendance at Public Workshops and Hearings	Page 14
Attachment 2 Revised Capital Facilities Appendix D: Potential Future Discretionary Projects	Page 17
Attachment 3 Description of Traffic Forecasting Method for the Comprehensive Plan	Page 19

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

MAYOR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE CITY'S
GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD RESPONSE

June 11, 1996

INTRODUCTION

The Seattle City Council held two public workshops and a public hearing in response to the April 2, 1996, decision of the Growth Management Hearings Board. That decision required the City to conduct additional public process on remand amendments adopted in July of 1995, and to revise or delete Land Use Policy L127 regarding the relationship between other City plans and programs and the Comprehensive Plan. The remand amendments make clarifications in the Land Use Element, add information in the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements and Appendices, and provide additional traffic forecasting and information on impacts on adjacent jurisdictions in the Transportation Appendices. The complete text of the proposed amendments is included in the May 9, 1996 Executive Report (copies are available from OMP). The May 9 package was widely distributed to all who attended the workshops or hearings and to those who requested a copy.

The workshops were held on May 23 and June 4, and the Public Hearing was held on May 30. Attendance at each meeting is shown in Attachment 1 to this report. A number of individuals and groups provided comments and suggestions at these meetings. Some comments addressed the subject of the proposed amendments and others did not. This report summarizes the comments that we received, provides responses to the comments, and makes recommendations for changes to the proposed amendment package to address certain comments.

The comments and recommendations contained in this report will be discussed at the joint meeting of the Business, Economic and Community Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees at 9:30 a.m., June 18, 1995, in City Council Chambers.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Several revisions to the proposed amendments are recommended in response to public comment, as follows:

Recommendation #1: Clarify the intent of Capital Facilities Appendix D, the list of Potential Future Discretionary Projects. Alphabetize the list and clarify that the projects are not in priority order. Revise the list to delete projects that have already been funded or are no longer being considered, and to add new projects that are being considered. (Attachment 2)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Recommendation #2: In order to clarify that the growth distribution shown in Land Use Goal 3I applies to the 20 year timeframe in the Plan and not necessarily the short term, before villages are adopted and boundaries are designated, add the following language to the Goal, after the first sentence:

Figure 7 indicates the intended distribution of growth over this Plan's 20-year life. Prior to the adoption of neighborhood plans and the designation of all the urban village boundaries, the proportion of growth that occurs in village areas may be different from the percentages shown in the figure.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Following are summaries of comments from the public and the Executive's response.

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Comments: Some people said they would like to see more workshops/hearings/community meetings on the proposed amendments, and voiced concern that there weren't more people in attendance. Comment was made that there needed to be an education process about the Comprehensive Plan in general.

Response: *The City scheduled both a workshop and public hearing on the proposed amendments. The intent of the workshop was to inform people about the proposal, answer questions, and hear comments and suggestions in a more informal setting than a public hearing. Opportunities for written comments were also available. In response to the citizen requests, Council President Drago scheduled an additional workshop with the Business, Economic and Community Development Committee for June 4. Notice of this meeting was distributed by Council President Drago's Office to those attending the workshop and those on the Department of Neighborhood's Community Contacts List.*

Notices on the May 23 workshop and May 30 hearing on these amendments was given as follows:

- *a display ad was placed in both the Seattle Times and the Post Intelligencer a week before the workshop;*
- *notice was mailed to approximately 500 individuals who: attended the hearing on these amendments last June; participated on one of the Committees that helped develop the Comp Plan; commented on the environmental impact statement for the Plan; or are on the Department of Neighborhoods Community Contacts list (which includes community newspapers, community councils, and interested individuals);*
- *articles were placed in the May issues of widely distributed city newsletters -- the Neighborhood Planning Newsletter (circulation 5,000) the DCLU Info (circulation 1,085) and the DON Community Calendar (circulation 1,600);*
- *Detailed notice of the workshop and hearing were contained in the Council's Hearings Calendar, which is mailed to approximately 800 individuals and groups;*
- *legal notice was placed in the Daily Journal of Commerce and the DCLU General Mail Release on April 18; and*
- *the Executive Report and Recommendations was available two weeks before the workshop from the Office of Management and Planning, Council offices, at libraries and Neighborhood Service Centers or on the City's Public Access Network (Internet).*

Regarding an education process on the Comp Plan, OMP and NPO are working with the public through the neighborhood planning process to inform people about

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

the Comp Plan and how it can be implemented. A brochure containing an overview of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan has been prepared to help with education about the Plan. Tools for neighborhood planning explain city policies and programs. In addition, staff is available by request to meet with groups to explain the Comp Plan.

2. COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

Comments: People raised questions on how the Comp Plan was anticipated to change over time, how aspects of neighborhood plans would become part of the Comp Plan, and whether there were changes to the Comp Plan that could happen without public involvement.

Response: The Comp Plan can be amended once annually in response to changing conditions, addition of new Elements, proposals from the public, etc. A guide to the process for amending the Plan is available from the Office of Management and Planning. Each year the dates may vary, but the process should remain essentially the same, with amendments being adopted along with the budget in November.

However, initial adoption of the part of a neighborhood plan that will be in the Comprehensive Plan is not bound by this once-a-year amendment limitation, so it can occur anytime throughout the year. Any future amendments to these goals, policies, maps, etc., however, would be subject to the once-a-year limitation.

Changes to the Comp Plan, including preparation and adoption of portions of neighborhood plans, require public involvement and input. The level and type of public involvement depends on the type of amendment, and may include meetings or workshops and always a public hearing. The neighborhood planning process in particular requires early and continuous public involvement.

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THESE AMENDMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

Comments: Several people expressed the importance of clarifying the relationship between neighborhood plans and the Comp Plan (raised in discussion on Land Use Policy L127) and wondered how this process was going to happen.

Response: The April 2, 1996, Hearings Board decision included discussion on the relationship between neighborhood plans and the Comp Plan. The Hearings Board ruled that Land Use Policy L127 discussing this relationship should either be deleted or revised to clarify this relationship. In response, the Executive is recommending that Land Use Policy L127 be deleted.

In addition, to further clarify content of neighborhood plans, particularly as it relates to the Comp Plan, the City has scheduled a workshop for June 26 from 6 - 8 p.m. at Seattle Central Community College, Room BE4106 to discuss this issue. People can also leave questions, comments or suggestions on the Neighborhood Planning Hotline at 684-5140.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

There is a Neighborhood Planning Element in the Comp Plan which is not being changed in these amendments. This Element maintains a strong commitment to neighborhood planning and recognizes neighborhood planning as an important tool in implementing the Comprehensive Plan. The neighborhood planning process is underway, and over 20 neighborhoods are working on developing their plans. Guidance on what should be addressed in a plan and a draft adoption package are being prepared by City staff in conjunction with the Neighborhood Planning Advisory Committee.

4. **CAPITAL FACILITIES APPROACH**

Comments: Several people commented that the things the City describes as amenities should be provided in order for the City to accept more growth, and that if money isn't available for the amenities, the City shouldn't allow growth.

Response: *The GMA does not require municipalities to prohibit growth if there is not enough money to provide all the things citizens want. The focus is on those facilities that are needed to accommodate new households, such as water, drainage and wastewater, electricity, solid waste, fire protection, police protection and schools. In the City's 1996 Residential Survey, a random sample phone survey of Seattle residents conducted in the spring of 1996, city residents also rated these as the most important facilities and services the City provides (wastewater and schools were not included in the survey).*

The City also provides an extensive citywide network of other facilities such as libraries, parks and recreation facilities, and city government facilities. These facilities are available for use by all the City's residents. The Plan recognizes that these facilities enhance the quality of life of the City's residents, and the City intends to continue to provide and expand such facilities as it is possible. The Plan remains committed to development of urban villages, and to obtaining amenities that help attract positive growth and development. However, each village is different and will have different types of facilities that its residents consider most desirable to help it develop as a village. Some areas may prefer more open space, a community center providing recreational programs for children, more library space for after school programs, more private day care, senior programs or a plaza or storefront police station. The City does not want to prescribe these types of facilities for neighborhoods -- rather each neighborhood should decide its own priorities. It is expected that through neighborhood planning additions or expansions of these facilities may be identified.

As existing funding becomes available or as new funding measures are approved, it is expected that additions to these facility networks will be made. As an example, the Countywide Future Funding Initiative for parks and recreation facilities includes neighborhood desired projects with an emphasis on urban village areas in Seattle. This Initiative also includes an opportunity fund that would pay for

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

neighborhood identified park improvements. The City expects that, through modifying existing spending and exploring new funding sources, funding will be available for these types of improvements.

5. **CAPITAL FACILITIES CRITERIA**

Comments: People asked how the City determined the adequacy of capital facilities, e.g., the Plan includes a response time for fire but not for police.

Response: The methods the City used to determine facility adequacy vary depending on the type of facility. How departments did this analysis is embodied in part in the letters contained in the City's GMHB Compliance package last year. Judgments of the adequacy of facilities are typically based on a set of factors, rather than on one simplified measure. For some, such as water supply, the type of service and impacts of growth are quantified e.g., growth in urban centers over the next six years will generate an additional average daily demand for 504,000 gallons of water. The City can then look at projected water supply to determine the adequacy of the water supply to serve growth

For some facilities, population growth is not the critical factor in determining the demand for service. For instance, demand for police service may relate more to the economy or social factors rather than new population. For police and other services, location of facilities is not a critical factor in determining adequacy. For instance, the adequacy of police service depends on the distribution of patrol cars, location of calls for service, and the strength of the dispatching system. For other services, location of facilities and response time are the critical factors (e.g., fire trucks must be housed in a fire station, and response time must be measured from these stations to the location of the fire -- though the number of calls for fire and emergency service is influenced by a number of factors, not only increases in population).

6. **CAPITAL FACILITIES - GMA REQUIREMENTS**

Comments: A citizen questioned whether the City followed the GMA requirements for a capital facilities element i.e., location and capacity of facilities, 6 year finance plan, and the requirement to reassess the Comp Plan if funding falls short.

Response: GMA Capital Facilities requirements are contained in both the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements, and the City's 1996-2001 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). Inventories showing locations and capacities of facilities are shown in tables, maps and charts in the Appendices to the Plan; anticipated future facility needs for the utilities, police, fire and schools are also contained in the Plan Appendices; those facilities that are considered to be needed are included in the Capital Improvement Program. Portions of the City's CIP are adopted into the Comp Plan by reference, and this constitutes the City's six-year finance plan. Section F of the Capital Facilities Element also contains the statement that the City

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

will reassess the land use element if funding for necessary facilities is not expected to be available. The CIP does not show any funding gaps for such facilities and therefore there is not currently a need to revise the Comp Plan.

7. CAPITAL FACILITIES - LOCALIZED ANALYSIS

Comments: A citizen stated that the Capital Facilities Element now only addresses facilities for the urban centers, and that since the City is proposing to have growth in urban villages, it should do localized capital facilities analysis now for all villages.

Response: The Capital Facilities Element does not only address urban center facilities. When the Plan was originally adopted, it included capital facilities inventories and analyses at a citywide level. The Hearings Board directed the City to conduct additional, specific analysis of the effects of concentrating growth in urban centers. The Comp Plan Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements contain both citywide inventories and analysis of facility adequacy, and localized inventories and analyses by urban center and urban center village. This type of analysis will also be prepared for each hub and residential urban village for use in their planning processes and for final designation of the village boundaries. Goal G31 includes a chart that lays out the expected distribution of household and employment growth by types of urban village and areas outside villages over the 20 year life of the Plan. Urban village boundaries will be adopted as part of neighborhood plans over the next several years. As those boundaries are being adopted, the City will provide capital facilities/utilities analysis for each of those areas.

Recommendation: In order to clarify that the growth distribution shown in Land Use Goal 31 applies to the 20 year timeframe in the Plan and not necessarily the short term, before villages are adopted and boundaries are designated, add the following language to the Goal, after the first sentence:

Figure 7 indicates the intended distribution of growth over this Plan's 20-year life. Prior to the adoption of neighborhood plans and the designation of all the urban village boundaries, the proportion of growth that occurs in village areas may be different from the percentages shown in the figure.

8. LIST OF POTENTIAL FUTURE DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

Comments: Several people raised questions on how the list of future discretionary projects was developed (Capital Facilities Appendix D), whether the listing was in priority order, and whether there was funding for these projects.

Response: This list of potential future discretionary projects was developed to identify major capital projects that the City might want to undertake in the future. These projects are not needed to accommodate household growth. For the most part, funding has not been identified for these projects. The list is not in priority

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

order. The list was derived from an initial "wish list" developed for the Executive and Council.

Recommendation: Clarify the intent of Capital Facilities Appendix D, the list of Potential Future Discretionary Projects. Alphabetize the list and clarify that the projects are not in priority order. Revise the list to delete projects that have already been funded or are no longer being considered, and to add new projects that are being considered. (Attachment 2)

9. **PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES**

Comments: A citizen expressed concern that park and recreation facilities are included in the GMA definition of public facilities and therefore should be considered in evaluating the sufficiency of facilities to accommodate new households.

Response: An inventory of park and recreation facilities and their capacities are included in the Capital Facilities Element. The City's system of parks and open areas contains over 6,189 acres, and the city expects to add 210 acres of open space over the next six years. The Plan does contain goals for the provision of additional urban village open space. As goals these are intended to guide future planning efforts and represent a level of park facilities that the City will strive to attain over the life of the Plan.

10. **CAPITAL FACILITIES - FUNDING**

Comments: Several people asked how the City's capital facilities planning relates to the availability of funding and how projects that come from neighborhood planning are going to be funded. There was concern that neighborhoods would have to pay for their own facilities to accommodate growth.

Response: Based on the City's capital facilities framework, the City determined that the following facilities were needed: new West Precinct/911 Center, school improvements included in the School District CIP, and numerous improvements contained in the Utilities CIPs. All facilities identified as being needed are included in the CIP and funding has been identified for the improvements.

As described earlier, other facility improvements are contemplated by the City and by the neighborhoods to make urban villages places where people want to live, work and play. The City expects that neighborhoods will identify desired facilities. In this era where wants exceed resources, the City and neighborhoods need to work together to identify priorities and funding sources, since there is never enough money to make all the improvements citizens would like to make. Existing City resources and new funding sources will be used to accommodate as many of the improvements as possible. Since readily available funding is limited, a bond measure may be an option for raising new funds for neighborhood facilities. Any such bond measure would be voted on and paid for citywide.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

11. CAPITAL FACILITIES - MAINTENANCE

Comment: A citizen asked how the City defines maintenance needs and costs.

Response: In late 1995, the City Council adopted its 1996 Major Maintenance Plan. This Plan was prepared in response to Comp. Plan policy and recommendations made by the Citizen's Capital Investment Committee in 1994, which specified that City departments should prepare a plan to provide a basis for future allocation of maintenance funds. The Major Maintenance Plan includes a listing and prioritization of major maintenance projects for the next six years for the following City departments: Library, Parks and Recreation, Seattle Center, Administrative Services and the Engineering Department Transportation Division. A full explanation of how maintenance was defined and funding requirements are found in the Major Maintenance Plan, available from the Office of Management and Planning.

Comprehensive Plan policies emphasize maintaining the City's existing infrastructure. City budget decisions reflect those policies; biennial major maintenance allocations have increased from an annual average of \$7 million to more than \$42 million for 1995-96.

12. TRAFFIC FORECASTS

Comments: Several people requested an explanation of the City's transportation modeling methods, Level-of-service, screenlines, and percentage of trips in the model assigned to transit. A question was raised as to why traffic forecasts are to the year 2010 and not 2014 like the rest of the Plan.

Response: The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires jurisdictions to establish "level of service standards for all arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system." To gauge the performance of its transportation system, Seattle uses volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios along screenlines.

A screenline is a line drawn across a group of (usually parallel) arterials. In this method, the City groups together arterials that serve a similar movement of traffic from one area in the city to another. The grouping of arterials reflects the fact that drivers in an urban area often have choices among several routes that they can take from one point to another. When faced with congestion and delays, drivers frequently look for alternative routes. The parallel routes provide those alternatives and work together as a system to convey traffic from one locale to another.

In determining the v/c ratio, the total number of vehicles crossing the screenline on all its arterials during the afternoon peak hour is the volume -- the first factor in the ratio. The second factor in the ratio is the total estimated one-direction peak-hour capacity for all the arterials that cross the screenline. As transportation engineers

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

use the term. "arterial capacity" is not a fixed number of vehicles that can never be exceeded. Rather, it is a relative measure of traffic flow, assuming certain conditions.

The City's Comprehensive Plan includes level of service standards (as v/c ratios) for 30 screenlines throughout the city. The standards represent maximum ratios that should not be exceeded. Level of service standards may vary by screenline location, allowing higher v/c ratios where higher development densities are desired or where the City would prefer to increase non-SOV capacity rather than making general arterial capacity. The maximum v/c ratios are 1.0 or 1.2, depending on the screenline location. Because the capacity estimate used in the ratio is a relative number, the ratio of 1.2 does not imply volumes that are equal to 120% of absolute capacity. That would be an impossibility. But 120% of a relative capacity is very possible. In fact, one can find examples around the region where individual roadways record v/c ratios of over 1.0 at certain times of the day.

A full explanation of the City's modeling method, level-of-service, and screenlines is included in Attachment 2 to this report.

The model forecasts traffic conditions for the year 2010. Even though the Plan covers the period to 2014, GMA requires only a 10-year forecast, and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) makes its projections for 10-year intervals (2000, 2010 and 2020). Using 2010 projections provides a consistency with the regional estimates.

Assumptions for the mode split estimates used to model the Comprehensive Plan's traffic were developed by PSRC for the City of Seattle's land use plan, and include: completion of the HOV core system; regional and commuter rail systems; increased transit service; and increased parking costs in Urban Centers. Mode split percentages used for the Alternative scenario are the same as those used for the region for 1990.

13. TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS TO ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS

Comments: A citizen questioned how the City determined which jurisdictions were adjacent to the city, and why the City did not look at Bellevue, Mercer Island, Vashon, Kitsap, etc.

Response: The 1995 Hearings Board decision stated that the City needed to "indicate which jurisdictions are adjacent to the city, what the present traffic volumes and system capacities of major arterials in those jurisdictions connected to Seattle are, and an analysis of what impact, if any, Seattle's transportation plan will have on those neighboring jurisdictions." (April 4, 1995 Decision, page 68 at 22-24) For the adopted Plan, Transportation Appendix D describes the peak-hour traffic impacts on arterials in adjacent jurisdictions. Four jurisdictions that share land boundaries along the north and south borders are included: King County,

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Tukwila, Lake Forest Park and Shoreline. Mercer Island and jurisdictions east of Lake Washington are not considered adjacent for this analysis; nor were Vashon Island and Kitsap County to the west.

14. **TRANSPORTATION LEVEL-OF SERVICE (LOS)**

Comments: Several people raised concerns with the adopted transportation LOS, particularly that volumes equal to or greater than capacity allows congestion. Concerns with the impact on air quality were also expressed.

Response: The GMR has determined that Seattle's transportation level-of-service measures the performance of our transportation system and therefore complies with the GMA. The Board stated that setting the desired LOS was a policy decision left to the discretion of local elected officials. This is not an issue that is part of the amendments now before the Council.

In response to the concern with air quality, the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Plan analyzed air quality impacts of the proposed Plan as well as 6 alternatives. This analysis was based on the results of the traffic model and concluded that air quality under the Plan, and all alternatives, would be better than 1990 conditions.

15. **TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES**

Comments: A citizen expressed concern that the Comp Plan's transportation strategies were punitive against cars, and that people shouldn't be punished for using their cars until alternatives are in place.

Response: While this issue was not a subject in the Hearings Board cases nor in the amendments that are currently before the Council, some response is warranted. The Transportation Element of the Plan provides for a balanced transportation system throughout the city. It encourages development of alternative modes of travel so that people have viable alternatives in addition to using cars.

16. **DUWAMISH MANUFACTURING/INDUSTRIAL CENTER**

Comment: A citizen expressed the opinion that facilities and infrastructure, and particularly transportation facilities, are substandard for expansion of industrial uses in the Duwamish Manufacturing/Industrial Center.

Response: While this issue was not a subject in the Hearings Board cases nor in the amendments that are currently before the Council, some response is warranted. The Duwamish area is one of two designated Manufacturing/Industrial Centers in the city. These are locations in which employment -- but no residential -- growth is expected over the life of the Plan. The City recognizes that the large size and the types of uses existing and expected in the Duwamish M/I Center make it unique in terms of the facilities and strategies that will help fulfill the Plan's vision there.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

The City is now engaged in several efforts to identify and develop possible improvements that would encourage the 20-year employment growth identified for the Duwamish M/I Center. These efforts include an overall plan for the M/I Center, plus a localized plan for the northern portion of the area and one for the Georgetown area. The City is also investigating the possible long-term increase in the number of rail/street conflicts in and around the Spokane St. corridor. In addition, the City is working with the state Department of Transportation in a study of possible transportation improvements in the northern portion of the industrial center. This study is looking at rail/street conflicts and at traffic access to the Colman Dock ferry terminal.

17. LAND USE - DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Comments: A citizen expressed the concern that development regulations have been altered in ways that allow more development in the urban villages, e.g., accessory units, residential small lot zoning, tandem lots, etc.

Response: Again, while this issue was not a subject in the Hearings Board cases nor in the amendments that are currently before the Council, some response is warranted. Accessory units are allowed throughout the City, with no preference for locations within urban villages. Residential Small Lot Zoning and tandem housing are zoning and housing tools, and may be permitted only through neighborhood plans. The densities allowed by these alternatives are considered moderate -- falling between the most dense single family zone and the least dense multi-family zone.

NEXT STEPS

Based on the public comment received, OMP is recommending in this report several revisions to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments (refer to May 9, 1996 Executive Report for original proposed amendment language). These comments and recommendations will next be discussed at the joint meeting of the Business, Economic and Community Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees at 9:30 a.m. on June 18, 1995 in City Council Chambers.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 1

Attendance at Public Workshops and Hearings

May 23, 1996 Workshop

City Councilmembers:

Jan Drago, Council President and Business, Economic and Community Development
Committee Chair

Tina Podlodowski, Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committee Chair

Attendees from the public:

Scott Species, Denny Triangle

Gordon Tretter

Scott Chan, Crown Hill/Ballard

Jay Saucedo, West Seattle

John Dolan, First Hill CC

Al Rousseau, West Seattle

Sue Galvin, Alki

Charlie Chong, Neighborhood Rights

Dennis Ross, Admiral CC

Don Anderson

Phil Noppe, Morgan Community Association

Shirley Schurman, Friends of West Seattle Junction

Joanne Coombs, FHIA

Cynthia Barker, Morgan Community Association

Annabelle Fisher, Lower Queen Anne CC

Douglas Tooley, Vision Seattle

Midge Batt, Morgan Community Association

Jeff Cherry, CAAPIT

Linda Park, Morgan Community Association

Shirley Mesher, Roanoke Park Assoc. of the Duwamish Community

Chris Leman, ECC

City Planning Commission:

Marty Curry, Executive Director

Kris Kofoed, Staff

Mel Streeter, Commissioner

Karen Daubert, Commissioner

Linda Graham, Commissioner

Christi Clark, Commissioner

Roger Waggoner, Commissioner

Tina Nar, Commissioner

Staff:

Nancy Ousley, Assistant Director, OMP

Theresa Cherniak, Amendment Coordinator, Capital Facilities/Utilities, OMP

Tom Hauger, Amendment Coordinator, OMP

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT I

Eric Chipps, Transportation, OMP
Eric Tweit, Transportation, OMP
Dennis Meier, Land Use, OMP
Ellen Kissman, Neighborhood Planning, OMP
Bob Tobin, Law Dept.
Susan Dehlendorf, NPO
Daniel Becker, NPO
Karma Ruder, NPO
Bob Morgan, Council Central Staff
Dan McGardy, Councilmember Drago's staff

NOVA Recorders

Mary Larson
Preeti Shridhar
Zola Reynolds
Minerva Mendoza

Facilitator: Nea Carroll

May 30, 1996 City Council Public Hearing

City Councilmembers

Jan Drago, Council President
Martha Choe, Councilmember
Cheryl Chow, Councilmember
Margaret Pageler, Councilmember
John Manning, Councilmember
Tina Podlodowski, Councilmember

Attendees from the public

Steve Rubstello
Jay Saucedo, Neighborhood Rights
Robert Rhea, Admiral Planning
Sue Galvin, Alki Community Council
Midge Batt
Ann Owchar, W. Seattle resident
Don Anderson
Dennis Ross
Al Rousseau, Neighborhood Rights
Alexandra Pye
Julie Brown, WSDF, Neighborhood Rights
Charlie Chong, WSDF
Shirley Schurman, WSDF
Donna Beeson, WSDF

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 1

Douglas Tooley, Vision Seattle
Shirley Mescher, TDC & Roanoke Park

Staff

Nancy Ousley, OMP
Theresa Cherniak, OMP
Bob Morgan, City Council Central Staff
Dan McGrady, Councilmember Drago's staff
Bob Tobin, Law Department

June 4, 1996 Business, Economic and Community Development Committee Workshop

City Councilmembers

Jan Drago, Council President
Margaret Pageler, Councilmember
Tina Podlodowski, Councilmember

Attendees from the public

Charlie Chong
Dennis Ross
Jay Saucedo
Don Anderson

Staff

Theresa Cherniak, OMP
Tom Hauger, OMP
Bob Morgan, Council Central Staff
Dan McGrady, Councilmember Drago's staff

People who picked up or were mailed copies of the Report (copies were also distributed at the workshops and hearing)

Scot Jamieson	Lainie Acacio
Elizabeth Schrag	Jean Carpenter
John Mautz	Pamela Harris
David Nemens	Dave Radabaugh
Patricia Boies	Doug Lorentzen
Carla Okigwe	Cairncross and Hempelman
Heather Loman	Jeff Harris
Sue Galvin	Shirley Mescher
Charlie Chong	Peter Eglick

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

APPENDIX D:
Potential Future Discretionary Projects
 (New Appendix Added 7/95, Amended 7/96)

Besides the facilities that are included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), there are a number of prospective discretionary capital projects that the City might undertake in the future is considering and for which various levels of planning have been done. They are listed below in alphabetical order to provide included herein to give a broad view of the City's potential future capital spending. Projects are not listed in any priority order. Funding for these projects is not yet identified, and no decisions have been made to go forward with funding these projects.

African-American Museum*
 Aquarium Redevelopment
 Baseball and Football Stadiums*
 Central Waterfront Bike Path
City projects included in a potential new 1996 Countywide Parks Bond Issue
Citywide Seismic Improvements
 Convention Center Expansion*
 Duwamish Coalition
Fiber-Optic Expansion
 Gas Works Park Environmental Clean-up
 Holly Park
 Homeless Day Center
 Library Master Plan
 LINC expansion
 New Memorial Stadium Relocation
Municipal Court Facilities
Neighborhood Planning Capital Projects
 Parks Master Plan
 Sand Point Redevelopment
Seattle Center Bus Barn Demolition and Environmental Clean-up
 Seattle Center Master Plan
 Sobering Center
 South Downtown Study Area Improvements
 Southwest Harbor Project (APL)*
 Spokane Street Viaduct Safety Improvements
Systems Garage
Telecommunications Improvements

* Projects with an * are not under the jurisdiction of the City, but are owned or sponsored by another government agency or private organization. It is possible that the City might participate in funding for these projects.

[Projects that are being removed from the list either because funding has been approved or they are no longer being considered:]
 Frederik & Nelson Parking Garage
 Pike/Pine Corridor Improvements

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 2

Promenade-23 Improvements
Dearborn/Hiawatha Property
Housing Levy
National Mobile Home Park
South Lake Union Plan Improvements (e.g., park, transportation improvements)
Green Lake Path
Hendrix Museum
SPU Stadium
UJATF (People's Lodge)
Open Space
Galer St. Gradecrossing
Multi-modal Terminal
Downtown Criminal Justice Facilities
Mounted Patrol
Neighborhood Public Safety Facilities
City Downtown Office Buildings (e.g., Gateway Center)
Kingdome Repaire

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

DESCRIPTION
OF
TRAFFIC FORECASTING METHOD
FOR THE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The City of Seattle traffic forecasting model follows a standard four-step modeling process:

- trip generation
- trip distribution
- mode split
- trip assignment

Each of these steps is described below. The model was validated to 1990 conditions, which means that traffic volumes calculated by the model for the year 1990 were compared to actual traffic counts observed in 1990, and refinements were made to align the model results with the actual counts.

In developing its Comprehensive Plan, the City used this model to analyze the impacts of seven different plan alternatives that the City considered. Those seven alternatives covered a wide range of potential growth levels, different growth patterns and different levels of transit service. The results of that analysis were summarized in the draft and final environmental impact statements on the Mayor's Recommended Comprehensive Plan (1993 and 1994).

Following the Growth Management Hearings Board ruling in 1995 that the City needed to provide analysis of the adopted plan and needed to show the impacts of a) concentrating growth in urban centers urban villages and b) reducing dependence on single-occupant vehicles, the City applied the model to the adopted Plan and to a new Alternative. The new Alternative was based on the assumptions that 1) future growth in the city would be distributed more widely than it would be with the Plan and 2) fewer alternatives to single-occupant vehicles would be available than with the Plan. By comparing the adopted Plan against this Alternative, the City was able to show the effects of concentrating growth and discouraging single-occupant vehicle use.

Between the time when the final EIS analysis was conducted (early 1994) and the 1995 analysis was begun, the City had updated the model by: redefining the boundaries of some traffic analysis zones to make them consistent with similar changes made by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC); and incorporating revised employment numbers from the State into the 1990 base. PSRC is the regional body that prepares growth projections and performs regional transportation analysis for jurisdictions within King, Snohomish, Pierce and Kitsap Counties.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

The model forecasts traffic conditions for the year 2010. Even though the Plan covers the period to 2014, GMA requires only a 10-year forecast, and PSRC makes its projections for 10-year intervals (2000, 2010 and 2020). Using 2010 projections provides consistency among regional estimates.

The updated model was used to compare the traffic impacts of the Plan with those that would result from the new Alternative. The model results are depicted later in this Appendix. The analysis describes the following traffic results that would be expected in the year 2010 for the Plan and the Alternative:

- total vehicle miles traveled
- daily vehicle volumes at north, south and east City limits
- the percentage of regional trips made by transit
- the ratio of peak-hour traffic volumes to road capacity along the screenlines used to define the City's level-of-service standard
- volume to capacity ratios for additional screenlines in or near each of the City's five adopted Urban Centers

For the adopted Plan, Transportation Appendix D describes the peak-hour traffic impacts on arterials connecting to and within adjacent jurisdictions. Four jurisdictions that share land boundaries along the north and south borders are included: King County, Tukwila, Lake Forest Park and Shoreline. Mercer Island and jurisdictions east of Lake Washington are not considered adjacent for this analysis; nor were Vashon Island and Kitsap County to the west. None of these jurisdictions has common arterials with Seattle. The Eastside jurisdictions are connected to Seattle via two limited access freeways -- I-90 and State Route 520. Vashon Island and Kitsap County are connected to Seattle only by the Washington State ferries. Once off the regional freeways or ferry system, traffic disperses throughout the region based on a variety of factors, including many that are related only to local trip attractions and roadway conditions within those jurisdictions.

Seattle's Traffic Model

The following describes the four-step process that constitutes the City's EMME/2 traffic model. It begins with a brief description of the basic inputs, followed by a description of each step. Finally, an explanation of the specific assumptions for the 2010 alternatives is provided.

INPUTS

Data used in the traffic forecasting model is stored in two basic structures -- a network and a zone system. The model is focused on the City of Seattle, but covers the four counties of King, Snohomish, Kitsap, and Pierce -- the same area covered by PSRC for the regional model. The four-county region is included because many trips in Seattle begin and/or end somewhere else in the region.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Network

The network describes the roadway system. It includes "links," which represent segments of individual roadways, and "nodes," which represent intersections. Within the city, the network includes regional freeways and highways, principal arterial streets, minor arterial streets, and collector arterial streets. Each link is assigned a speed and capacity. The speed is the speed limit on the arterial. The capacity is assigned based on the arterial classification, speed, number of lanes, lane width, and spacing and timing of signals. The capacities for links in the model generally represent Level-of-Service E conditions.

Zones

Traffic analysis zones (TAZs) are geographical areas used to store population, employment and trip data. There are 518 TAZs within the city limits and an additional 211 outside the city. In the City's model the TAZs within the city are much smaller than those outside. This allows the City to assess the traffic impacts of relatively small-scale modifications to growth allocations within the city, while including the impacts of regional growth. The base population and household data is taken from the 1990 census, and employment data is from the state Employment Security Department statistics.

TRIP GENERATION

The trip generation model estimates the number of trips generated within each TAZ -- those produced within the TAZ and those attracted to it. Trips are calculated from population, households, four groupings of employment, and university enrollment. The rates used to calculate trips were derived by PSRC using census and survey data. The same method for calculating trip generation rates is applied throughout the four-county region.

TRIP DISTRIBUTION

Within the model, each TAZ in the model is paired with every other TAZ, and the trip distribution model determines the interaction of trips between each pair of TAZs. The model calculates the number of trips going from one TAZ to another, looking at each pair. For instance, the number of trips from TAZ A to TAZ B is based on the number of trip attracted by TAZ B and the travel time from A to B, relative to the travel time to other zones. The City hired a consultant to help develop the trip distribution model and validated the results through origin-destination survey data and travel time data.

MODE SPLIT

The mode split model was developed, and is run, by PSRC. For each pair of TAZs (as used in the trip distribution model) the mode split model estimates the percent of all trips that will use each of three travel modes: non-carpool, carpool, and transit. (The mode

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

split from TAZ A to TAZ B may be different than the mode split from TAZ A to C.) The mode split calculations consider the relative travel time and costs for the different modes.

The mode split percentages estimated by the PSRC model are applied to the trips that come out of the city's trip generation and distribution models to calculate the number of non-transit vehicle trips. That number is then put into the assignment model.

ASSIGNMENT

The assignment step in the model assigns the non-carpool and carpool trips to specific links in the network by determining the paths with the minimum travel time between each pair of TAZs. Assignment is an iterative process that estimates the decrease in speed on each link as the traffic volume increases. The model aims to reach an equilibrium, in that the iterations continue until the overall travel time for all trips is minimized.

2010 FORECASTS

In terms of the model's assumptions, the 2010 forecasts for the adopted Plan and the Alternative are distinguished by their population and employment forecasts and mode split assumptions.

Population and Employment

Population and employment forecasts were developed in cooperation with PSRC. PSRC creates a forecast for the region and then allocates the growth to 219 forecast analysis zones (FAZs). In Seattle, each of PSRC's FAZs includes a number of the City's TAZs. The allocation from the FAZs to the smaller TAZs within them is based on travel accessibility, zoned development capacities, and other land use policies.

To model the traffic impacts of the Comprehensive Plan, the City assumed the growth levels that appear in the adopted Plan and its Appendix. Allocation of the growth to TAZs under the Alternative was based on proportionate zoning capacity among the TAZs. Total levels of employment and residential growth within the city are the same for both alternatives. For both alternatives, the allocation of growth outside the city is based on PSRC's land use forecasts.

Network Assumptions

The roadway network is the same for both 2010 alternatives. Network changes for 2010 include the First Avenue South Bridge and HOV lanes on I-5. No changes in the City's arterial streets were assumed for the 2010 network.

NOTICE:
IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

Mode Split

Assumptions for the mode split estimates used to model the Comprehensive Plan's traffic were developed by PSRC for the City of Seattle's land use plan. The following assumptions affect mode split for the year 2010:

- completion of the HOV core system,
- regional rail system, including commuter rail
- increased transit service, and
- increased parking costs in Urban Centers.

Mode split percentages used for the Alternative scenario are the same as those used for 1990.

RESULTS

The following shows the results of the traffic modeling described above for both the adopted Plan and for the Alternative.

Total vehicle miles traveled in the region per day

1990	2010 forecasts	
	Adopted Plan	Alternative
70 million	93 million	100 million

Traffic volumes at City limits

	1990	2010 forecasts	
		Adopted Plan	Alternative
North	327,000	374,000	430,000
South	409,000	476,000	564,000
East	237,000	271,000	290,000

Regional transit trips as a percent of total motorized trips

1990	2010 forecasts	
	Adopted Plan	Alternative
3%	6%	3%

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

Level of Service Standard -- Seattle's Screenline Method

Further impacts of the adopted Plan and the Alternative were defined in terms of screenlines. This section describes the rationale and use of screenlines, as well as the specific impacts forecast by the model.

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires jurisdictions to establish "level of service standards for all arterials and transit routes to serve as a gauge to judge performance of the system."

To gauge the performance of its transportation system, Seattle uses volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios along screenlines. A screenline is a line drawn across a group of (usually parallel) arterials. In this method, the City groups together arterials that serve a similar movement of traffic from one area in the city to another. For example, screenline 6.11 in the Plan's Transportation Figure 2 measures traffic going from south to north and from north to south in the Ballard/Crown Hill area near NW 80th Street. The grouping of arterials reflects the fact that drivers in an urban area often have choices among several routes that they can take from one point to another. When faced with congestion and delays, drivers frequently look for alternative routes. The parallel routes provide those alternatives and work together as a system to convey traffic from one locale to another.

In determining the v/c ratio, the total number of vehicles crossing the screenline on all its arterials during the afternoon peak hour is the volume -- the first factor in the ratio. For conditions in 1990, the base year for the model, or for current calculations, the volume is taken from actual traffic counts. For future years, the City relies on the EMME/2 model to project volumes (described above). Volumes are shown separately for each direction of traffic flow across the screenline: for instance, the northbound volume is counted separately from the southbound volume.

The second factor in the ratio is the total estimated one-direction peak-hour capacity for all the arterials that cross the screenline. The capacity estimate is determined by looking at a number of considerations along the roadway, such as the number of lanes, the posted speed, and the amount of "green time" given the arterial by signals along it. Lane width and the mix of vehicle types may also influence the capacity in some cases (for example, a street that has a large number of buses may have its capacity reduced because of the effect the buses have on the traffic flow).

As transportation engineers use the term, "arterial capacity" is not a fixed number of vehicles that can never be exceeded. Rather, it is a relative measure of traffic flow, assuming certain conditions. Because the Comprehensive Plan's policies express a tolerance for congestion as a means to encourage use of other travel modes and as a way to prevent using limited urban land for roadway expansion, the capacity defined for the City's screenline v/c ratio is roughly equivalent to Level of Service E, a level which transportation engineers apply to roadway operations that approach congested conditions, with delays at intersections and decreased travel speeds.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 3

The City's Comprehensive Plan includes level of service standards (as v/c ratios) for 30 screenlines throughout the city. The standards represent maximum ratios that should not be exceeded. Level of service standards may vary by screenline location, allowing higher v/c ratios where higher development densities are desired or where the City would prefer to increase non-SOV capacity rather than making general arterial capacity. The maximum v/c ratios are 1.0 or 1.2, depending on the screenline location. Because the capacity estimate used in the ratio is a relative number, the ratio of 1.2 does not imply volumes that are equal to 120% of absolute capacity. That would be an impossibility. But 120% of a relative capacity is very possible. In fact, one can find examples around the region where individual roadways record v/c ratios of over 1.0 at certain times of the day.

The screenline method provides more flexibility in planning and implementing improvements, where it appears that a standard would be exceeded, by allowing the City to focus on solutions that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's transportation and land use goals and policies. Improvements, in the form of capacity enhancement or demand reduction, may be implemented on a single arterial within the screenline to bring the v/c ratio to an acceptable level, while furthering the Plan's goals and policies.

For example, if a screenline is predicted to exceed the standard, and a pedestrian priority arterial is identified as the most congested within the screenline, rather than removing or reducing sidewalks along that arterial to add vehicular capacity, another arterial crossing the screenline could be improved. Some traffic from the congested arterial would then be expected to shift to the arterial with the increased capacity.

The screenline v/c ratios allow the City to gauge performance on a system-wide, or citywide, transportation level. More detailed and localized review of projects through the State Environmental Policy Act and other processes will still occur, where appropriate.

Impacts

Transportation Figure A-13 in the Comprehensive Plan's Appendix displays the forecast v/c ratios for the year 2010 with the adopted Plan and with the Alternative on the screenlines for which level-of-service standards have been set. It also includes v/c ratios for additional screenlines in and around the City's five designated urban centers. These additional screenlines provide an area-wide assessment of the relative traffic impacts for both the Plan and the Alternative.

g:\projects\compplan\gmhb\wstf3\notes.doc

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

RECEIVED

JUN 24 1996

TINA PODLODOWSKI
COUNCILMEMBER

WEST SEATTLE
Defense Fund



June 24, 1996

✓ Council President Jan Drago
Councilmember Tina Podlodowski
1101 Municipal Building
600 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Council President and Councilmember:

Attached are the comments on the Mayor's Report and
Recommendations On Public Comment Regarding The City's
Growth Management Hearings Board Response.

Thank you for the opportunity to do this.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Chong

Charles Chong
President

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

West Seattle Defense Fund

June 24, 1996

Re: MAYOR'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING THE CITY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD RESPONSE - June 11, 1996, from Tom Tierney, Director, Office of Management and Planning.

(The following comments follow the numbering used by the Mayor's Report.)

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public comment was that for an issue which affects so many neighborhoods only one public workshop and one public hearing were not adequate, especially when contrasted with at least four meetings in four city areas on the issue of unleashed dog runs.

We suggest that the notice, time and location of the June 4th 'workshop' might not meet the criteria suggested by the Hearings Board. We did attend - on advice of legal counsel and in keeping with our public and private testimony that we would take a positive approach toward settlement.

2. COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THESE AMENDMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

We believe that the April 2, 1996 Hearings Board decision is quite clear on what neighborhood plans need to be included and why.

4. CAPITAL FACILITIES APPROACH

The 1995 remand by the Hearings Board explains why city-wide capital facilities do not comply with the GMA requirement for adequate infrastructure in concentrated growth areas: 6% of Seattle land mass for urban centers and 12% for hub and residential urban villages.

The inventories and analysis should be in accordance with this result of the urban village strategy. Or does the City propose dropping the urban village strategy?

5. CAPITAL FACILITIES CRITERIA

The response seems written to hide the inadequacy of facilities if real levels of service are used.

6. CAPITAL FACILITIES - GMA REQUIREMENTS

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

If the CIP does not show any funding gap, the question is would it in light of the expected \$30-40 million funding gap? The question is consistent with what the City Council has been saying.

7. CAPITAL FACILITIES - LOCALIZED ANALYSIS

We suggest re-reading of the 1995 remand. We would be forced to appeal this response and, have no doubt that the Hearings Board will agree and be sustained by higher review.

8. LISTS OF POTENTIAL FUTURE DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

Why is this list included? Why is this list not included in the CIP? Why is there not a public process focused on this list? How many people or organizations know about this list? What significance does it have? What are the potential, real costs for each project? When will they be up for approval? Within the next six years? (See especially the 'Sand Point Redevelopment' project. Or the baseball and football stadiums. Is the plan to expand LINC to West Seattle postponed?)

9. PARK AND RECREATION FACILITIES

We suggest that the Hearings Board did not ask for 'goals' or city-wide facilities but inventory and analysis in areas of concentrated growth to determine whether or not infrastructure in these areas would support the planned growth.

10. CAPITAL FACILITIES FUNDING

The question is not what the City decides it needs. The question is whether or not existing infrastructure or improvements with reliable funding will be adequate for planned growth. The determination of yes or no must be supported by analysis.

11. CAPITAL FACILITIES - MAINTENANCE

The remand not only asks for a maintenance plan but specifically includes maintenance as a factor to determine adequacy of facilities for planned growth.

Charles Perry

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Donald S. Anderson
1938 48th Ave. SW
Seattle, WA 98116

June 19, 1996

Honorable Tina Podlodowski
Atten: Theresa Dunbar, Clerk
1101 Municipal Building
600 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

RECEIVED
JUN 25 1996
TINA PODLODOWSKI
COUNCILMEMBER

Comments to: Seattle's June 11, 1996
"REPORT BACK ON PUBLIC COMMENTS
REGARDING THE CITY'S GROWTH
MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD
RESPONSE"

Dear Ms Dunbar:

I was disappointed with the portions of the report that interested me the most. There were few changes, primarily only reasons why it was so good. My thoughts follow.

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: Nothing was added to the process to help the public understand the development process, standards criteria, or take control of their community. Additionally there was no mention of steps to be taken to insure broad based citizen input for amendments to the Plan. Basically the city has made a patch for this time and has made no meaningful changes for the future.

12. LOS: The city seemed to say that for a variety of reasons congested conditions with delays at intersections and decreased travel speeds are OK. The statement "*one can find examples around the region where individual roadways record v/c ratios of over 1.0 at certain times of the day*" is very misleading. This occurs on multilane freeways at about 35 mph bumper to bumper just before the system slows to stop and go. I remain firm in my resolve that LOS of 1.0 and 1.2 are not acceptable LOS standards.

12. TRAFFIC FORECASTS Something is seriously missing in the city discussion. It definitely says someone else estimated what the mode split difference would be with or without the Plan and then that difference was modeled. Viola the plan is a traffic success, see, just look at the numbers. How does that prove anything?

Also the Mode Split estimates for the Comp Plan are not exclusive to the Comp Plan.

- *Completion of the HOV core system.* This is a given for both.
- *Regional rail system, including commuter rail.* This is regional voter item, not a given, but goes for both Plan and Alternative.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

- *Increased transit service.* This is a variable and will continue to increase for both.
- *Increased parking costs in Urban Centers.* Right, sure, the commercial lots plan to drop fees for the Alternative, no more increases.

In my previous employment I sent back many traffic reports better than this one.

13. TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS TO ADJACENT JURISDICTIONS: I disagree with paraphrasing and condensing the citizen comment (my letter explains the significance of transit on the center roadway of I-90).

Mercer Island and others are indeed adjacent jurisdictions. I believe there could be other reasons. Maybe Mercer Island was not contacted because residents have single occupant vehicle (SOV) exclusive rights to the center transit lanes on I-90 (space permitting.) To add more transit to the HOV lanes will jeopardize their exclusive rights. Maybe counties relying on ferry use were not considered because there will be insufficient reasonable parking provided at the terminal locations.

14. LOS & A/Q A good traffic analysis would have tested, that is used the LOS standards set for the Comp Plan. See also # 12.

The EIS may have stated that, based on results of the traffic model, the air quality would be better than 1990 conditions. However, the only model that was run was the total burden analysis, and not individual project analyses. The EIS or FEIS stated that complete modeling would be performed for projects as they came up. That is not being done and it is why I said Seattle is violating the CAAA. Incidentally, many of the roadways I've been referring to were included in earlier versions of the plan or EIS process.

"...the City's screenline v/c ratio is roughly equivalent to Level of Service E, a level which transportation engineers apply to roadway operations that approach congested conditions, with delays at intersections and decreased travel speeds" is still in direct conflict with the CAAA that projects and plans not cause or contribute to any new violations or worsen existing violations.

15. TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIES: This response reads good, however, it does not represent what is happening in the city. We are losing lanes, free right turns, and parking is being restricted everywhere except on the roadway system, well there too. Think about it: the busses are going to have to use the residential streets to get through because the one lane left will be choked by US Mail vehicles, Package Express, pizza deliveries, and some well "balanced" cars.

Respectfully Yours,



Donald S. Anderson

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PROCESS

On April 2, 1996, the Growth Management Hearings Board directed the City of Seattle to provide for additional public review on amendments to the Comprehensive Plan adopted in July of 1995, prior to readopting them.

In complying with this direction, the City Council held two widely publicized public workshops, a public hearing, and two discussions in joint committee meetings prior to taking action on the amendments. The intent of the first workshop was to inform people about the proposal, answer questions, and hear comments and suggestions in a more informal setting than a public hearing. Opportunities for written comments were also available. The second workshop was added in response to citizen requests.

Following is the schedule of public meetings, availability of reports on the amendments, and the public noticing that was done for the meetings.

Public Meetings:

May 23, 1996 6:00 - 9:00 p.m. Seattle Central Community College	Public Open House and Workshop held by the joint Business, Economic and Community Development and Neighborhoods and Neighborhood Planning Committees
May 30, 1996 7:00 - 9:00 p.m. City Council Chambers	Public Hearing conducted by the Seattle City Council Committee of the Whole
June 4, 1996 9:30 a.m. City Council Chambers	Public Workshop held by the Business, Economic and Community Development Committee

Reports and Availability:

<u>May 9, 1996</u> Mayor's Report and Recommendations on the Growth Management Hearings Board Response	Mailed to the appellant, appellant's attorney, and to individuals as requested. Available at branch libraries, Neighborhood Service Centers, Office of Management and Planning and Council Offices, and on the City's Public Access Network (Internet)
<u>June 11, 1996</u> Report Back on Public Comments Regarding the City's Growth Management Hearings Board Response	Mailed to all individuals that attended the workshops and/or hearing, or who received the May 9 report. Available at branch libraries, Neighborhood Service Centers, Office of Management and Planning and City Council offices.

FOOTER CHANGED TO
INDICATE FINAL DOCUMENT

LAND USE ELEMENT

C. DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH

GOALS

G31 Encourage Distribute the additional 50,000 - 60,000 households (52,500 - 63,000 dwelling units) and 131,400 - 146,600 jobs called for in this plan to locate in among the various areas of the city as shown in Figure 7-folows: Figure 7 indicates the intended distribution of growth over this Plan's 20-year life. Prior to the adoption of neighborhood plans and the designation of all the urban village boundaries, the proportion of growth that occurs in village areas may be different from the percentages shown in the figure. Projected annual growth is shown in Land Use Appendix E. Over the first six years of the period covered by the Plan, the City expects to add about 10,700 households and 48,000 jobs.

Land Use Figure 7
20-YEAR GROWTH TARGETS
GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH
INSIDE AND OUTSIDE CENTERS AND VILLAGES

Category Location	% of Citywide Residential Growth	% of Citywide Employment Growth
In Urban Centers	45% (22,500 - 26,700 hshlds)	65% (85,410 - 95,500 jobs)
In Manufacturing/Industrial Centers	No housing target	10% (13,140 - 14,660 jobs)
In Hub and Residential Urban Villages (adopted and unadopted)	30% (15,000 - 18,000 hshlds)	No target for Residential Urban Villages Hub Urban Villages Only: 15% (19,700 - 21,990 jobs)
Remainder of City	25% (12,500 - 15,300 hshlds)	No Specific Target
Totals	50,000 - 60,000 hshlds	131,400 - 146,600 jobs

B. CATEGORIES OF URBAN VILLAGES

URBAN CENTERS POLICIES

L21 Promote the balance of uses in each urban center or urban center village indicated by one of the following functional designations, assigned as follows:

(AMENDED BY JONN
 BSCD / N = NP 6/25/96)

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Public Notice:

The City provided extensive notice on the May 23 workshop and May 30, 1996 hearing on these amendments, as follows:

- a display ad was placed in both the Seattle Times and the Post Intelligencer newspapers on May 16, 1996, a week before the workshop;
- notice was mailed to approximately 500 individuals who: attended the hearing on these amendments last June; participated on one of the Committees that helped develop the Comp Plan; commented on the environmental impact statement for the Plan; or are on the Department of Neighborhoods Community Contacts list (which includes community newspapers, community councils, and interested individuals);
- articles were placed in the May issues of widely distributed city newsletters -- the Neighborhood Planning Newsletter (circulation 5,000) the DCLU Info (circulation 1,085) and the DON Community Calendar (circulation 1,600);
- Detailed notice of the workshop and hearing were contained in the Council's Hearings Calendar, which is mailed to approximately 800 individuals and groups; and
- legal notice was placed in the Daily Journal of Commerce and the DCLU General Mail Release on April 18, 1996.

Notice of the June 4 public workshop, added at the request of the public, was distributed by Council President Drago's Office to those attending the May 23, 1996, workshop and those on the Department of Neighborhood's Community Contacts List.

g:\projects\compplan\gmbl\w\sd\attach1.doc

DISC
DOCUMENT
NAME CHANGED

6/21/96 AMENDMENTS APPROVED BY JOINT BECD / N + NP
ON 6/25/96

Clarifications for Goal G31 in Remand Amendments.

Amendments are shown as changes to the Current executive recommendation.

C. DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH

GOALS

G31 Encourage the additional 50,000 - 60,000 households (52,500 - 63,000 dwelling units) and 131,400 - 146,600 jobs, the city-wide growth targets called for in this plan, to locate in the various areas of the city as shown in Figure 7. Figure 7 indicates the intended distribution of growth over this Plan's 20-year life. Prior to the adoption of neighborhood plans and the designation of all the urban village boundaries, the proportion of growth that occurs in village areas may is likely to be different from the percentages shown in the figure. Projected annual growth is shown in Land Use Appendix F.

Land Use Figure 7
20 YEAR GROWTH GOALS TARGETS
GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF GROWTH

Category	% of Citywide Residential Growth	% of Citywide Employment Growth
Urban Centers	45% (22,500 - 26,700 hshlds)	65% (85,410 - 95,500 jobs)
In Manufacturing/Industrial Centers	No Housing target Goal	10% (13,140 - 14,660 jobs)
In Hub and Residential Urban Villages (adopted and unadopted)	30% (15,000 - 18,000 hshlds)	No Target Goal for Residential Urban Villages Hub Urban Villages Only; 15% (19,700 - 21,990 jobs)
Remainder of City	25% (12,500 - 15,300 hshlds)	No Specific Target Goal
Totals	50,000 - 60,000 hshlds	131,400 - 146,600 jobs

G32 Achieve growth in urban centers sufficient to:

- A. Meet the minimum density criteria established for urban centers by the King County Countywide Planning Policies, reflected in policy L16D.
- B. Meet growth targets contained in existing comprehensive subarea plans, such as the Northgate Area Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Plan.
- C. Recognize existing plans for major projects in specific urban centers that will result in significant increases in jobs and/or housing, such as the plans of major medical and educational institutions.

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

TAPE

TIME START _____
TIME FINISH _____

**NEIGHBORHOODS & NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING COMMITTEE
& BUSINESS, ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, June 25, 1996
2:00 p.m.**

Member: Tina Podlodowski, Chair
Cheryl Chow, Vice Chair
Jane Noland, Member
Sue Donaldson, Alternate

Staff: Gary Davis, Legislative Assistant
Mary Hsu, Legislative Assistant
Telephone: 684-8808
After Hours Message Line: 684-8888
tina.podlodowski@ci.seattle.wa.us

The Council's Chambers and offices are physically accessible; print and communications access provided on request. Call 684-8888 (TDD: 233-0025) for further information.

RECOMMENDED
ACTION

1. Chair's Report.
2. C.B. 111306 Amending the Comprehensive Plan. (This bill would make Comprehensive Plan amendments in response to the order of the Growth Management Hearings Board.)

BRIEFING,
DISCUSSION &
VOTE

TP/tv

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE
IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

STATE OF WASHINGTON - KING COUNTY

70290
City of Seattle, City Clerk

—ss.

No. ORD. TITLES

Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CTOT: 118194-118199

was published on

07/18/96

The amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of \$ _____ which amount has been paid in full.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on

[Signature]
07/18/96
[Signature]
Notary Public for the State of Washington
residing in Seattle

City of Seattle
TITLE-ONLY PUBLICATION
The full text of the following ordinances, passed by the City Council on July 1, 1939, and published here by title only, will be mailed, at no cost, upon request for two months after this publication. For further information, contact the Seattle City Clerk at 684-8344.
ORDINANCE NO. 118184
AN ORDINANCE relating to the Police Department, increasing expenditure allowances in the 1939 Budget of the Police Department to provide additional funding in support of the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) program and making a reimbursable appropriation therefor, all by a three-fourths vote of the City Council.
ORDINANCE NO. 118185
AN ORDINANCE authorizing the Mayor or his designee to execute a lease for property at the Sand Point Naval Base.
ORDINANCE NO. 118186
AN ORDINANCE relating to cable television, appropriating new franchise fees, revenues, authorizing debt to acquire equipment and increasing the expenditure authority of the Department of Administration Services and the Library for these purposes, all by a three-fourths vote of the City Council.
ORDINANCE NO. 118187
AN ORDINANCE amending the Comprehensive Plan.
ORDINANCE NO. 118188
AN ORDINANCE relating to the Department of Parks and Recreation authorizing the acceptance of a gift of \$50,000 from the Seattle Zoological Society to support the Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation Woodland Park Zoo's Reptile Program and increasing the 1939 Department of Parks and Recreation Budget, therefore.
ORDINANCE NO. 118189
AN ORDINANCE relating to the Seattle Center Department, making an appropriation from the Cumulative Reserve Fund, Capital Projects Subfund, for environmental clean-up at the Market Bus Barn site upon a three-fourths vote of the City Council.
Publication ordered by JUDITH PIP, P.M., City Clerk.
Date of official publication in the Daily Journal of Commerce, Seattle, July 18, 1939.

Affidavit of Publication

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

STATE OF WASHINGTON - KING COUNTY

70576
City of Seattle, City Clerk

--S.

No. ORD IN FULL

Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CT:ORD 118197

was published on

07/26/96

The amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of \$ _____, which amount has been paid in full.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on
07/26/96
Notary Public for the State of Washington,
residing in Seattle

NOTICE: IF THE DOCUMENT IN THIS FRAME IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT.

Affidavit of Publication