

Public Comments Received on the

King County Comprehensive Plan

Via the Council's Web Site and Email
September 20, 2016 - November 28, 2016

Testimony to King County TrEE Committee

September 20, 2016

My name is Robert Braeutigam, and I reside at 2640 271st Ave SE, Issaquah WA, which is within the Duthie Hill Notch. My neighbors and I , as well as members of the neighboring Windsor Heights Homeowners Association have presented comments at past Committee meetings opposing any revision of the Urban Growth Boundary that would include the Duthie Hill Notch within the UGA and make it eligible for annexation and development.

But I am not here to restate those issues and concerns. Rather, I am here to thank you for your efforts in putting the Comprehensive Plan together. We have monitored progress of the Comprehensive Plan within your committee via attendance at your meetings, viewing Channel 22 telecasts, and following updates on the King County website. We appreciate the level of effort that went in to this review and revision.

In reviewing the Striking Amendment S1 and the supporting documentation, we were pleased to note that you have concurred with Executive Staff recommendations and have not incorporated any change to the UGA as it pertains to the Notch.

If our comments and concerns were any factor in your decision, we would like to thank you for listening to us. This was a small issue in the grand scheme of things facing this committee and the County but it has a large impact on our properties and our lives.

We know there are steps remaining on the path to final approval by the Council, but we just want to say thank you for what you have done this far.

From: [Taran Tiwana](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Parcel number 3423059034
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 10:06:08 AM

Hi,

My name is Taranjeet Tiwana . I live in Westmount Vista community in Renton 98058. I received a letter from the county that says there is a proposal of building apartments near our community which is totally not acceptable. We are unhappy with the idea of the apartments being built near our neighborhood. We really don't want any apartment building near our house so please consider our request.

I really appreciate the letter being sent by the County to inform us about everything.

Thanks

Taranjeet Tiwana

Address 13410 SE 181st St

Renton WA 98058

PH:-206-694-9538

From: [Janice Magill Sattler](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Please rezone of parcel# 1457500005 from RB to R1.
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 1:12:03 PM

Please rezone of parcel# 1457500005 from RB to R1.
Enforce the rules! Janice Sattler

From: [Michael Turner](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: proposal to rezone of parcel# 1457500005 from RB to R1
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 8:54:47 AM

I support this proposal. We do not need islands of noncomplying commercial use in our wetlands, or adjacent to them.

Michael R. Turner

15713 SE 145th St

Renton, 98059

From: [Lynda Voigt](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: to rezone of parcel# 1457500005 from RB to R1
Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2016 8:43:20 AM

I continue to be distressed at the refusal of the car dealership on the property by Cemetery Pond to follow the rules and respect the nearby wetland. I helped clear the wetland around Cemetery Pond and Tributary 291 of an unbelievable and disgusting amount of garbage and junk. I also helped restore the area with native plants. I have lived in this area for 43 years and have watched our woods, streams and wetlands disappear to intensive development. We would so much like to preserve the small amount of wetland we still have.

At this moment, the two adjacent parcels are for sale. We ask this rezone to remove the existence of "changed circumstances" which buyers could cite in their own pursuit of inappropriate, incompatible rezones. Please don't let this distressing problem grow any further. The community is merely asks King County to make real the promise written in the rules already on the books.

Please rezone of parcel# 1457500005 from RB to R1.

Thank you,
Lynda Voigt
15713 SE 148th St.
Renton 98059

From: [Janet Emerson](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Please REZONE PARCEL 1457500005 from RB to R1. I live in the area and have not been happy with the fact that the car ownership people ignor proper care of the property.
Date: Wednesday, September 21, 2016 5:00:14 PM

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [King County Council](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: FW: Public Hearing Notice for 2016 Comprehensive Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 19, 2016 9:37:28 AM

From: Tom [mailto:TDCarp@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 18, 2016 7:16 PM
To: KCCouncil@subscriptions.kingcounty.gov
Subject: RE: Public Hearing Notice for 2016 Comprehensive Plan

I know you're doing your best to provide opportunities for KCCP public comment, but making people who want to verbally comment come to the Court House is unreasonable.

You let KC Council members call in to meetings. Why not create similar access points in the county to bring the Council to the people (as opposed to the opposite)?

Tom

From: [Jennifer Adelfio](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Development in Fairwood
Date: Monday, October 24, 2016 12:33:37 PM

Hello,

I am wondering if/when a decision is made to build into R6 to R18 if there are plans in putting a stop light in at 140th and SE 180th ST? The traffic is horrendous on 140th. I can barely get out of SE 180th ST as it is.

Also, I am wondering if there have been any studies surrounding the traffic in Fairwood currently? It is nearly impossible to come and go down the only two hills available - the 140th hill into Maple Valley and the hill down past the hospital. All of the traffic from the Maple Valley flows through Petrovitsky, causing significant delays....Adding hundreds of people into this area is going to have a dramatic impact on the traffic.

Additionally, a medium blocking access to East bound traffic into the shopping center by Taco Time needs to be built... right after the light. I've seen many near-misses because the light is backed up and everyone is trying to use that turn lane in both directions.

Thank you and I anticipate your response.

Jennifer Adelfio

Sent from [Outlook](#)

From: [Chris Pasinetti](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Enumclaw UGA Questions
Date: Monday, October 24, 2016 1:57:33 PM

Hello,

I have a question regarding the UGA technical amendments. Specifically the amendment regarding 228th Ave Se- with the right-of-way being removed from our potential annexation area this would certainly preclude that roadway from being developed to city standard (curb, gutter sidewalk, etc.).

Would this also not preclude the city from entering into an interlocal agreement with the county for the provision of services with regard to that roadway when when the day comes where those properties annex and the subsequently develop.

I'm assuming the answer is no, but having two different street designs is the reason what that roadway is proposed for removal to begin with.

Chris Pasinetti, AICP

Community Development Director
City of Enumclaw

cpasinetti@ci.enumclaw.wa.us

tel. (360) 615-5726

fax (360) 825-7232

From: [Gina Buchanan](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: Layman's Explanation for "Do Pass" Recommendation on 2016 Comprehensive Plan
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 11:14:12 AM

Good Morning,

Is there someone who can "nutshell" this recommendation and what it means for surrounding property owners?

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/2016compplan.aspx>

Thank you,

Gina Buchanan | Community Association Manager



15 Oregon Ave, Suite 308 • Tacoma, WA 98409

P: (253) 472-0825 | **F:** (253) 472-0628

WEB: www.managementtrust.com

From: [Jensen, Christine](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: FW: Comment on Comprehensive Plan
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 11:57:55 AM

Christine Jensen

Principal Legislative Analyst | King County Council
516 Third Ave, Room 1200 | Seattle, WA 98104
206.477.5702 | christine.jensen@kingcounty.gov

Learn more about the [2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update](#)

This email and any response to it constitute a public record and may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Miller, Ivan
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 11:51 AM
To: Jensen, Christine <Christine.Jensen@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: FW: Comment on Comprehensive Plan

FYI

From: Kyle Britz [<mailto:artizensolutions@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 1:07 PM
To: Compplan
Subject: Comment on Comprehensive Plan

Kylebritz@yahoo.com

Community outreach needs to more accessible and inclusive.

From: [Barbara Speaks](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: KCCP email list
Date: Thursday, November 17, 2016 2:24:24 PM

Thank you for keeping me informed for related news and schedule updates. Especially proposed ordinances 2016-0155 and 2016-0159. I did send in an online comment.

From: [Jensen, Christine](#)
To: [CouncilCompPlan](#)
Subject: FW: Sierra Club comments on King Co. Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update
Date: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 8:13:23 AM
Attachments: [KCCP "16Update-Sierra CoverLetter.pdf](#)
[KCCP "16Update-Sierra Comments.pdf](#)
[Biosolids Agricultural Water Use.pdf](#)

Christine Jensen

Principal Legislative Analyst | King County Council
516 Third Ave, Room 1200 | Seattle, WA 98104
206.477.5702 | christine.jensen@kingcounty.gov

[Learn more about the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update](#)

This email and any response to it constitute a public record and may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Tim Gould [mailto:tim.g.sierraclub@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2016 4:47 PM
To: McDermott, Joe <Joe.McDermott@kingcounty.gov>; King County Council <council@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Constantine, Dow <Dow.Constantine@kingcounty.gov>; Jensen, Christine <Christine.Jensen@kingcounty.gov>; Miller, Ivan <Ivan.Miller@kingcounty.gov>; Starbard, John <John.Starbard@kingcounty.gov>; Taniguchi, Harold <Harold.Taniguchi@kingcounty.gov>; True, Christie <Christie.True@kingcounty.gov>; Quinn, Adrienne <Adrienne.Quinn@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Sierra Club comments on King Co. Comprehensive Plan 2016 Update

Councilmember McDermott,

Please find attached the Sierra Club comment letter and supporting information pertaining to the 2016 updates to the King County Comprehensive Plan. We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Plan update and look forward to further discussion with you, your Council colleagues, and staff regarding the topics in the Plan update.

Please contact me or Conservation Committee Chair Josh Osborne-Klein (cover letter signatory) if you have questions about our comments.

sincerely,
Tim Gould
Chair, Transportation & Land Use Committee
Sierra Club Washington



November 7, 2016

Joe McDermott joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov
Chair, King County Council
King County Courthouse
516 Third Ave, Room 1200
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: 2016 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan

Chairman McDermott,

The Sierra Club welcomes the opportunity to provide Comments on the King County Executive's and Council's proposed **2016 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan (Update)**. We strongly support such planning efforts at the State, Regional, County, and Local level.

When it comes to the interconnected fields of Land-Use, Growth Management, and Transportation, we are guided by the following principles:

1. Minimize the impacts on and use of land, airspace, and waterways;
2. Minimize the consumption of limited resources and reduce pollutant and noise emissions;
3. Provide everyone, including pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users, with adequate access to jobs, shopping, services, and recreation;
4. Provide adequate and efficient goods movement and substitute local goods for those requiring long distance movement, where feasible;
5. Encourage land uses that minimize travel requirements;
6. Strengthen local communities, towns and urban centers, and promote equal opportunity;
7. Eliminate transportation subsidies which handicap achievement of the above goals; and
8. Ensure vigorous, effective public participation in transportation planning.

Below are our **General Comments** on the Update.

- Maintaining the integrity of the State's Growth Management Act is important to the Sierra Club and we believe the Update goes a long way towards doing that.
- We strongly support critical Environmental Sustainability and Ecosystem Protection principles that serve as a foundation for many County policies.
- We strongly support the linking to the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP), a comprehensive legislative and policy plan for climate action.
- We further commend the County on the strong language regarding climate change and greenhouse gas emissions interspersed throughout the Update. The Sierra Club strongly

supports such policies and how such policies must be knitted into the fabric of planning to ensure a cohesive push towards meeting a set of critical goals.

- We remain concerned habitat protection efforts will be stymied and, thus, undermined at jurisdictional boundaries unless the cities work in partnership with the County to maintain the integrity of and protect wildlife corridors.
- We commend the use of a “precautionary approach” to planning and development regulations. This is the most prudent and, in the long run, economical philosophy to pursue.
- There is a lack of clarity in relation to whether wetland restoration or mitigation measures are to take place in the same watershed that the impacted wetlands are located. It is best to mitigate in the same watershed as impacts occur. A mitigation sequence scheme should be included, i.e., the highest priority is to avoid all impacts to wetlands, then provide a sequence of mitigation alternatives that are decreasingly less desirable.
- Transportation Concurrency is a major concern due to the near gridlock in most of the Puget Sound region. Consequently, we recommend the County strengthen a variety of policies that when taken together create major impediments to adequately managing traffic flows at levels that promote the steady and free movement of people and goods. Such impediments include the allowed (per RCW) 6-year interval between development approval and infrastructure actually being in place, Transfer of Development Rights offsets, etc.
- We strongly commend the County on its Non-Motorized Transportation Program and Transportation Demand Management Program. We will continue to work with the County in further enhancing these needed programs to provide healthy and safe alternates to vehicle travel to people and to serve all populations.

We have attached both our **Detailed Comments** (organized Chapter-by-Chapter, Section-by-Section) and **Supplemental Information: Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use**.

Please contact me should you have any questions regarding our comments. Thank you.



Josh Osborne-Klein
Chair, Conservation Committee
Washington State Chapter, Sierra Club
washington.chapter@sierraclub.org

cc: King County Executive Dow Constantine: Dow.Constantine@kingcounty.gov
King County Council: council@kingcounty.gov
Council Principal Legislative Analyst: Christine Jensen christine.jensen@kingcounty.gov
Comprehensive Planning Manager Ivan Miller: ivan.miller@kingcounty.gov
DPER Director John Starbard: John.Starbard@kingcounty.gov
KCDOT Director Harold S. Taniguchi: harold.taniguchi@kingcounty.gov
DNR&P Director Christie True: christie.true@kingcounty.gov
DCHS Director Adrienne Quinn: adrienne.quinn@kingcounty.gov

**Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update
- - Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use - -**

LAND APPLIED SEWAGE SLUDGE

<http://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/124-A86/>

Pipe Dreams: Tapping into the Health Information in Our Sewers

<http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-superbug-sewers-20160307-story.html>

Sewage plants are failing to kill lethal superbugs unleashed from hospitals

http://www.sludgefacts.org/IJOEH_1104_Snyder.pdf

The Dirty Work of Promoting “Recycling” of America’s Sewage Sludge

http://emerald.tufts.edu/med/apua/news/newsletter_60_2110964016.pdf

Tracking Antibiotic Resistance Resistance Genes in the Environment

<http://www.newsweek.com/eating-meat-grazed-human-sewage-might-lower-female-fertility-432537>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1310922/>

Health Risks from Surface-disposal and Stockpiling.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20821484>

Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 597–605, 2010 # 2009
SETAC Printed in the USA DOI: 10.1002/etc.66 TRICLOCARBAN, TRICLOSAN,
POLYBROMINATED DIPHENYL ETHERS, AND 4-NONYLPHENOL IN BIOSOLIDS AND
IN SOIL RECEIVING 33-YEAR BIOSOLIDS APPLICATION

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24375516>

Bioaccumulation Of Triclosan And Triclocarban In Plants Grown In Soils Amended With
Municipal Dewatered Biosolids

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es901860r>

Behavior of Decabromodiphenyl Ether (BDE-209) in the Soil-Plant System: Uptake,
Translocation, and Metabolism in Plants and Dissipation in Soil

www.cwmi.css.cornell.edu/case.pdf

Case for Caution Revisited: Health and Environmental Impacts of Application of Sewage
Sludges to Agricultural Land

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26498966>

Uptake of polybrominated diphenyl ethers by carrot and lettuce crops grown in compost-
amended soils

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412011002650>

Measurement of flame retardants and triclosan in municipal sewage sludge and biosolids

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update - - Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use - -

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v412/n6843/abs/412140a0.html>

Persistent pollutants in land-applied sludges

<http://bmcplantbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12870-015-0583-5>

Uptake of dioxin-like compounds from sewage sludge into various plant species--
assessment of levels using a sensitive bioassay

<http://bmcplantbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12870-015-0583-5>

Differential tissue accumulation of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin in Arabidopsis
thaliana affects plant chronology, lipid metabolism and seed yield

<https://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-89807480.html>

Researchers Link Increased Risk of Illness To Sewage Sludge Used As Fertilizer
Science for Sale. David L. Lewis. Skyhorse Publishing. 2014.

RECLAIMED WATER

Vegetables

Abstract: <http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/fpd.2011.1044>

Article: <http://cen.acs.org/articles/94/web/2016/04/Vegetables-grown-treated-wastewater-boost.html>

Exposure to xenobiotics occurs through ingestion of reclaimed wastewater-irrigated
produce.

<http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/153531404772914437>

Persistence of Salmonella enterica Serovar Typhimurium on Lettuce and Parsley and in
Soils on Which They Were Grown in Fields Treated with Contaminated Manure Composts
or Irrigation Water

<http://cen.acs.org/articles/94/web/2016/04/Vegetables-grown-treated-wastewater-boost.html>

Vegetables grown with treated wastewater boost human exposure to pharmaceutical
contaminants

Consuming produce watered with reclaimed wastewater increased detectable levels of the
drug carbamazepine in people's urine

Pathogens

http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories2009/20090213_antibiotic.html

Antibiotic Resistance: A Rising Concern in Marine Systems NOAA 2/13/2009

Pharmaceuticals

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update - - Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use - -

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16519291>

Presence and Distribution of Wastewater-Derived Pharmaceutical in soil irrigated with reclaimed wastewater

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27021726>

Environ Sci Technol. 2016 Apr 19; 50(8):4476-82. doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b06256. E-pub 2016 Apr 7. Human Exposure to Wastewater-Derived Pharmaceuticals in Fresh Produce: A Randomized Controlled Trial Focusing on Carbamazepine

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-346>

Pharmaceuticals in Drinking Water

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es011055j>

Pharmaceuticals, Hormones, Other Organic Wastewater in Stream/Freshwater, 1999-2000: A National Reconnaissance

<http://www.opb.org/news/article/federal-government-finds-harmful-contaminants-in-c/>

High toxic levels from sediments to resident fish to osprey eggs & aquatic insects

<http://www.opb.org/news/article/polluting-the-water-with-toothpaste-shampoo-and-dr/>

Polluting The Water With Toothpaste, Shampoo, And Drugs

<http://www.opb.org/news/article/pharmaceuticals-in-the-water/>

<http://www.civilbeat.org/2016/06/study-several-common-drugs-could-leach-into-oahus-groundwater/>

Antimicrobials

http://www.sludgenews.org/resources/documents/Buth_Dioxin-Triclosan.pdf

Evidence for dioxins derived from the antimicrobial triclosan was obtained from analysis of two sediment cores from the Mississippi River downstream of Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN

http://www.lccmr.leg.mn/projects/2010/finals/2010_05f_rpt_thesis_quantification-triclosan.pdf

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es3045289>

Quantification of Triclosan, chlorinated triclosan derivatives, & dioxin photoproducts.

Flame Retardants

<http://cen.acs.org/articles/92/web/2014/09/Fire-Retardants-Wash-Laundry.html>

Fire retardants wash out in laundry

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es502227h>

Flame Retardant Transfers from U.S. Households (Dust and Laundry Wastewater) to the

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update - - Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use - -

Aquatic Environment

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es070728g>

Evidence of debromination of decabromodiphenyl ether (BDE-209) in biota from a Wastewater Receiving Stream

Plastics and Micro/Nano Particulates and Fibers

Study: http://brenmicroplastics.weebly.com/uploads/5/1/7/0/51702815/bren-patagonia_final_report.pdf

Article: <http://www.outsideonline.com/2091876/patagonias-new-study-finds-fleece-jackets-are-giant-pollutant>

<http://www.outsideonline.com/1998166/plastics>

The Invisible Nightmare in Your Fleece 7/30/2015

<http://www.doh.wa.gov/portals/1/documents/4400/332-132-epa-grant-strategy.pdf> for the 2012 work plan

Environmentalists Drawing a Bead on Microplastics; Marie-Danielle Smith
msmith@ottawacitizen.com 8/17/14

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17706266>

Plasticizers and their degradation products in the process streams of a large urban physicochemical sewage treatment plant..

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/07/080724221823.htm>

Nano particulates in Sewage Could Escape Into Bodies of Water. Swiss Institute of Technology, Zurich.

<http://www.ceint.duke.edu/biblio/uptake-and-retention-metallic-nanoparticles-mediterranean-mussel-mytilus-galloprovincialis>

Uptake and Retention of MetNP in the Mediterranean Mussel

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es200809c>

Filter-feeding Bivalves Store and Deposit Colloidally Stable Gold Nanoparticles

Estrogens

<http://www.northernlife.ca/printarticle.aspx?id=89251>

What happens when you put fish on the pill? Researcher Used the Northern Lake to Test Estrogens Effect on Fish.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0092630>

Contraceptive Options & Their Associated Estrogenic Environmental Loads

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update
- - Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use - -

<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es202880e>

Fish Endocrine Disruption Responses to a Major Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrade

Fluoride

<http://www.sonic.net/kryptox/environ/salmon.htm>

Impact of Artificial **Fluoridation** on salmon...in NW WA State & B.C.

<https://www.deepdyve.com/lp/elsevier/heavy-metals-in-red-crabs-chaceon-quinquedens-from-the-gulf-of-mexico->

Heavy Metals in Red Crabs in the Gulf of Mexico

Other

[http://www.sludgenews.org/resources/documents/Artificial Sweeteners in WWTPs.pdf](http://www.sludgenews.org/resources/documents/Artificial_Sweeteners_in_WWTPs.pdf)

Fate of Artificial Sweeteners in NY State Wastewater Treatment Plants in New York State, U.S.A

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21683444>

Refined Sewer Epidemiology Mass Balances and Application to Heroin, Cocaine & Ecstasy. Environment International

<http://blog.pugetsoundinstitute.org/2013/02/caffeine-and-other-tracers-used-to-target-wastewater-pollution/>

Caffeine & Other Tracers Used to Target Wastewater Pollution

http://www.denverpost.com/denver/ci_29135024/recycled-water-doing-damage-conifers-washington-park-denver

<http://www.denverpost.com/2015/11/18/why-so-many-trees-in-denvers-washington-park-are-dying/>

Recycled, non-potable water saves money, but some say it's contributing to killing off trees earlier than normal.

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

General Comments

We support the proposed King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) Update's long-term priorities:

1. Create Sustainable Neighborhoods;
2. Preserve and Maintain Open Space and Resource Lands;
3. Direct Development Towards Existing Communities;
4. Provide a Variety of Transportation Choices;
5. Address Equity, Social, and Environmental Justice; and
6. Achieve Environmental Sustainability.

We support the following goals in the 2016 KCCP Update:

Growth Management

Reduction of sprawl by concentrating growth in urban areas where services and infrastructure exist.

Create healthy, sustainable urban communities where residents live and work.

Annexation incentives that include County-City planning and incorporate transferable development rights (TDRs) in Potential Annexation Areas (PAAs).

Recognition to avoid incompatible uses in the Rural Area, such as urban serving facilities.

Equity and Health

The new **Chapter 4 -- Housing and Human Services** that emphasizes community development, residential local improvement districts, and increased density and affordable housing focused on transit.

Focus on creation of sustainable neighborhoods.

Emphasis on Equity and Social Justice.

Public Health programs including healthy food, urban agriculture, Local Food-farm-supportive programs.

Environmental Policy

Strong focus on Climate Change throughout the Plan including cross-referencing with Strategic Climate Action Plan policies.

Collaboration with local governments to reduce greenhouse gasses (GHGs) and prepare for impacts of climate change.

Conservation and maintenance of our open spaces, parks, trails, and cultural resources with a focus on healthy ecosystems that provide needed natural functions.

Recognition of the new stormwater permit with increased focus on low-impact development, basin/sub-basin planning, infrastructure mapping, and Green Building Code.

Policies on rail transport of oil.

Support for a market-based price on carbon.

Transportation

Recognition that sustainable and efficient transportation options are important to our quality of life and for fighting climate change.

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

Increased multimodal transportation options to meet local community needs with an emphasis to reduce impacts to our shared environment.

Although the proposed KCCP Update addresses Climate Change in multiple places, we cannot stress enough how critical it is for policies therein to be framed with climate change solutions in mind. There must be a strong and continuous connection between the KCCP and the Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP), which guides County work to achieve ambitious climate goals and prepare for the impacts of climate change. Recognition within the KCCP Update of the importance of linking transportation, land-use planning, and limiting sprawl to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is critical to achieving SCAP goals.

Specific Comments

The following provides our comments on specific policies in the 2016 KCCP Update.

Chapter I -- REGIONAL GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLANNING

II. King County Planning Framework

D. Sub-Regional Planning and Partnerships

We support the proposed addition of sub-regional planning programs and partnerships that are related to the Comprehensive Plan, including the additions of Policies **RP-109a.** (King County Cities Climate Collaboration), **RP-109b.** (Regional Transit Oriented Development Program), **RP-109c.** (Eastside Rail Corridor); and **RP-109d.** (Regional Code Collaboration).

III. King County Guiding Principles

We support the planning objectives and consistency with the State's Growth Management Act. We particularly support the proposed additions to those objectives: *"manage stormwater runoff," "improve ... particulate emissions,"* and *"reduce per-capita greenhouse gas emissions."*

Chapter II -- URBAN COMMUNITIES

I. Urban Communities

A. The Urban Growth Area

1. Growth in Urban Centers and the Promotion of Public Health for All

The promotion of urban centers to meet needs for housing, jobs, services, culture and recreation through emphasis on transit-oriented development (TOD) is a crucial piece to ensure the success of the regional planning Policy **RP-109b** (see above--Regional Transit Oriented Development Program). We stress the importance of TOD (such as in Policy **U-108**) for focusing growth that can be served by transit and reduce its climate footprint compared with the county average.

We call for restoring the Executive's needed addition (*"Facilities serving urban areas such as new medical, governmental, educational or institutional development, shall be located within the Urban Growth Area, except as provided in policies R-326 and R-*

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

327.”) to Policy **U-109** so as not to precipitate further urban sprawl outside the Urban Growth Area (UGA).

We support the addition of Policy **U-109a** to encourage “compact communities that transit can serve” as long as language is added to ensure they are wholly within the UGA.

B. Residential Land Use

3. Increases to Zoning Density

We call for restoring the existing KCCP language in **Policy U-128** (“...*exceeding state requirements*”). Both the Executive and the TrEE Committee Chair in his Striker Amendment supported this commonsense language as part of granting density incentives.

C. Commercial Land Use

2. Community Business Centers

We call for restoring the Executive’s key addition (“...*including secure bicycle parking;*”) to Policy **U-163** to help promote this alternate form of transportation that is increasingly used by many.

3. Neighborhood Business Centers

As above, we call for restoring the Executive’s key addition (“...*including secure bicycle parking;*”) to Policy **U-168**.

D. Urban Planned Developments and Fully Contained Communities

We do not agree with item d. under Policy **U-180**: “*No particular percentage formula for the mix of uses should be required. Instead, the mix of uses for a Fully Contained Community should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis,...*” The history of Fully Contained Community developments in central Puget Sound indicates that a minimum percentage should be established for job uses based on area or land value or other appropriate metric. While transit-oriented site planning is laudable (item b), better integration with transit planning and available resources is needed to ensure a Fully Contained Community will have some transit service to orient its development around.

F. Eastside Rail Corridor

We fully support the proposed additions that provide a vision for the Eastside Rail Corridor (ERC) and have been actively engaged in the process. However, we believe far more emphasis must be given to a true multimodal corridor that enthusiastically embraces multiple mass transit modes and includes frequent electrified all-day transit service (either electric bus or light rail). This corridor serves a different market than I-405 Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) and is complementary, not an alternative, to the longer-distance I-405 travelshed. The ERC mode, either light rail or electrified (battery or trolley) BRT, should be selected based on cost effectiveness given the projected ridership. We support a combination of quiet electrified transit and a bicycle and pedestrian commuter and recreational trail in a clean “green corridor” connecting eastside communities.

Land-use patterns near the ERC should be consistent with such a transit and pedestrian/bike trail facility and the people-moving capacity it can provide. While these will be decisions of the cities along the corridor, the County should indicate a strong preference for such transit-land use integration, perhaps with corresponding incentives for the cities involved. More local Metro bus service can provide needed connections with stations along the ERC transit route, or other amenities could be provided by the County. We see a key leadership role for the County to help strengthen partnerships to make this happen.

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

Chapter II -- RURAL AREAS & NATURAL RESOURCE LANDS

I. Rural Area

II. Rural Designation / A. Rural Area Designation Criteria

We call for restoring the full language in the Executive's proposed inclusion of item i. under Policy **R-201**: *"Rural uses that do not include urban or largely urban-serving facilities."* By striking out *"urban or largely"* and substituting *"primarily"* it waters down the intent, which is that the Rural Area is no place for such facilities.

III. Rural Densities and Development

C. Transfer of Development Rights Program

The intent of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) to achieve desirable land-management goals is admirable and we agree with the addition to item f. under Policy **R-314**, which adds to sequestering carbon through *"conserving agricultural lands."*

1. Sending and Receiving Sites

We support the new Policy **R-320a** regarding amenities to the urban unincorporated areas which serve as Transferrable Development Rights receiving sites: *"King County shall provide amenities to urban unincorporated Transferrable Development Right receiving areas to improve the livability of the receiving area. Amenities should be provided at levels commensurate with the number of Transferrable Development Rights used in the receiving area. The type, timing and location of amenities provided to urban unincorporated Transferrable Development Right receiving areas should be informed by a public engagement process including members of the affected receiving area and the city affiliated with annexation."*

2. Rural and Resource Land Preservation TDR Program

We continue to disagree with item b. under existing Policy **R-323**: *"In order to satisfy transportation concurrency requirements in the Rural Area in a transportation concurrency travel shed that is non-concurrent, a development proposal for a short subdivision creating up to four lots may purchase Transferrable Development Rights from other Rural Area...."* Transportation Concurrency is a powerful tool which helps ensure infrastructure is in place for new development or that enables such development to be denied. It seems counterintuitive to allow development in a non-concurrent Travel Shed through the use of TDRs.

D. Nonresidential Uses

We continue to strongly support Policy **R-326** on facilities and continue our strong support for Policy **R-327** based on the recommendations of the School Siting Task Force.

E. Character and Development Standards

We strongly support the additions to Policy **R-336**: *"...Stormwater management practices should be implemented that emphasize preservation of natural drainage systems, protect water quality and natural hydrology of surface waters and groundwater. Rural development standards should also, where feasible, incorporate and encourage Low Impact Design principles for managing stormwater onsite by minimizing impervious surfaces, preserving onsite hydrology, retaining native vegetation and forest cover, capturing and reusing rainwater, controlling pollution at the source, and protecting groundwater. King County shall take care that requirements for onsite stormwater management complement requirements for onsite wastewater management."*

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

We call for restoring the full language in the Executive's proposed new Policy **R-336a**: *"To help achieve the goal of reducing energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with new construction, King County should adopt and implement green building codes that are appropriate, ambitious and achievable. Adoption of such codes may result in an increased use of solar panels, private wind generation turbines and similar renewable energy technologies that may need to be sited in the Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands, as appropriate. Development standards will seek to ensure that the siting, scale and design of these facilities respect and support rural character."* These are commonsense measures to protect our natural environment and institute green building codes, respectively.

VI. Resource Lands

C. Forestry

2. Promoting Forest Management

We support the addition to Policy **R-636** to include: *"...management of stormwater runoff and associated pollutants."*

We continue to take issue with the County's promotion of and support for the use of biosolids in forest ecosystems (e.g., Policy **R-639**: *"King County encourages the use of recycled, organic-based soil amendments, such as biosolids, and fertilizers in forest ecosystems,..."*). The spreading of municipal treated, but still-toxic sewage sludge on these lands and in and near riparian areas threatens their ecology and microbial life and can harm the wildlife. Based on years of study, we oppose the use of contaminated toxic-containing or pathogen-containing waste as a compost ingredient or as a fertilizer. Over the past quarter century, since the land spreading of treated sewage sludge (aka biosolids) and the recycling on land of sewage effluent (aka reclaimed water) was allowed in WA, many hundreds of scientific studies have shown an uptake of toxic chemicals in soils, plants, animals, and food crops. Over this time period, the evidence has become increasingly clear that treatment does not protect against the thousands of industrial, personal, and household products (chemicals of emerging concern), medical and veterinarian wastes, anti-biotic-resistant bacteria and genes, micro/ultrafine particulates, and other contaminants--as well as newly discovered pathogens--found in municipal waste. What the US EPA and the WA Department of Ecology deem legal does not make the substances safe. We support science-based evidence. We urge the County to investigate alternatives to land spreading that European countries have adopted--Switzerland bans land spreading and soon will Germany. We welcome further discussion of these critical issues and offer to provide County elected officials and staff a myriad of science-based reports concerning reuse of municipal sewage solids (see attached Supplemental Information). As a brief example of the strong work done in this area see:

https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-04/documents/targeted_national_sewage_sludge_survey_sampling_and_analysis_technical_report_0.pdf

; <http://cwmi.css.cornell.edu/case.pdf>; <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17180968>; <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/2/11>; <http://cwmi.css.cornell.edu/case.pdf>.

D. Agriculture

2. Sustaining Agriculture and Farming

We support the additions to Policy **R-668** regarding improving efficiency of water for agricultural use and incentives for irrigation efficiency. However, in both the prefacing

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

text and in Policy **R-668** the phrase “*recycled water*” is used in place of “*reclaimed water*.” As per our comments above under **VI.C.12**, we seek clarification of the County’s definition of “*recycled water*” and if it includes treated sewage effluent, which the WA Department of Ecology terms “*reclaimed water*.” We are concerned about toxic contaminants reaching both groundwater and crops and the subsequent potential for human and animal absorption of the waste chemicals. We want to ensure groundwater is tested prior to any waste being injected into the soils and as an on-going procedure. We believe sustainable agricultural production should be defined, in part, by both clean water inputs and clean water outputs, whatever the nature of the sources, uses and quantities of water involved. Water contaminated with pesticides or other toxic substances, particularly those that are persistent and/or systemic, should never be allowed to enter either surface or subsurface hydrological systems. Water used for food crop irrigation, livestock watering, and on farm food processing should be tested to establish a baseline and retested at reasonable intervals for contaminants that threaten health or food safety. A sound scientific basis should be used for both the selected interval(s) and the identified contaminant(s). Knowing the clear dangers treated sewage wastes pose we encourage the County to adopt the *Precautionary Principal* to help ensure public confidence and safety of our natural resources and public health. New and growing technologies--available through laboratories that currently assess multiple contaminants--aid in finding contaminants previously unknown in wastes. The County should contract with laboratories doing this work. A plethora of science-based studies exists on the perils of the use of reclaimed water for agricultural crops that deal with pathogens, pharmaceuticals, antimicrobials, flame retardants, micro/nano particles/fibers, estrogens, fluorides, etc. We include a set of these resources in the attached Supplemental Information.

E. Mineral Resources

We believe the addition of item “*1. Climate change impacts from coal mined for energy production;*” to Policy **R-689** is a good step, but it is too narrowly focused to coal mined for energy production (e.g., what about coal mined for steel manufacturing, etc.?). Mining operations could release trapped methane irrespective of what is being mined and the use of the product. We recommend the following change to the item: “*1. “Climate change impacts from ~~coal mined for energy production~~ direct or indirect emission of greenhouse gases.*”

We strongly support the addition of consideration of: “*...regional impacts from transport and assessment of climate change impacts from end-use of oil, gas and coal...*” to Policy **R-690**.

Chapter IV -- HOUSING AND HUMAN SERVICES

To ensure needed connectivity with transportation and services, we recommend some additions to the chapter’s overview paragraph as follows:

1st sentence: “*Establishment of vibrant, thriving, healthy, ((and)) sustainable and communities is a key goal of King County’s Strategic Plan.*” Add “*connected*” just before “*communities*.”

4th sentence; “*The ((CPPs)) Countywide Planning Policies provide a framework within which all jurisdictions are called upon to plan for a range of affordable housing*

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

choices within ((~~diverse, healthy, sustainable communities that include~~)) neighborhoods that promote health, well-being, diversity and access to opportunities for employment, recreation, social interaction and cohesion, active transportation (walking, biking and public transit) and education.” Add “and transportation” immediately after “affordable housing.” Also add “services,” immediately after “employment.”

I. Housing

We support the strong emphasis on affordable housing and on the need to address increasing homelessness. However, in the context of climate change and sustainability, we ask for an equal emphasis on much higher density development near high-quality transit – in transit corridors and, especially, in the vicinity of key transit hubs. Such housing can be affordable both in itself and by dramatically reducing parking and transportation costs. In addition, it will greatly reduce the infrastructure costs in light of expected population increases.

While existing affordable housing should be preserved or rehabilitated in most areas, high-density redevelopment needs to be prioritized adjacent to key transit hubs, creating or enhancing walkable town centers. For example, an important purpose of light rail is defeated, if a new station opens in an area that is already developed, but only to a low level of density, and as a consequence higher density redevelopment is severely restricted to preserve affordability for the few existing residences. This would dramatically reduce housing affordability options for all except the wealthiest residents, and push new development or redevelopment in the area to much less suitable locations. That is, prioritizing the preservation / displacement objective in such a context is a direct cause of escalating housing costs, lack of housing supply, and sprawl.

The wording of section **B. Strengthen Housing Linkages with Transportation** is compatible with these concerns, but such concerns are not consistently reflected in section **A. King County's Regional Role in Promoting Housing Choice and Opportunity**, particularly in the initial overview and in Policies **H-104** and **H-105**.

A. King County's Regional Role in Promoting Housing Choice and Opportunity ((Throughout King County))

Once again, to ensure needed connectivity with transportation we recommend a change to the first paragraph's 3rd sentence; *“However, local government actions such as land-use policies, development regulations and infrastructure finance also have a significant impact on housing affordability.”* Add *“and transportation”* immediately after *“land-use.”*

In the first paragraph at the top of p. 4-4 add the following to the end of the sentence: *“in the context of their transportation options.”* In the second paragraph's 1st sentence on p. 4-4 replace *“new”* with *“higher density”* so it reads: *“...in areas for higher density development near high capacity and frequent transit.”* At the end of the 3rd sentence add: *“where higher density development is not a priority.”* Delete the 4th sentence as the recommended addition to the 3rd sentence makes it moot.

1. Regional Convener

We support proposed new (actually, moved from Chapter 2) Policy **H-102**, but the original language: *“...within the Urban Growth Area,”* which the Executive proposed to be maintained, should be restored. King County should not be looking at expanding housing beyond the Urban Growth Area. This also applies to Policy **H-103**.

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

We support proposed new (actually, moved from Chapter 2) Policies **H-104** and **H-105**. However, they are nearly identical (i.e, rental and ownership, respectively) and could be combined. If done, we recommend adding the following at the end of the newly combined Policy: *“In some areas experiencing strong demand for more housing, especially near key transit hubs, preservation strategies may be a cost-effective way to maintain affordable housing for some, but these strategies must not be allowed to drive escalating housing costs for the majority by overly restricting higher density redevelopment that includes affordable housing.”*

2. Support Housing Models and Policies that Promote Healthy Communities, Housing Affordability and an End to Homelessness

We support proposed new (actually, moved from Chapter 2) Policy **H-113**. However, we recommend changing the 2nd sentence thusly: *“King County should work on a regional level with jurisdictions to enact a comprehensive healthy housing code system in the county that encourages walkable neighborhoods with green space and that provides for regular inspection of rental housing units for violations of healthy housing standards, including in unincorporated King County.”*

We support Policy **H-115**. However, we recommend adding the following to the end of the sentence: *“...and encourages encampments with municipally supported management and services on a temporary basis as needed.”*

3. Fair Housing Access

In the opening paragraph’s 2nd sentence we recommend adding “or minority” immediately after “moderate-income.”

Chapter IV -- ENVIRONMENT

I. Natural Environment and Regulatory Context

A. Integrated Approach

We call for restoring the Executive’s proposed additions (*“...floodplain management plans, stormwater retrofitting plans and salmon recovery plans.”*) to Policy **E-104**. Listing of such Plans is not redundant and are critical to informing the development of environmental regulations, restoration/mitigation projects, and incentive/stewardship programs, thus ensuring consistency.

II. Climate Change

We strongly support linking to the King County’s 2015 Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP), a comprehensive legislative and policy plan for climate action that outlines both commitments and policies.

Countywide

We recognize the challenge inherent in the need for GHG emissions reductions. We urge the County to set and update, as necessary, targets that are supported by climate science to ensure climate stabilization. Working targets such as 50 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2030 provide a good starting point, but may need to be adjusted according to the science to keep planetary warming below an acceptable threshold.

Status of King County Climate Change Efforts

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

A shared measurement framework is very important to support with adequate resources and update with the best recognized science. The County will only track and respond to the quantities that it accurately measures.

B. Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In Policy **E-206c** we recommend the original “80% by 2050” target be restored.

D. Collaboration with Others

We support new Policy **E-227** *“King County supports comprehensive federal, regional and state science-based limits and a market-based price on carbon pollution and other greenhouse gas emissions. A portion of revenue from these policies should support local greenhouse gas emissions reduction efforts, such as funding for transit service, energy efficiency projects, and forest protection and restoration initiatives. King County also supports renewable energy standards for electricity production and vehicle efficiency performance standards.”* Further, we recommend the County explore Carbon Trading or Carbon Taxes, so as to truly price the true cost of Carbon emissions.

III. Air Quality

B. Ozone, Fine Particulate, Toxics

We continue to support Policy **E-301** to reduce emissions from outdoor wood burning and recommend large “slash burns” be eliminated and the debris composted.

IV. Land and Water Resources

A. Conserving King County’s Biodiversity

3. Biodiversity Conservation Approaches

d. Decisions in the Face of Uncertainty

Policy **E-417** states; *“King County should take precautionary action informed by best available science where there is a significant risk of damage to the environment.”* Although “precautionary action” is an essential part of good policy, other Policies herein should tie into such an approach.

g. Habitat and Development

While we support the change to Policy **E-425** (*“To protect or improve adjacent wetlands and aquatic habitats...”*), we remain concerned. Buffers and control of development along waterways are required to reduce sedimentation in water, but this requires both consistency in permitting and subsequent enforcement. When “buffer averaging” is used, it should be applied in such a way as to ensure continued protection of adjacent wetlands and no degradation of aquatic habitat. These same comments also apply to Policies **E-475** and **E-499-c**.

Chapter VI -- SHORELINES

Since the policies herein comprise the County’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP), which already was approved in 2014 by Ecology and, thus, there are no substantive changes to address, we provide no comments.

Chapter VII -- PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

General Comments: We support the need to retain, maintain, and enhance our shared parks and open space. We support the conservation principles identified including concepts such as: “*contiguous*” forests (**P-103**), “regional” trail corridors (**P-120**), “forest stewardship” plans (**P-128a**), and “integrated pest management” (**P-128b**).

I. Parks, Recreation, and Open Space

B. Components of the Regional Open Space System

3. Regional Trails System

Eastside Rail Corridor

We support the Policies **P-110**, **P-110a**, and **P-110b**. However, to reiterate our previous comments (see Chapter 2 earlier herein), we believe far more emphasis must be given to a true multimodal corridor that enthusiastically embraces a robust regional trail system and multiple mass transit modes (including frequent electrified all-day transit service).

Chapter VIII -- TRANSPORTATION

II. Providing Services and Infrastructure that Support County Land Use Vision

C. Public Transportation System

We strongly support the statement which immediately proceeds both Policies **T-204** and **T-205** on p. 8-14, “*Metro also partners with jurisdictions and the private sector to spur transit-oriented development through redevelopment opportunities at or adjacent to park-and-rides.*” The County should make more explicit that park-and-rides are a form of land banking that can be used for transit-oriented development when housing and commercial demand and transit service make such transition feasible.

F. Level of Service Standards

We call for restoring the Executive’s proposed listing of potential congestion reduction measures in new Policy **T-214b** as it meets the intent of the Growth Management Act: “*...supports reduction of vehicle miles traveled and reliance on single occupancy vehicle trips,....*” These are key tools that must be employed, if we are to expect to solve our ever-growing congestion problems.

I. Nonmotorized Transportation Plan

We support the proposed changes to Policies **T-231 through T-244** to support and enhance nonmotorized forms of transportation and meet the goals of Vision 2040 and Transportation 2040.

J. Transportation Demand Management

We strongly support the proposed new Policy **T-248** (renumbered) as part of the County’s Transportation Demand Management strategies: “*King County should promote employee transportation programs that encourage trip reduction, use of public transportation, walking, and bicycling, and provide regional leadership by modeling this with its own employees.*” Leading by example will help such strategies spread to the private sector.

We suggest the following modifications to Policy **T-251** regarding Transportation Demand Management as the County is an advocate for integrated transportation solutions, as well as climate change actions: “*King County supports a comprehensive road user charge system that includes environmental cost accounting and parking and congestion*”

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

pricing strategies as a means to optimize transportation system performance, generate revenues in a more sustainable financing model, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”

III. Ensuring Effective Management and Efficient Operations

D. Climate Change, Air Quality, and the Environment

We support the proposed new commonsense Policy **T-324a**: *“King County will reduce greenhouse gas emissions from its off-road vehicles and equipment by using low-carbon fuels and advanced technologies, and by partnering with other agencies to implement demonstration projects using these vehicle technologies.”*

IV. Financing Services and facilities that Meet Local and Regional Goals

D. Revenue Shortfall

We call for restoring the Executive’s use of the word “existing” in the addition made to Policy **T-405**: *“...to maintain, preserve and improve existing transportation infrastructure and service levels.”* This would be in line with the KCDOT’s policy to focus on existing road and bridge maintenance and preservation, rather than “improve” (i.e., add capacity to) transportation infrastructure.

V. Coordination and Public Outreach

A. Regional Coordination

We call for restoring the Executive’s proposed addition: *“...of maintaining an average speed of 45 mph or greater at least 90% of the time during the morning and afternoon peak hours.”* to Policy **T-505**. Should State standards for HOV lanes change in ways that are bad for the environment and traffic management, such a particular metric, which is very important to King County ought to be called out as a specific example, or as a minimum in addition to the state standards. This specific standard should remain in the policy as a County defined minimum for HOV lane performance.

We support the Executive’s proposed new Policy **T-507b** to support transit and mobility options, as well as the addition by the TrEE Committee of: *“ , with a commitment to dual use (recreational trail and public transportation), consistent with federal railbanking.”* However, with the text *“...Transit and nonmotorized...”* deleted just after the addition, the language then downplays transit, *“multimodal facilities, including regional trails.”* Either the statement ought to drop the qualifier *“...including regional trails”*, or add another specific call-out: *“ including regional trails and transit corridors.”* It is better to keep the language parallel and balanced; dual use really is just that.

Chapter IX -- Services, Facilities, and Utilities -- No comments.

Chapter X -- Economic Development -- No comments.

Chapter XI -- Community Service Area Planning -- No comments.

Chapter XII -- Implementation

Sierra Club Comments 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Update

We support the changes to **I-203b** to remove item b.5. A Demonstration Project to build a large number of homes on the Reserve Silica site in Ravensdale has been riddled with a variety of concerns not the least of which include: traffic impacts in an area with very little infrastructure; inappropriate land use of an area that is required to be reclaimed to forestry after mining is complete; and a long history of environmental problems, not the least of which is highly toxic materials dumped on site over the years. The area is surrounded by the Forest Production District and Open Space and is completely inappropriate for a large housing development at the end of the Rural fringe.

APPENDICES -- No comments.

ATTACHMENTS -- No comments.

See attached:

Supplemental Information on Biosolids and Agricultural Water Use

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Brian	Duffer	<p>7</p> <p>While I have no objection to further development in our county, nor any objection to progress, my concern is that it be done responsibly and with a vision toward the future. The major concern I have towards the proposed changes to the zoning regulations is to bulleted item two, where service conditions being addressed and improved will read simply "not degraded." This seems a short-sighted and vague wording, allowing for any number of interpretations, where a developer could come in and build, not make needed improvements to the infrastructure based on some subjective valuing of no degrading and walk away. It would seem much wiser to continue to expect any and all developers to make needed and necessary improvements before finishing a project. My fear is that this proposed change then leaves it to local communities to "pick up the pieces" and fund the improvements that should otherwise have been made in the first place. One obvious impact will be the added traffic to the already overloaded Falcon Way / 219th and cetra, since it is the only entrance and exit that is functional to both Kentlake Highlands and Kentlake Senior High.</p>
Jacob	Orchard	<p>3</p> <p>We are homeowners in The Estates neighborhood in Carnation and we oppose the current proposal for the new design and layout of the new development behind our home (Proposed Ordinances 2016-0155 and 2016-0159). While we are not happy about the proposal at all, our main concern is the use of our neighborhood as the only means of reaching the new development and the new roadway being built along the rear fence line of a numerous homes in our neighborhood, of which we are one of. We specifically bought here because of it being private, quiet, having little traffic and having abundant wildlife that we see in the back field and wooded area that is behind our home. Daily, we observe a variety of animals such as deer, coyotes, hawks and bald eagles. The placement of the road bordering along our rear fence line as the only access to the development will decrease the values of our homes, add traffic and pedestrian noise and remove all of our privacy. We paid a premium for our lot overlooking the farmland field where the proposed development is going and we are elevated high with a low fence line; adding this road will destroy what made this private, peaceful quiet neighborhood an appealing place to live. We refuse to allow our neighborhood to become the only cut through to the new development. Our roads here are designed for neighborhoods, not main roadway type of traffic. We propose joining the new development to an already existing road, either 60th St or 55th St, as to give them direct access to Hwy 203 and keep our neighborhood safe, peaceful, private and protect our home values. If the current plan is approved we would expect some sort of new retaining wall, fencing and foliage buffer that meets the approval of all the current residents affected in The Estates provided by the new developer. Please consider our request and reject or amend the proposal as to not ruin and infringe on the property and privacy of already existing members of our city. Jacob and Michelle Orchard 32988 NE 52nd St Carnation, WA 98014</p>
Jason	Morgan	<p>3</p> <p>I'm concerned about the increased traffic. Not only will there be traffic in front of my house (which is fine) but also directly behind my house. As a result, I do believe this would diminish the value of my home and others around me, not increase it. In addition, the increased traffic through the neighborhood may increase the risk of "children at play" getting getting hurt. There must be a better option to this proposed plan so that traffic doesn't need to go through our neighborhood first. If this was your home, would you want this done directly behind your quiet, private backyard?</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Randall	Kim	3
Nate	Johnson	3

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Kathleen Arnold	8	<p>My comments refer specifically to the proposed affordable housing development on Gorsuch Road in Vashon. I am unable to attend the public hearing on November 28, 2016 because of work commitments. While I am in favor of having more affordable housing, the proposed site on Gorsuch Road is unfortunately not an appropriate place for this project. Gorsuch Road is close to the bus line and walking distance from uptown Vashon, but it is a very rural area. We don't have any uptown amenities such as sewers, sidewalks, or streetlights. The street runs downhill from Vashon Highway; my neighborhood is in a valley. The proposed development is uphill from my property on the same side of the street. During the rainy season a lot of water runs down my street and onto my property. Last November and December when the rains were heavy, the drainage ditches running down Gorsuch overflowed and the ensuing floods wrecked my gravel driveway. King County graciously sent Mr. Jim Didriksen to my house to help with the driveway damage. Paving over a large section of upstream land can only add to the water runoff problems on our street. There is an environmental aspect to all the water in the neighborhood as well; this is our drinking water and we are the stewards of this very important asset. People who live in a critical aquifer recharge area like my neighborhood have to seriously commit to this responsibility: toxic chemicals, wastes, pesticides, herbicides, and errant sewage discharge must be avoided. I question how strongly a community of renters with a for-profit management company would take this to heart. The latest draft of the King County Comprehensive Plan for Vashon-Maury Island prioritizes preserving environmentally sensitive areas, protecting our water supply, and limiting growth and housing density in critical groundwater recharge areas. I respect the wisdom that has gone into writing this plan. The proposed development on Gorsuch Road is not consistent with the principles of our community plan, so it should be rejected. Thank you for this opportunity to express my opinions.</p>
Richard Mathias	8	<p>A few years ago Wesley Homes purchased a large platt of land in Fairwood with the intention of eventually building a retirement and assisted care center. Located west of 140 Ave. SE. and south of Petrovitsky Road, the land's residential density rating is R6. They will need an R18 before they can commence planning the Fairwood facility. Many Fairwood residents are now in retirement and attend the local Methodist, Lutheran and Catholic churches. As they approach their golden years they will need a local retirement center like this. Wesley Homes is a not-for-profit organization with successful retirement facilities in Des Moines, Auburn and currently being built in Puyallup. They are highly preferred both from a cost and a living comfort standpoint. They have long waiting lists of prospective residents... I appeal to you to change the residential density code for the Wesley Homes Fairwood development to R18. Richard Mathias Fairwood resident</p>
Gregory Nereim	3	<p>Regarding Map Amendment #10 / 328th Avenue NE Near NE 60th St I am a resident of the neighborhood called the Estates at Snoqualmie Valley Trail. This proposed land action appears to provide access to the a development through the Estates neighborhood via the main entrance and a road that currently dead ends at the property under consideration. I have concerns about this and I oppose having my neighborhood used as the access to the proposed new development. I would like to see the access for that development to be placed somewhere else. My concerns are due to the increased traffic volume on our narrow streets. There are many children in the neighborhood, and this would route the additional traffic right past an established park where they frequently play.</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name		District	Comment
Irene	Kotulak	3	<p>I am a homeowner at the Estates at Snoqualmie Valley Trail community in Carnation. I am concerned about the proposal to build a new road connecting my neighborhood to a future development (parcels 1525079049, 1525079005 and 1525079010). This proposed road through our community would significantly increase traffic and noise, and impact the home values of many of my neighbors' homes that face the proposed road site. If the new neighboring community residents are driving through my neighborhood to get to and from their homes, they will be continually driving right by our community playground/park. We have many young children in our neighborhood who play at that park, and I am concerned about their safety with the increased traffic, especially since many people tend to speed more through neighborhoods that are not their own. Additionally, I believe the road in our neighborhood is narrower than standard roads. I do not believe our road is designed for through-traffic. I don't believe bringing more traffic through our community is a wise option, especially when there is a very suitable alternative option for a road (NE 55th Street), which would connect the new community directly to SR 203 instead of bringing all that traffic through existing neighborhoods. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Barbara	speaks	9	<p>This comment is for proposed ordinances 2016-0155 and 2016-0159. I live 500 feet away. This is regarding the development almost directly across the street from me. I have been a resident in Lake Sawyer since 1977. I am a disabled senior low income. IN 2006 Yarrow Bay widened my road 10 feet all on my side and raised the road up higher in front of my driveway. they did not put in a drain. MY driveway and front yard was turned into their drainage pond and driveway sank. MY foundation has settled. I was not able to sue at that time, but if they do not fix the damage I am going to. I suffered from chronic depression all those years and colon problems, too. If the forest across the street is cut down a second drain out by the road will be needed. Also those acres of trees are my only south wind break. The foothills are windier than Seattle. I have about 20 100 feet 3 feet in diameter fir trees. Some are on city land and many are on mine. I want all of those giant firs taken out and the stumps removed or ground down. (excluding septic and water line areas). I have had two large 100 foot trees come down because of development. One two years ago that missed my house by four feet. Soon there will not be any more tall trees in Lake Sawyer area because of development, except for parks, too dangerous! I know they have to leave a buffer by the creek, but that will not help me. Traffic wise this arterial is already busy. It will just make it worse. Kentlake High and Cedar Heights schools are at full capacity. / Where will the kids attend ? sincerely, Barbara Speaks</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Chris	Hawkins	<p>I am writing with a concern regarding new development in Carnation, WA. There is a proposed plan that would build a new access road through my development (The Estates) that would force new Carnation residents to drive through my neighborhood in order to reach their own. I have lived in a neighborhood in Sammamish that served as a thoroughfare for other newer developments, and people routinely drove rapidly past my home and others in an effort to more quickly get to theirs. As a parent of four young children ages 3-7, this is frightening. I am not against development at all. My family and I are the beneficiaries of greater development in Carnation and I look forward to future growth! I feel strongly, however, that any new road construction that causes one development to travel through another creates an unnecessary risk for the residents and their children, especially. My neighborhood, at least, has sidewalks. New traffic would pass through older neighborhoods without sidewalks and along travelways used by dozens of school children to and from the nearby Carnation Elementary. As much as I'd like to believe that citizens would use "common sense" and slow down through residential streets on their way home, I know this is not reality. If it were, the traffic calming trend in civil engineering would not be so prevalent. I think that both the new development and the existing residencies near mine would benefit greatly from having a separate neighborhood access, likely off of Tolt Ave. This way new residents would more quickly be able to get home, and traffic would not increase through my neighborhood and through the existing homes nearby. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns and ideas and for conscientiously working towards intelligent growth in our communities. Please feel free to contact me further.</p>
Adair	Hawkins	<p>I am deeply concerned about my children's safety with the proposed main road that is supposed to be built on 328th avenue NE, near 60th street. This road would connect the Main Street by the elementary school to a new, large neighborhood and there would be a lot of traffic right by the kids' park. My family and I moved to the neighborhood "the Estates" because it is an enclosed neighborhood with out any main roads going through it. I propose that the new road be connected to NE 60th ST, which would allow direct route to SR 203. Thank you, Adair Hawkins</p>
Donna	Stock	<p>I would like to express my support for rezoning of property in the Fairwood area near 140th Ave SE and Petrovitsky Road. I understand this is referred to as Fairwood A in the Plan. I especially want to support the rezoning that is necessary for the continuing care retirement facility. My parents lived in the Wesley Homes facility in Des Moines for many years, living in various settings - an independent house, an independent apartment, in an assisted living apartment and in the nursing home. My family was extremely grateful for the Wesley Homes option for them. I only see the need for this kind of quality care for senior citizens growing and hope that you will support their efforts in the Fairwood location. Thank you!</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District		Comment
Kerry	Holt	le to dete	<p>While I reside in District 5, this comment concerns my property located within District 3, parcel number 3024069019. I strongly oppose the changes contained within King County Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment #6. Specifically, I object to the listed parcels being removed from the City of Issaquah potential annexation area. The current proposal leaves this relatively small area landlocked between Bellevue and Issaquah but not within a potential annexation area. I have grave concerns about whether King County will be able to effectively provide necessary services to this small, isolated area over the long term. The current proposal ensures that the County will continue to be faced with the difficult and expensive task of providing services to this small, isolated area for the foreseeable future. Removing these parcels from the annexation area is not in the best interest of the County or the residents of the area. I also strongly oppose the proposal to change the zoning of my particular parcel, parcel 3024069019, from Urban Reserve to Rural Area. We specifically purchased this property within the Urban Growth Area because of the possibility of future growth, development and incorporation into a community that would provide the necessary services to its citizen property owners. There is no reason to change the zoning of our parcel to Rural. This is evidenced by the development of nearby parcels with residential zoning. While I believe that the property's best use in the distant future may ultimately be residential development as the population of King County grows, at this point I only urge you to retain the property's current designation of Urban Reserve.</p>
GEORGE	TERHAAR	le to dete	<p>In the proposed 2016 update to the King County Comprehensive Plan -- Ordinances 2016-0155 and 2016-0159, it would appear that a proposed right-of-way would significantly impact my property. If the UGA boundary of Highpoint Street and 248th Ave. SE is extended west and later a road was made through the area, the neighbors' and my road would be impacted. Plus, my privacy hedge would be lost. If this is true, our property values would diminish as traffic would be much closer to my residence. Selling the property would be dramatically impacted as well; I cannot foresee anyone wanting to have traffic that near to his/her house. With this in mind, I am strongly opposed to moving the right-of-way.</p>
Charles	Hurt	9	<p>I am writing in opposition to the planned development of Addison Park in the Fairwood area. I have great concern about the increased car traffic in the area and specifically as it affects the Forest Estates neighborhood and the walking families and children on the way to Carriage Crest Elementary. It is shortsighted to move forward with the plan that gives Addison Park residents access to the Forest Estates neighborhood at the intersection chosen when the safety of students should be given the highest priority.</p>
S	WEIch	9	<p>RE: Covington Creek Development "November 28th, 2016 in downtown Seattle at 1:30 PM for those who would like to voice their opinion" is simply not satisfactory. I strongly suggest you reschedule the meeting. It's unreasonable to think that those of us that live in the neighborhood can possibly make it to downtown Seattle on a weekday let alone midday. This is not satisfactory. The road structure and routes need to be addressed: They cannot simply be crossed out of the plan. The planned community is massive and the infrastructure needs to be planned.</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name		District	Comment
Maria	Pickering	3	<p>In reference to the amendment to the Urban Growth Area boundary, the land use map and zoning affecting the new development The Estates, I would like to express my position of disapproval to the proposal. The construction of a road as a connecting via to another development will affect the current status of privacy, security and traffic within our residential. It could potential affect the value of the homes which main appeal was again privacy, security and low traffic. The county can utilize an existing road (NE 60th St) to the new development which will give the new residents direct route to SR 203 and preserve the current layout of the The Estates in Carnation. We hope that the county will make the right the decision by supporting all parties interest. Very Respectfully, Maria and Ken Pickering</p>
William	Griffin	3	<p>We received a letter in the mail regarding proposed map ammendment #10 in Carnation. The existing "Land Use And Zoning Ammendments" documents that is on the website is dated September 1, 2016 and only includes the proposed map ammendments #1-#9. We are in the process of making changes to our back yard and construction was slated to start in two weeks. The proposed road runs across the full length of the back side of our property. We have had to put that on hold until we have more information regarding these proposed zoning changes. How can we find out more about proposed map amendment #10? How can we find out more about the plans? How can we find out who the developer is that is requesting to make these zoning changes? The road that is being proposed which runs along the back-side of our property and would sit within the 100 year flood plain. Will the road be raised up out of the 100 year flood plain? Would it be raised to match the height of our yard? What about water run-off from the road? If we had a retaining wall across the back of our property would it be impacted by the construction of the road and/or it's water management? What about light pollution from new street lights? How many street lights would be added and where? Thank you in advance for helping us to get answers to these questions.</p>
Teresa	Ostle	3	<p>Regarding proposed map ammendment #10 - East Cougar Mountain Innovation Area - I am in full support of rezoning the proposed 24 parcels from "upd" to "ra" but would like the council to seriously consider rezoning it as open space/park as it abuts Cougar Mountain Park. This area is one of few remaining areas for wildlife (bears, coyotes, bobcats) especially in view of all the proposed and active development along Newport Way in Issaquah. Thank you.</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name		District	Comment
Barbara	Reuter	9	<p>I live as property owner quite close to the proposed land use action/area zoning change. I am opposed to the King County Comprehensive Plan re-zoning for parcels 3423059035, 9031 and 9061 despite the recognized need to have to have senior and affordable housing. I commute to work in a van pool, which meets at the Park and Ride at Nativity Lutheran Church, 17707 140th Ave. SE in Renton, adjacent to the properties. Turning left out of that property is frightening, as traffic converges from the businesses on both east and west sides of 140th Ave. SE. I have witnessed many "near collisions" from drivers turning both right and left from both sides of the street with no traffic signals. The traffic backs up severely from 140th St. and Petrovitsky intersection both north and south, as well as east and west, during extended a.m. and p.m. rush hour periods. I leave by 6:45am and am home by 5pm, and the traffic is nightmarish. There is simply not the infrastructure with the surrounding two lane roads in either direction (which turns into a one lane road heading south on 140th Ave. SE when it changes into 132nd Ave. SE) to consider adding high urban residences such as senior housing (which will also include additional traffic from all the employees driving to and from work at Wesley Homes), not to mention the addition to a multifamily development apartment complex. The quality of life with additional traffic burden on existing infrastructure would be a factor in our decision to relocate out of King County.</p>
William	Lyell	8	<p>Input on Zoning Change Proposal to Vashon, Section 29, Township 23, Range 03. If the area of proposed change is properly inspected, it would be rezoned as a wetland, not eligible for consideration for additional building. This area is definitely a wetland with a stream running though it. King County needs additional low income housing, but not at the expense of destroying an established wetland.</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Mark	Lanz	<p>7 The Reserve at Covington Creek and Oakpointe at Black Diamond Housing Developments I received a letter this week from King County informing us they are planning to build a new housing development (Reserve at Covington Creek) across Falcon Way, which is the main street out of our community (Kentlake Highlands). This comes after progress has been made on another new community (Oakpointe at Ten Trails) 4.5 miles down Lake Sawyer Road in Black Diamond. The proposal for the Reserve is for 80 new homes to be built. In a news story (Voice of the Valley, 2016) it's reported that 320 of 4,800 new homes are scheduled to be built in phase one of the Oakpointe project, with the first home being ready for occupancy in January of 2018. In the draft letter from King County they provided several amended zoning conditions where certain wording has been crossed out or underlined. The one thing that caught my eye is the amendment for our road infrastructure. In a statement below, King County (2016) has crossed out "addressed and improved" and substitutes "not degraded" that is somewhat vague, which could also be interpreted possibly as "do nothing." When hundreds of new vehicles are introduced to our existing roadways, how does King County purpose to keep the roads from becoming degraded, unless they have been improved? "King County and any development applicant shall address traffic in the area to ensure that existing level of service conditions are ((addressed and improved -)) not degraded ((-)) by any future development; and." (addressed and improved has a strike-through in the draft letter that does not appear here in the text box) My concern is it appears they will not be doing anything to address the substantial increase in traffic that will occur in the next few years as nearly 4,900 new homes are completed, each with at least one vehicle added to our immediate roadways. There is only a 25 mph road leading from Oakpointe through Black Diamond to HWY169, also two lanes and 35 mph for several miles each way. Traffic will likely be traveling Lake Sawyer Road that runs in front of Kentlake Highlands with variable speeds between 35 and 45 mph, in addition to an elementary school with 20 mph school zone. How will the significant increase in traffic affect our daily commutes? A King County Council hearing is scheduled for November 28th, 2016 in downtown Seattle at 1:30 PM for those who would like to voice their opinion, or you can provide comments online regarding the proposed Reserve at Covington Creek. While there is probably not much that can be done about the new communities going in nearby, it may be possible to have the existing road infrastructures in our immediate area "addressed and improved" sooner than later. Some useful links are provided for more information on this matter. Public Hearing Notice (Scroll to the bottom for the notice on The Reserve) http://www.kingcounty.gov/council/2016compplan/notice.aspx Additional information on Oakpointe in Black Diamond http://www.inblackdiamond.com/ Reference King County. (2016). Reserve at Covington Creek. King County. Retrieved from http://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/CompPlan/2016/notice/ReserveAtCovingtonCreek-BlackDiamond_notice.ashx?la=en Voice of the Valley. (2016). Ground</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Peter	Sluder	<p>In regards to the Fairwood A Zoning and Land Use Study. I am strongly opposed to the R-18-P or higher density re zoning of the parcels in the study. There currently is already a very large high density apartment complex in this general area (Pebble Cove) as well as single family homes and town homes. These large dense rental properties such as the existing Pebble Cove tend to bring more theft, vandalism and irresponsible tenants to the area vs homeowners. Multiple homeowners including myself have already dealt with theft and vandalism in the area. There are also many cars I see regularly doing double the speed limit out of the dense apartment complex in the area on the only road out as well as on the surrounding streets. I am a bicyclist and a Harborview ER/Critical Care Transport nurse by profession for 16 years in the area and have seen plenty of the aftermath in relationship to the over development and over population of areas. Especially areas that incorporate a larger percentages of renters. I am not against the development of the area but I believe a lower density project (although not as profitable for the land owner/developer) will better maintain the safety and quality of life in the area. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
Rosanna	Phillips	<p>When we purchased our home, we were told that the proposed land near our home, mentioned in the plan above, would stay a green space- that it would never be built upon. It was a huge factor in our decision to purchase in our neighborhood. Our family uses the green space trails on a regular basis. We have seen deer, coyotes, rabbits, raccoons and even a bear in our streets over the last few years while driving and while on walks- removing this green space would eliminate another safe refuge for the wildlife. Traffic is already a headache, and your proposed changes do not even make sure that any traffic challenges are dealt with. When our developer was working on our neighborhood, we had to wait longer for our homes, because a stoplight had to be added- which we are very grateful for now after living in this house for over 10 years. If you do decide to allow a designated green space to be destroyed, more cars are coming (when you figure most homes have at least 2 vehicles- on our street there are several homes with 3-6 vehicles at one home), then the developers should make things better, not just "not create a detriment". Thank you for taking time to read this. Rosanna Phillips</p>
Andrew	Bailey	<p>Developing the land next to Kentlake High school should not be allowed. We purchased our homes in Kentlake Highlands with the understanding that that land surrounding it was not zoned for this use. Rezoning the land feels like you are just selling us out. Traffic is already a mess when the school is starting or ending, traffic on 272nd and Maple valley Highway is already getting out of control. We already get no resources (being in unincorporated King County) with police response times ranging from two hours to a full day. Now we are expected to just let the county change the rules for a quick buck and share our already nearly non-existent resources with another 80 new households? No thank you. Why can't they build a development where the rules allow for it? There's plenty of space out here without changing the rules for cash.</p>

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name		District	Comment
Christine	Hunt	7	I oppose development of the area at SE Falcon Way at 216th and SE 296th Street. 1. Natural space must be protected. There is creek that runs through this area. The area is home to wildlife, including osprey, eagles, deer, coyote, and rabbits. 2. This area cannot handle more traffic. Traffic will only get worse as it is with the large amount of development already starting in Black Diamond. As well, SE Falcon Way is already dangerous due to speeding high schoolers on their way too and from school. I live in the Kentlake Highlands neighborhood across from the school. It can be difficult turning left out of neighborhood amidst students speeding. There has also been at least one accident where a speeder lost control of their car, left the road on SE Falcon Way, and crashed through a backyard fence. Adding more traffic to this area will increase accidents and congestion. Please keep this area natural.
Brad	Booth	3	Regarding: Tall Chief Area Zoning and Land Use As an owner of property directly adjacent to one of the effected parcels, I would like to submit my support for the plan as long as parcels # 052407-9025 and # 052407-9026 remain forestlands as indicated in the proposal. Thank you, Brad Booth
Jerry	Flagel	9	As a resident of Fairwood for 45 years, I see the aging of many in my community. I'm asked frequently if I know of good retirement homes. (I am 75). Having a retirement home in Renton/Fairwood would be an excellent addition to Renton/Fairwood. I heartily support the rezone of this area to accommodate a retirement home and skilled nursing facility in this community. Jerry Flagel
Elke	Lewis	3	TO: King County TrEE Committee RE: Comprehensive Plan Meeting on 9/20/16 A "THANK YOU" NOTE TO YOU.... I am Elke B. Lewis and I reside at 2618 - 271 Avenue S.E., Issaquah, WA 98029 (Duthie Hill Notch). I am a neighbor of Robert Braeutigam who resides at 2640 - 271 Avenue S.E. Robert represents those of us who oppose the revision of the Urban Growth Boundary to include the Duthie Hill Notch within the UGA which would open us up to annexation and development. We make our concerns known to those involved with the Comprehensive Plan. We watch the telecasts and review The King County website. We are PLEASED to see that you have concurred with Executive Staff recommendations and have NOT made any change to the UGA in our area. THANK YOU for listening to us! We enjoy our area and lifestyle here in the Duthie Hill Notch. We feel it is a special area for those of us fortunate to live here and is very unique in that our setting offers the perfect environment for wildlife with a pond and wetlands and game trails in our country setting. To alter this area in any way would shatter such a rural, private location and forever negatively impact our lives and the wildlife that call our Notch "home". If you are personally familiar with the Plateau, it is alarmingly being transformed into urban sprawl. There is construction going on up here almost everywhere you turn. THANK YOU, again, for your consideration and listening to our concerns. Respectfully, Elke B. Lewis

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Tim	Kelly	9 <p>I had been asked to comment previously and had sent the following questions on a number of occasions to a Ms. Claussen so that I could reasonably comment. I have not received a reply to any of my questions and would be better able to comment if I had some information to comment on. Ms. Claussen, Thank you for the opportunity to learn more about the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update. I noticed you have fine-tuned the 2016 comprehensive plan update to single out specific parcels for development and zoning changes; Also of note was the additional Council Motions included in the 2016 work that will appropriate tax dollars that will assist in development of the these specific parcels. I also noted that all of the parcels listed for "study" have open permits. Because I live near the parcels listed in the Fairwood 1 area (Motion 14276) I'll try to keep my questions specific to this area; and please note that the questions below assume that the study will allow for the parcels to be re-zoned and I would request that your answers are prepared assuming the same. In the unlikely event the study finds a facility can be placed elsewhere, or we don't need one, or the site is inadequate, or money would be better spend doing something other for senior citizens, than I realize the project will not happen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you forward me information and docket(s) on the site-specific amendment application(s) for the parcels listed in Motion 14276 and any relevant review comments by the King County Hearing Examiner. 2. Since the parcels in the study are already tied to an open permit, is the County going to close the current permits prior to re-zoning, then require the developer to re-set the permit clock to allow for public comment and due process. 3. Will the study include the cost (and taxpayer expense) of looking at traffic, access and environmental concerns associated with the development. If so, will the developer (again assuming it is rezoned) reimburse the county for this work. 4. Why did the study specifically select the named parcels when there are thousands of other parcels that would be better suited or simply build in the areas that are currently zoned. The current comp plan did look at this issue, addresses the need and afford appropriate zoned areas. Why not use those? 5. The tenant of the Comprehensive Plan is to look into a 20 year horizon and not to recommend stop gap solutions, is your study targeting this 20 year window and if the need for a senior center is shown, what is the earliest allowable re-zone afforded the developer thru the Comp Plan. 6. The motion mentions the study is for non-profit (which actually is a misnomer as it does profit a lot of people) senior housing. Is this sole intent of the study and the only outcome this study will look at. If not, what else is included in the scope of the study. 7. I don't understand how the equity and social justice initiative would have any nexus with this decision, quite the opposite as it appears to benefit Wesely Homes and Columbia Bank. Wesely Homes is affiliated with the methodist church, if you look at the history of the church it is arguably one of the least socially inclusive organizations in the world while Columbia bank limits its affiliates to those with money. 8. Could you tell me who submitted the original request or study that indicated this great need for Senior
Ed & Bob	Frazelle	le to dete <p>Very Short We live only a few blocks from where they want to re-zone. 180 & 140 in Fairwood</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic is already very bad This location would make it even worse near the business area. 2. We already have water problems. Water comes down the hill and floods our crawl space The swamp behind us sometimes floods the street. They tried to fix the water problem; however it still raises the water level. (140th & 181st) Ed Frazelle 14027 SE 181st St Renton, WA 98058

2016 Comprehensive Plan Comments from Council Web Site

Received September 20 through November 28, 2016

Name	District	Comment
Joel	Riehl	<p>Regarding Issaquah-Hobart Road (which is a soul-crushing, property value-killing ordeal every day), traffic flow improvements are proposed in the new Comprehensive Plan for the stretch between Cedar Grove Road and May Valley Road. In point of fact, the stretch between Highway 18 (and in my case, the entrance to Mirrormont) and Cedar Grove Road is much worse on the morning commute. Traffic typically lightens once one is past Cedar Grove Road. This is my experience over 25 years of living in Mirrormont. I don't know what your data is telling you, but my experience is telling me you are focusing on the wrong stretch of road. In an ideal world, I would widen Issaquah-Hobart road to 4 lanes from Highway 18 all the way into Issaquah, where I would split it to an East bypass (considered and rejected some years ago) and a widened Newport Way, and improved interchange at route 900 and I-90 to the West. And Park and Ride lots with metro routes at Highway 18 and Cedar Grove Road. An improved interchange at Highway 18 and I-90 is also needed. Lastly, it wouldn't bother me if the entire area were rezoned to 1/4 acre lot size, if that would support improved roads and transit.</p>
Bakht	Khan	<p>I live near 140 and 180 and I would like to voice a strong opposition to the rezoning plan in the area. Traffic at the intersection is already heavy and I had witnessed several close calls. By allowing additional units to be built will increase the population and make the area more dense adversely affect aesthetic. i understand that Schneider parcel (southerly most parcel) currently has approved permits for a four-story, 28-unit condominium project under existing R-6 zoning, which remain at R-6. Tallest buildings in the surrounding area are 35 - 40 feet. Proposed height of 65 feet and/or 68 feet is incompatible with surrounding areas. Allowing 65 plus tall building will negatively affect the area and destroy the beautiful area. Please DO NOT ALLOW this area to be damaged and DO NOT ALLOW a building to be built so high. Thank you!</p>