

Public Comments on Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2

Winery, Brewery Distillery Code Changes

June 11, 2019

Auzins, Erin

From: Cynthia Lanners <cllanners@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 7:20 AM
To: Balducci, Claudia; Upthegrove, Dave; Auzins, Erin; Kohl-Welles, Jeanne; McDermott, Joe; Wolf, Karen; Lambert, Kathy; kcexec@kingcounty.gov; Gossett, Larry; von Reichbauer, Pete; Dunn, Reagan; Dembowski, Rod
Subject: Vote No on the Beverage Ordinance—June 12, 2019

Dear King County Council:

I am writing to ask you:

Please, vote NO on the Beverage Ordinance coming before June 12th. It is designed to reward those businesses who have chosen to operate illegally outside the business-zoned area and punish those who have remained in the designated business-zoned area of the Sammamish Valley.

Your vote NO will also protect the APD and the fragile environment of the Sammamish Valley that you are sworn to protect.

A vote NO is a vote to protect our farms.

A vote NO is a vote to protect our rural areas.

A vote NO is a vote in support of our GMA.

A vote NO prevents a precedent that will have the potential to erode APD zones across the county and state.

Many others will be writing long messages with the details of this ordinance, telling you about its impact and the damage it will do. I am asking you to live by the rules already in place and not to support those who chose to flaunt those rules.

Please adopt the Friends of Sammamish Valley Amended Ordinance that would protect the APD farmlands.

Thank you,

Cynthia Lanners
13325 NE 152nd St.
Woodinville, WA 98072
206-669-0847

--

Cynthia Lanners (206) 669-0847 Sent from Gmail Mobile

Auzins, Erin

From: Cynthia Lanners <cllanners@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 7:24 AM
To: Balducci, Claudia; Upthegrove, Dave; Auzins, Erin; Kohl-Welles, Jeanne; McDermott, Joe; Wolf, Karen; Lambert, Kathy; kcexec@kingcounty.gov; Gossett, Larry; von Reichbauer, Pete; Dunn, Reagan; Dembowski, Rod
Subject: Vote No on the Beverage Ordinance—June 12, 2019

Resent (typo):

Dear King County Council:

I am writing to ask you:

Please, vote NO on the Beverage Ordinance coming before you on June 12th. It is designed to reward those businesses who have chosen to operate illegally outside the business-zoned area and punish those who have remained in the designated business-zoned area of the Sammamish Valley.

Your vote NO will also protect the APD and the fragile environment of the Sammamish Valley that you are sworn to protect.

A vote NO is a vote to protect our farms.

A vote NO is a vote to protect our rural areas.

A vote NO is a vote in support of our GMA.

A vote NO prevents a precedent that will have the potential to erode APD zones across the county and state.

Many others will be writing long messages with the details of this ordinance, telling you about its impact and the damage it will do. I am asking you to live by the rules already in place and not to support those who chose to flaunt those rules.

Please adopt the Friends of Sammamish Valley Amended Ordinance that would protect the APD farmlands.

Thank you,

Cynthia Lanners
13325 NE 152nd St.
Woodinville, WA 98072
206-669-0847

--

Cynthia Lanners (206) 669-0847 Sent from Gmail Mobile

--

Cynthia Lanners (206) 669-0847 Sent from Gmail Mobile

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 10:22 AM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: Form submission from: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/council/issues/winery-code.aspx>

Submitted from: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/council/issues/winery-code.aspx>
Submitted at 10:22:04 AM, on Tuesday, June 11, 2019

Winery_Code:

FromUser: Guy W Dunn

EEmail: gwdunn@earthlink.net

addr1: 15050 NE 144 Street

city: Redmond

state: WA

zip: 98052

MessageText: Concerning the Sammamish Valley Winery property listed Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2, we are in favor of allowing demonstrations projects to go forward.

With the exception of the parcels at the extreme southern end of the Demonstration Projects in the Sammamish section, (NE 124th Street north to where 156th Ave NE turns off the Woodenville - Redmond Road), the land shifts from the Sammamish Slough flood plain to Glacial Moraines hillsides. These are less conducive to agricultural activities due to the change in soils and the pitch of the hillsides, than the flat Alluvial & Loam soils that you find on the west side of the Woodenville-Redmond Rd. And those southern most parcels are already used as a nursery similar to several business on the west side of the Woodenville-Redmond Road across from the project area.

Since these projects are not on prime agricultural lands, they are not "stealing" Ag use in favor of tourism. The fact that they overlook real farm lands lend to the experience of visiting these businesses which create their products from farming, albeit farming not on the valley floor. But it reminds us of the rich farming that takes place across the entire state. Bringing some of the bounty of eastern Washington over the Cascades right into Puget Sound for us to enjoy right here in King County.

The Ag tourism has increased the tax revenue for the County and the neighboring cities, and has allowed for increased spending on capital improvements in the area. These Ag tourism businesses in this demonstration project anchor the 100 plus businesses in the winery, food, distillery and brewery sector surrounding the greater Woodenville area.

For our family and how we live, we find these businesses to be good neighbors and increase our appreciation of where we live. And where a strong asset for our decision to live were we do.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Guy W Dunn

User IP Address:10.84.2.22

User Software Client:Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko)

Chrome/75.0.3770.80 Safari/537.36

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 10:38 AM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Sammamish Valley

-----Original Message-----

From: Sara Suter [mailto:sfsuter@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 7:50 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Sammamish Valley

Hello,

As we know, there are few places that exist anymore in what's become a crowded area, that retain rural character. Please protect Sammamish Valley by not allowing developers and an excess of bars to encroach on the few remaining farms in the area. Furthermore, traffic is already an issue & need not be increased.

Thank you,

Sara and Christoph Suter
Woodinville residents

Sent from my iPhone

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 10:38 AM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Support for Wineries and Tasting Rooms in Rural King County

-----Original Message-----

From: Rick Leegwater [mailto:rjleegwater@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 10:10 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Darlene Brown <darlenewbrown@comcast.net>
Subject: Support for Wineries and Tasting Rooms in Rural King County

Hello King County Council,

My wife and I enjoy wine tasting in the Sammamish Valley area year round, but especially during warm summer evenings, during and after dinner time.

Please ensure that existing wineries and tasting rooms are allowed to stay open. Please do not pass regulations that will put any existing winery or tasting room out of business. These are agricultural-related businesses that should be encouraged to thrive.

Please ensure that Mathews Winery's wonderful events, many of which are farm-to-table dinners that support our local farmers, can continue to be held at their winery.

Sincerely,
Rick Leegwater & Darlene Brown
13006 NE 98th Pl, Kirkland, WA 98033

Auzins, Erin

From: Glenda Cooper <gjc.myvoice@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 11:05 AM
To: kcexec@kingcounty.gov; Dembowski, Rod; Dunn, Reagan; von Reichbauer, Pete; Gossett, Larry; Lambert, Kathy; McDermott, Joe; Kohl-Welles, Jeanne; Upthegrove, Dave; Balducci, Claudia; Auzins, Erin; Wolf, Karen
Subject: King County's Winery, Brewery, and Distillery Ordinance

The Sammamish Valley is not all wine and beer. It is families, fruit, veggies and flowers. It is open spaces, bike rides and hot air balloons. It is home to artists and computer geeks. We shouldn't be an afterthought. Please don't vote for this ordinance.

I attended the meeting on June 4th in Kirkland. I appreciate that Councilmembers Balducci and Lambert took the time to come to the east side and meet with us and I appreciate that a meeting was set up in a location and time that made it more possible for community members to attend. Thank you.

I had hoped that I would be able to leave the meeting feeling that I better understood the ordinance--and I did. I was hoping that I had misunderstood what I had read/heard about the ordinance--I hadn't. In fact, I left this meeting feeling even more unsettled about this proposal that was talked about in terms of certainty not possibility by the Councilmembers.

The proposal is bad. It does not protect our way of life, our farmers, our land or our futures. SR202 can not support the increased traffic. There are no sidewalks in the majority of this area and there is no way to add such safety features. King County has already said that no improvements are going to be made to this area in regards to roads, lighting, traffic flow or safety concerns. There is little parking--as it is we find cars parked in the right of way of the side streets near the roundabouts. This happens every weekend, every concert at Chateau St Michelle, every sporting event at the fields. The number of events and the number of guests allowed at each by each of the WBDs is unrealistic. There will be multiple events going on all year long with all their guests, noise, pollution, traffic and lack of parking. Where is the "off-site" parking supposed to exist? Why are setbacks altered for CUPs? Why are set backs reduced to 25ft? Why are TUPs not required for some things? Why are TUPs good for a year? Why are applications allowed for 3 years? why a 5 year evaluation start time? My list of concerns goes on--and it is a list you have heard over and over from residents, farmers, and other business owner of the Sammamish Valley and similar areas.

Once you open up these areas to more commercial uses, there will be more than just tasting rooms that come. Once you allow these companies to set up in our valley and other areas of King County, they are there to stay. How would you get them out if this "Demonstration Project" doesn't work? There is no exit strategy because there is no intent for this to be temporary. It is presented as a test--but it is not a test. It is presented as a demonstration but it is not a demonstration. It is set up to become a permanent situation. I don't appreciate my life and neighborhood being used as a "testing" ground. I especially don't appreciate being told it is a test when it clearly is not a test for the Sammamish Valley. For the Valley--this will become permanent because once these businesses set up shop--you won't make them leave. The ordinance is designed to allow these groups in and allows for them to stay. There are currently 5 in Project A--there can be up to 13. 13!! Plus 6 more huge plots in Project B!! That is 19!!! We can tell you the results of this test based on the current WBDs we have had (illegally) for years. More will only make things worse. More tasting rooms etc don't need to be allowed for the County to get its data--look at how things have gone with the current illegal companies. Don't open these areas up to more and then leave the residents with the mess.

I am pleased that the council wants to bring more regulation to this area. I am concerned that there will not be complete enforcement. The enforcement of our current regulations didn't happen which has given us this mess.

I think that the current violators should be fined significantly-- perhaps something along the lines of 2-5% of their profits gained for the entire time they have been in violation. Make them comply with code. Then grandfather them in and cut it off. No more. Anyone else setting up illegally will be massively fined and shut down--no second chances. Leave the rest of the space as it is. There will be space available if the Wine Village ever comes to fruition. There are legal spaces available if they want them. For once, let nature have a chance. Let the farmers have space.

I don't think we have the right plan yet. I think the farmers and residents need to be more included in the process not left yelling their concerns at stone walls and begging for their livelihoods and peaceful living. The Sammamish Valley is not all wine and beer. It is families, fruit, veggies, flowers. It is open spaces, bike rides and hot air balloons. It is home to artists and computer geeks. We shouldn't be an afterthought. We shouldn't be a testing ground. We shouldn't be left with the aftermath of something we didn't ask for. Please don't vote for this ordinance.

Sincerely,
Glenda Cooper

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:46 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: WOODINVILLE TASTING ROOMS AND WINERIES

From: Christiana Maia [mailto:christianamaia@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 12:49 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: WOODINVILLE TASTING ROOMS AND WINERIES

Greetings Council Members,

Registered voter and tax payer here, looking to understand the current situation with what is possibly happening to close down Woodinville tasting rooms and wineries. I am a huge supporter of the wineries and tasting rooms, and many of my friends are currently employed by them. They provide steady jobs to so many people. They also provide many opportunities to small businesses and create a destination for people to travel from around the world.

Is there someone who can explain the situation in plain language to me?

Thank you for your time,
Christiana Maia
King County resident and registered voter

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:46 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Abolishing Wine and Beer Tasting Locations

-----Original Message-----

From: Ray Loehr [mailto:rloehr45@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 1:17 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Abolishing Wine and Beer Tasting Locations

I know my plea is fruitless as I've long since dismissed the value of the voice of the people. However, if you are going to eliminate the capitalistic presence in Woodinville, why not establish communes with an accompanying Five Year Plan?

Ray Loehr
rloehr45@gmail.com

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:46 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Winery regulation

From: M Bryce Taylor [mailto:mb.taylor@outlook.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 1:25 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Winery regulation

Hi!

I recently learned about a possible change to zoning that would impact King County wineries. I just wanted to chime in that I see the wineries as a valuable part of the area and a major part of what I love about living here. Please don't make any decisions that negatively impact them.

Thanks,
Bryce

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 2:46 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW:

From: Kathy Heideman [mailto:kathyheideman@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 1:52 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject:

Please don't ban the wineries. They are good for the community and provide a fun family activity as well as contribute to the tax base

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Auzins, Erin

From: Charlotte Lomet <jlomet@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 3:50 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: The Beverage Ordinance puts King County farmers out of business

Dear Supervising Legislative Analyst Erin Auzins,

The Sammamish Valley Agricultural Production District (APD) is one of the most fertile valleys in the country. If farmed to full potential, the Valley could annually supply local organic vegetables to 80,000 people, at a value of \$54 million. These sustainable, high yields are essential as climate change decreases yields in the Midwest and California.

It makes ZERO SENSE to support the Lambert/Balducci version of the Beverage Ordinance, which undermines the efforts of dozens of hard working farmers in the Valley, works at cross purposes to well-established land use regulations, and is totally counterproductive to multiple KC initiatives supporting local farming with taxpayer dollars.

* The Ordinance allows for commercial development on top of the Valley's steep-sloped, environmentally sensitive KC SO-120 Ag Buffer Overlay area. The RA Buffer and the APD are an integrated environmental ecosystem. Development in the RA Buffer damages the adjoining farmlands with sediment-laden, toxic, and overheated water runoff from impervious and compacted surfaces. Groundwater flow is also degraded by commercial activity which exceeds the capacity of residential septic systems.

* Land use speculation pushes out the farmers. Farmland in the Valley's APD, when sold for farming, is typically priced at \$15k-35k per acre. Recently several parcels have sold for as much as \$850k per acre and another was on the market for \$1.6m per acre – with intention for uses other than agriculture.

* KC farmers will be put out of business. Additionally, these farmers support a broad ecosystem of local restaurants, chefs, foodbanks, and landscaping companies that will be harmed by the Ordinance.

* The 60% rule for product to be grown ON SITE should be restored, to prevent productive farmland from being turned into manufacturing uses.

* Commercial development of Rural Area and APD lands goes against many taxpayer-funded KC efforts to support locally sourced food, including the Local Food Initiative, the Farmland Preservation Program, Puget Sound Fresh, Farm King County, and the Land Conservation Initiative.

* The WA State GMA mandates that King County protect the County's Rural Areas and APDs. The Ordinance allows for commercial development throughout KC Rural Areas and will negatively impact not only the Sammamish Valley APD but the other KC APDs as well.

Please adopt the Friends of Sammamish Valley Amended Ordinance that would protect the APD farmlands.

Sincerely,
Charlotte Lomet
17008 NE 139th St.
Redmond, WA 98052

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 6:28 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2 - Friends of Sammamish Valley Comments
Attachments: Letter to Dembowski and Council 061119.pdf

From: Fred Schmidt [mailto:schmidt@ewlaw.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 3:17 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>; Dembowski, Rod <Rod.Dembowski@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Gossett, Larry <Larry.Gossett@kingcounty.gov>; Lambert, Kathy <Kathy.Lambert@kingcounty.gov>; Kohl-Welles, Jeanne <Jeanne.Kohl-Welles@kingcounty.gov>; Upthegrove, Dave <Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>; Balducci, Claudia <Claudia.Balducci@kingcounty.gov>; von Reichbauer, Pete <Pete.vonReichbauer@kingcounty.gov>; McDermott, Joe <Joe.McDermott@kingcounty.gov>; Dunn, Reagan <Reagan.Dunn@kingcounty.gov>; Peter Eglick <eglick@ewlaw.net>
Subject: Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2 - Friends of Sammamish Valley Comments

Greetings,

Attached please find Peter Eglick's letter of today's date sent on behalf of Friends of Sammamish Valley concerning Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2.

Thank you,



Fred Schmidt
Paralegal
Eglick & Whited PLLC
1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3130
Seattle, WA 98104
206.441.1069

This e-mail is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. If you believe that it has been sent to you in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by someone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.



Peter J. Eglick
eglick@ewlaw.net

June 11, 2019

*Via Email (council@kingcounty.gov;
rod.dembowski@kingcounty.gov)*

Rod Dembowski, Chair
King County Council
516 Third Ave, Room 1200
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Friends of Sammamish Valley Comments Concerning
Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.2 - Regulations for Wineries,
Breweries and Distilleries

Dear Chair Dembowski and Council:

This office represents Friends of Sammamish Valley (FOSV) with regard to the above proposed Ordinance. This letter supplements extensive comments submitted by FOSV under separate cover. Its purpose is to summarize key legal objections and to urge that the proposed Ordinance not be adopted.

As explained below, the Ordinance is a trifecta of legal deficiency: It simultaneously violates the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the Washington Constitution.

Spot zoning: Spot zoning is generally defined as zoning to grant a discriminatory benefit to one owner or a group of owners to the detriment of neighbors or the community at large. Since the advent of the Growth Management Act, instances of spot zoning have become uncommon. This proposed Ordinance manages to revive the doctrine for example in its establishment of “demonstration project” overlays that coincide with areas of current Code violations. The maps that reflect these overlays, particularly for the Sammamish Valley, are reminiscent of North Carolina or Maryland redistricting gerrymanders – and they are similarly arbitrary, capricious, and unconstitutional. The solution to Code violations is not to gerrymander the violators into safety from regulations that are important to GMA compliance.

Noncompliance with the Growth Management Act: Preservation of agricultural lands and uses is a paramount mandate under the GMA. Rural lands and buffers are critical to this

mandate as are soils, water availability, and water quality. The County cannot lawfully succumb to pressure to divert from this mandate, no matter how politically compelling other uses may be. Twenty years ago, the pressure came from youth soccer groups, pressuring this Council to allow “interim” supposedly reversible conversion of agricultural lands to playfields, parking areas, and related facilities. The Council succumbed. But, the Washington Supreme Court forcefully rejected and reversed the County’s actions emphasizing that protection of agricultural lands and adjacent areas is non-negotiable under the GMA. *King County v. Central Puget Sound Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd.*, 155 Wash. App. 305 (2000).¹

In addition to this fundamental problem, Futurewise in its June 6 letter to you, as well as FOSV in its additional submissions, has explained the Ordinance’s other disconnects, flaws, and loopholes, which also speak to noncompliance with the GMA. Futurewise’s submission is particularly significant. It was a participant in earlier County processes leading up to this Ordinance, but has sharply parted ways with what the Council is now being asked to approve. Some may quibble with one or another of Futurewise’s comments, but, over-all they present a powerful admonition from a nonpartisan group that has longstanding expertise and experience on the subject matter.

Environmental Impact Statement is required: Under SEPA, an EIS is required for actions with the possibility of creating significant adverse impacts on the environment. The County has issued a SEPA Determination of NonSignificance (DNS) for the Ordinance, claiming that it is a “nonproject” action with no specific sites or impacts at issue so no EIS is required now. This excuse is dead wrong. The law (including Washington Supreme Court case law) is clear that an EIS can be necessary even for a nonproject action. And, in any event, this Ordinance is a conglomeration: some of its aspects may be “nonproject” in the sense that they do not involve specific areas or locations, but others clearly do. The County can try to skate on this issue and wait for a court or the Growth Board to reverse. But why would the Council choose to do that? The purpose of an EIS is to provide decisionmakers a hard look at and full disclosure of a proposal’s impacts. Does the Council have that now? Do you know how many acres and which areas in the County are potentially affected by the Ordinance’s permission for what would effectively be retail drinking establishments (bars) in rural areas? Do you know whether there is sufficient water supply available for the demonstration project areas? What are the current traffic counts for those areas and how would roads’ level of service be impacted? A properly prepared EIS would provide such data and analysis so that the Council would have it before considering Ordinance adoption.

Not just imperfect, not even good: The Ordinance sprawls over 125 pages throwing together confusingly a number of discrete actions ranging from on the one hand location-specific demonstration areas, to on another hand a Countywide allowance for “wineries”, “breweries” and “distilleries” so vaguely defined that the Ordinance ends up authorizing bars, nightclubs and

¹ I was the attorney who successfully argued this case in the Washington Supreme Court and prevailed against the County, so I have some particular familiarity with its holdings.

June 11, 2019

Page 3

event centers. It is essentially a suitcase proposal: dresses, shirts, pants, shoes, etc., all in one package that the Council is asked to pass through, regardless of fit or suitability. The Council should decline to do so. Nor should the Council attempt to “fix” on the fly the flawed Ordinance jumble. Instead, the Ordinance should be voted down or at a minimum sent back to the Executive. Some portions, if proposed discretely should never be adopted. Others could be addressed more specifically and corrected if presented in standalone form.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

EGLICK & WHITED PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Eglick', written over a horizontal line.

Peter J. Eglick
Attorney for Friends of Sammamish Valley

cc: Larry Gossett (larry.gossett@kingcounty.gov)
Kathy Lambert (kathy.lambert@kingcounty.gov)
Jeanne Kohl-Welles (jeanne.kohl-welles@kingcounty.gov)
Dave Upthegrove (dave.upthegrove@kingcounty.gov)
Claudia Balducci (claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov)
Pete von Reichbauer (pete.vonreichbauer@kingcounty.gov)
Joe McDermott (joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov)
Reagan Dunn (reagan.dunn@kingcounty.gov)
client

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 6:28 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Keep Tasting Rooms and Wineries in Redmond-Woodinville Area

-----Original Message-----

From: Kawika Pavao [mailto:kawikapavao@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 4:15 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: pavaoweb92@gmail.com
Subject: Keep Tasting Rooms and Wineries in Redmond-Woodinville Area

To Whom it May Concern;

Please change zoning so that wineries and testing rooms can remain in the area between Redmond and Woodinville. These areas provide a safe environment for socializing and tourism for our region.

These are also established businesses providing revenue to the county and nearby cities.

Mahalo,

David & Cindy Pavao
Redmond Ridge, WA 98053

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 6:29 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Hollywood Wine District

From: Virginia McDonald [mailto:ginny0324@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 5:23 PM
To: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Hollywood Wine District

Dear Council Members:

As a resident of King County who enjoys visiting the tasting rooms in the Hollywood district, I would like to express my support for the local wine industry and urge you to allow the current establishments to continue their operations unchanged.

The tasting rooms bring many visitors to the area and provide income to local hotels, restaurants and other businesses. Along with many fellow residents of Woodinville and other King County communities, I also appreciate the opportunity to share a very enjoyable experience with my family and friends. Wine tasting has become one of my favorite things to do with local friends, as well as with with guests from other parts of the county.

All of this activity promotes and supports the Washington wine industry. It also benefits the City of Woodinville and King County. Please allow the tasting rooms to continue their present operations.

Sincerely,

Virginia McDonald
17918 NE 156th St.
Woodinville, WA 98072

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 6:29 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: FW: Winery Ordinance - Effect on 14701 148th Ave NE, Woodinville WA

From: Sal Leone [mailto:leone@washingtonwine.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 5:40 PM
To: Balducci, Claudia <Claudia.Balducci@kingcounty.gov>; Lambert, Kathy <Kathy.Lambert@kingcounty.gov>
Cc: Communications, Comments <council@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Winery Ordinance - Effect on 14701 148th Ave NE, Woodinville WA

Claudia:

Thank you for the follow-up on last weeks Winery Ordinance meeting but I was hoping you would specifically discuss my personal situation. I have sent at least two prior e-mails but have not received any response.

Although I signed a settlement agreement with the county, it appears that I will be the only winery & brewery to be closed down in the Woodinville area of unincorporated King County. My property is in neither Overlay A or Overlay B and is only 1.48 acres. Hence, I don't qualify for either a tasting room or a winery II and the Winery I classification is too restrictive to operate for a profit.

This does not make any sense considering:

My property is not adjacent to any farmland.
The city of Woodinville is across the street and immediately to the south of my property
My property is next to a sport field and a big parking lot operated by the county
My property is not in the Special Overlay Buffer
King County narrowly defeated annexing my property into the City of Woodinville by a narrow vote of 4-5.
My business is conducive to my neighbors.

Can you please respond to my concern and what is the solution. Please share this info with all of the council members so you may adopt an amendment to this ordinance. If writing is inconvenient, then perhaps we could meet somewhere.

Sal Leone

From: Balducci, Claudia [mailto:Claudia.Balducci@kingcounty.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 4:45 PM
To: Balducci, Claudia <Claudia.Balducci@kingcounty.gov>
Subject: Follow-up Questions from June 4 Community Meeting

Hello,

Thank you to everyone who attended the June 4th community meeting to discuss the Winery, Brewery, and Distillery code update currently being considered by the King County Council. We had a great turnout and a robust discussion

with the audience. We were not able to answer all of the questions in the moment and have prepared written responses as promised. You can find the questions and answers attached to this email.

This document will be updated if more questions arise or if more information becomes available. We heard a few questions that were not directly related to the code update and will be answering those through other means.

The formal public hearing for the ordinance is tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12th at 10:30am on the 10th floor of the King County Courthouse in Seattle. I do not expect the Council will take action on the ordinance tomorrow as we will need time to think about the comments we hear.

Thank you for your continued engagement on this issue.

Claudia

Claudia Balducci
Metropolitan King County Council, District Six

King County Courthouse
516 Third Avenue, Room 1200
Seattle, WA 98104-3272
206.477.1006

claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov

www.kingcounty.gov/council



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

Auzins, Erin

From: Pooja Kohli <p_wassan@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:44 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: The Beverage Ordinance puts King County farmers out of business

Dear Supervising Legislative Analyst Erin Auzins,

The Sammamish Valley Agricultural Production District (APD) is one of the most fertile valleys in the country. If farmed to full potential, the Valley could annually supply local organic vegetables to 80,000 people, at a value of \$54 million. These sustainable, high yields are essential as climate change decreases yields in the Midwest and California.

It makes ZERO SENSE to support the Lambert/Balducci version of the Beverage Ordinance, which undermines the efforts of dozens of hard working farmers in the Valley, works at cross purposes to well-established land use regulations, and is totally counterproductive to multiple KC initiatives supporting local farming with taxpayer dollars.

* The Ordinance allows for commercial development on top of the Valley's steep-sloped, environmentally sensitive KC SO-120 Ag Buffer Overlay area. The RA Buffer and the APD are an integrated environmental ecosystem. Development in the RA Buffer damages the adjoining farmlands with sediment-laden, toxic, and overheated water runoff from impervious and compacted surfaces. Groundwater flow is also degraded by commercial activity which exceeds the capacity of residential septic systems.

* Land use speculation pushes out the farmers. Farmland in the Valley's APD, when sold for farming, is typically priced at \$15k-35k per acre. Recently several parcels have sold for as much as \$850k per acre and another was on the market for \$1.6m per acre – with intention for uses other than agriculture.

* KC farmers will be put out of business. Additionally, these farmers support a broad ecosystem of local restaurants, chefs, foodbanks, and landscaping companies that will be harmed by the Ordinance.

* The 60% rule for product to be grown ON SITE should be restored, to prevent productive farmland from being turned into manufacturing uses.

* Commercial development of Rural Area and APD lands goes against many taxpayer-funded KC efforts to support locally sourced food, including the Local Food Initiative, the Farmland Preservation Program, Puget Sound Fresh, Farm King County, and the Land Conservation Initiative.

* The WA State GMA mandates that King County protect the County's Rural Areas and APDs. The Ordinance allows for commercial development throughout KC Rural Areas and will negatively impact not only the Sammamish Valley APD but the other KC APDs as well.

Please adopt the Friends of Sammamish Valley Amended Ordinance that would protect the APD farmlands.

Sincerely,
Pooja Kohli
12888NE 200th place
Woodinville, WA 98072

Auzins, Erin

From: Kamil Nemr <abirnemr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 10:12 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: The Beverage Ordinance puts King County farmers out of business

Dear Supervising Legislative Analyst Erin Auzins,

Please vote NO to save Sammamish river.

The Sammamish Valley Agricultural Production District (APD) is one of the most fertile valleys in the country. If farmed to full potential, the Valley could annually supply local organic vegetables to 80,000 people, at a value of \$54 million. These sustainable, high yields are essential as climate change decreases yields in the Midwest and California.

It makes ZERO SENSE to support the Lambert/Balducci version of the Beverage Ordinance, which undermines the efforts of dozens of hard working farmers in the Valley, works at cross purposes to well-established land use regulations, and is totally counterproductive to multiple KC initiatives supporting local farming with taxpayer dollars.

* The Ordinance allows for commercial development on top of the Valley's steep-sloped, environmentally sensitive KC SO-120 Ag Buffer Overlay area. The RA Buffer and the APD are an integrated environmental ecosystem. Development in the RA Buffer damages the adjoining farmlands with sediment-laden, toxic, and overheated water runoff from impervious and compacted surfaces. Groundwater flow is also degraded by commercial activity which exceeds the capacity of residential septic systems.

* Land use speculation pushes out the farmers. Farmland in the Valley's APD, when sold for farming, is typically priced at \$15k-35k per acre. Recently several parcels have sold for as much as \$850k per acre and another was on the market for \$1.6m per acre – with intention for uses other than agriculture.

* KC farmers will be put out of business. Additionally, these farmers support a broad ecosystem of local restaurants, chefs, foodbanks, and landscaping companies that will be harmed by the Ordinance.

* The 60% rule for product to be grown ON SITE should be restored, to prevent productive farmland from being turned into manufacturing uses.

* Commercial development of Rural Area and APD lands goes against many taxpayer-funded KC efforts to support locally sourced food, including the Local Food Initiative, the Farmland Preservation Program, Puget Sound Fresh, Farm King County, and the Land Conservation Initiative.

* The WA State GMA mandates that King County protect the County's Rural Areas and APDs. The Ordinance allows for commercial development throughout KC Rural Areas and will negatively impact not only the Sammamish Valley APD but the other KC APDs as well.

Please adopt the Friends of Sammamish Valley Amended Ordinance that would protect the APD farmlands.

Sincerely,
Kamil Nemr

2111 228th pl SE
Bothell, WA 98021

Auzins, Erin

From: Communications, Comments
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 11:55 PM
To: Auzins, Erin
Subject: Form submission from: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/council/issues/winery-code.aspx>

Submitted from: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/council/issues/winery-code.aspx>
Submitted at 11:55:18 PM, on Tuesday, June 11, 2019

Winery_Code:

FromUser: Elisa Schmitt

EMail: elisaschmitt@gmail.com

addr1: 15419 NE 140th St

city: Redmond

state: WA

zip: 98052

MessageText: We live just off Rt 202, all the way at the end of the road, behind a huge tree and up a narrow lane. It is rural here, we have a few acres zoned RA-2.5. Yesterday we saw a healthy coyote. A couple weeks ago two adorable bear cubs hid under my sweetie's car while mama bear stood watch. Last year a bear family stayed for several weeks. The officers from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife explained to us that we live in a rural area and needed to learn to co-exist. The neighbor whose chickens were eaten was in violation! She had allowed the bears to eat her chickens. It is difficult to understand that in our Rural Area we live in the bears territory rather than the other way around. That is what the law says.

My family will not be able to maintain our rural lifestyle if this bill passes. The owner of the parcel next door is waiting for the results of this vote. If yes, those 5 acres will become a winery. That parcel is long and skinny East-West, running all the way up the hill through coyote and bear country. In order to use that land, they will need to cut many trees, install septic, build a gravel road, lots of parking, likely a fence. The steep grade, trees, and wet nature of the soil will make development a huge and environmentally damaging event. Rather than the bear's spot for hibernation, that property will effectively become a wall against the bears current North-South travel.

We love wine and we have been to Matthews, DeLille, and others. We see the glassware loaded into trucks at the end of the evening because their own septic system can't handle the load. A wine restaurant sometimes washes wine glasses for a neighboring tasting room when there is a problem with the other's septic. Believe it or not, at the DeLille mansion 15 years ago I saw a sign in a back bathroom urging guests to flush only if necessary. If it's yellow let it mellow?? Can you imagine that at the elegant DeLille?!? Septic issues aren't new but they are essential. If we in King County value the environment we need to provide sewer to all of the businesses along Rt 202. It doesn't make sense to bring in big business and watch the pollution spike downstream. As a gift to the river and the other property owners off Rt 202, how about sewer for all of us on this steep hill and in the valley. If we are developing, there is no reason to mandate septic.

My family have lived as neighbors to the wonderful Delille Cellars, makers of some of the best wine in the valley. I hear they operate the mansion illegally. They have been entirely unresponsive to my calls over the years. Their peacock came on our property fifteen years ago. I called to be helpful, but they didn't return the call. Their band was too loud and past 11pm, 12 years ago, 11 years ago, and when our child was born 9 years ago. About 8 times a year. I called but there was never a response! I mentioned the loud music when I went to pick up some wine. The office employee gave me a free bottle, but told me she wasn't the one to help. The noise continued. Again and again, even in person during the music late at night, there was no one for me to talk to, no one "in charge" and they were unable to shut off music at 11pm, even on a weeknight. I called the police about the noise, and they too said they couldn't enforce the noise ordinance and shut the music down. If this is how an exemplar winery does it, what can we expect from new smaller upstarts? What I describe is not life in a rural area. It is more like living in the apartment over a dance hall with rules that are not enforced. This is about zoning, but what will people and companies do with the zoning? Build a septic on the wetland next door? Clear cut in order to create parking? Ignore the fire code? With the police privately hired to assist tasting rooms with traffic, how can police impartially monitor those driving inebriated? I have never seen police pull a car over, but I have often seen pieces of cars in the traffic circle left over from an accident. We could use better police services if this is an income producing valley.

In conclusion, there is the perfectly good land elsewhere so we don't need to do this. Woodinville Village is currently an eyesore and should be utilized. Or we could use the warehouses near Januik, or the old Molbak's property at Rt 202 and 124th. A centralized development would give centralized sewer, self-policing, great parking, hopefully a hotel and fewer inebriated drivers on the road. Woodinville Village would be walkable to Chateau Ste Michelle and the Willows Lodge. Creating new zoning might work if strictly coded, enforced, and policed, but we can't be sure. As is, many smaller septic systems would be overtaxed by weekend guests with pollution running down towards the salmon in the beautiful Sammamish River. Bears, coyote, and bobcats would be disrupted, displaced, and probably killed. Families would be disturbed by noise pollution, and having to look at parking lots of cars. Businesses and tasting rooms disturb the Rural Area. We don't need a demonstration project to test it out, it is already clear. This Proposed Ordinance will cause damage, and specifically ruin the core functions and character of the Rural Area.

RA-2.5

If you have to do this, please include an amendment to say that all new construction, parking and septic be within 400' of Rt 202. Further up the hill is God's Country. It belongs to the bears and the birds. If we build there it will displace the bears. They will frequent the tasting rooms even more than they do currently! I am happy to work with any new owner of the property. I think by working together we can find good solutions. The best solution is to preserve our Rural Area. Thank you.

User IP Address:10.84.2.22

User Software Client:Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 10.0; Win64; x64) AppleWebKit/537.36 (KHTML, like Gecko) Chrome/64.0.3282.140 Safari/537.36 Edge/18.17763