

**Public Comments on Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413**

2020 Comprehensive Plan &  
Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan

May 20, 2020 to May 25, 2020

**From:** [Laura Feinstein](#)  
**To:** [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#)  
**Subject:** Comments on the King County Comprehensive Plan Update  
**Date:** Friday, May 22, 2020 5:26:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [Sightline Institute comment on King County Comprehensive Plan Update.pdf](#)

---

Dear Councilmember Upthegrove,

Sightline Institute respectfully submits the attached comments on the update to the King County Comprehensive Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for all of the effort the Council has put into the proposed amendment on fossil fuel facilities.

Sincerely,  
Laura Feinstein  
Sightline Institute



To: The Office of Councilmember Upthegrove  
From: Sightline Institute  
Date: May 21, 2020

### **Comments on Council Amendments to the 2020 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council Amendments to the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan. We applaud King County for considering enhancements to their approach to utility franchise agreements to tackle climate change and build a more sustainable future. Sightline Institute strongly supports the proposed amendments to the fossil fuel facility policies offered in the section "Fossil Fuel and Fossil Fuel Facility" because they are important steps for addressing the ongoing global climate crisis.

Recently, Sightline published a [series of articles](https://www.sightline.org/series/freedom-from-fracked-gas/) (sightline.org/series/freedom-from-fracked-gas/) outlining how local governments could leverage franchise agreements to free our communities from fracked gas. This letter summarizes our comments and recommendations from those articles as they pertain to the King County Comprehensive Plan amendments under consideration. We've attached these articles by email.

With the recent Washington Supreme Court ruling on King County Ordinance 18403 allowing King County to charge franchise fees, the County has an unexpected opportunity to phase out the use of fracked gas. Combined with the proposed amendment to the King County Comprehensive Plan to consider greenhouse gas and health impact assessments when renewing franchise agreements, these two policies provide some of the necessary levers to start dismantling the fracked gas infrastructure serving King County.

As the King County Council considers these conceptual amendments, Sightline recommends the following:

- Prohibit the expansion of fracked gas infrastructure in the King County right-of-way by denying a franchise for new infrastructure to local distribution companies.
- For existing fracked gas infrastructure, update the franchise agreements with local distribution companies to include:
  - A franchise fee on fracked gas infrastructure commensurate with the Social Cost of Carbon.
  - A franchise fee on electricity infrastructure commensurate with the Social Cost of Carbon. With more than 17% of the State's electricity generated from fossil fuels, King County can also influence the speed of adoption of clean electricity.
- Reduce the term of franchise agreements to less than 10 years in order to give policymakers more ability to monitor, enforce, and revise the agreement.

Again, thank you for your leadership and commitment to fighting climate change. We look forward to seeing the Comprehensive Plan Update move forward.

Sincerely,

Eric de Place  
Director, Thin Green Line

Laura Feinstein  
Research Fellow



## KING COUNTY'S UNEXPECTED OPPORTUNITY TO STOP FRACKED GAS

New authority to make gas utilities pay could boost climate efforts.



**Author: Eric de Place and Laura Feinstein**

(@Eric\_deP) on January 9, 2020 at 12:40 pm

This article is part of the series [Freeing our Cities from Fracked Gas](#)

Quite by accident, King County is starting 2020 with the potential to become a leader in phasing out the use of fracked gas in buildings. Eliminating fossil fuels in homes and businesses is an important step on the Northwest's road to decarbonization, and it's consistent with [the most serious analytical studies](#) of the issue. Already, a number of cities in California and elsewhere have [initiated bans](#), or partial bans, on new gas hookups. But local governments may be able to use other, subtler methods of reducing gas use in buildings that are even more effective.

One such hidden lever is the ["franchise agreements"](#) that cities and counties have with the utilities—including gas companies—that make use of public right-of-way like streets and sidewalks. In theory, these contracts give local governments the ability to manage gas infrastructure down (and out) over time, a helpful tool in the fight against climate change. Up until now, Washington counties were not allowed to have fees alongside the agreements. But in a little-noticed ruling last month, the Washington Supreme Court found that King County has authority to charge franchise fees, too. And, if a utility and the county cannot agree on the charge, then the county can actually bar the utility from using the county right-of-way.

The case wound up before the Supreme Court after King County passed [an ordinance](#) in 2016 requiring utility providers to pay rent for using the County's right-of-way. Although King County does collect reimbursements for the administrative expenses incurred in managing the franchise, much like other local governments do, the County has not historically collected franchise fees or utility taxes for use of its public right-of-way, something that municipal governments do all the time. At the time, the County Council was simply trying to raise revenue to address budget deficits, not solve the climate crisis. But the move opened the door to some interesting possibilities for reducing fossil fuel use.

Soon after the rule was passed, however, a group of water and sewer districts sued King County, halting the rule's implementation. Puget Sound Energy (PSE), western Washington's gas utility, also intervened in the lawsuit, filing an [amicus brief](#) in opposition to the new ordinance.

The lawsuit made its way through the courts in the ensuing years. The Superior Court initially ruled in favor of the water and sewer districts, but King County appealed the ruling in 2018, [petitioning](#) the Washington Supreme Court. The Court heard oral arguments last September and issued its [final opinion](#) on December 5, reversing the Superior Court decision and giving King County the legal basis to charge a franchise fee. Plus, the decision handed King County a bonus: cities and towns are constrained by state law to a six percent rate on [utility taxes](#)—a tax that is entirely separate from franchise agreements—but the ruling allows King County to charge any amount it chooses, unconstrained.

Together, franchise fees and utility taxes could be prime instruments for raising costs on gas utilities with an eye toward making fracked gas less economical relative to clean electricity. That would incentivize consumers to switch away from gas over time, thereby reducing fossil-fuel use and helping to achieve reductions in emissions consistent with the County's [Strategic Climate Action Plan](#).

Find this article interesting? [Please consider making a gift to support our work.](#)

Yes, raising costs on gas utilities could, in theory, increase costs on consumers. In fact, in its [amicus](#) brief to the Supreme Court, PSE makes just this argument: "...a dramatic rate hike is exactly what will happen if the Ordinance and Rules are legitimized." PSE estimates that this ordinance will increase the cost of utility service by nearly \$40 per year for each utility customer. That's a potential problem, but it's an easily fixable one.

For starters, it's conceivable that state regulators could simply prohibit PSE or other gas utilities from passing along the additional costs, taking them out of corporate profits instead. At the local level, it would be straightforward for cities or counties to use the revenue for direct financial assistance to lower-income ratepayers who are already treated inequitably by the current system. The money might simply be given to lower-income households almost like a basic income payment or it might be used to pay for the cost of transitioning homes from gas to clean electricity. King County could also experiment with different fee schedules that would match the environmental impacts of the services traveling through the county right-of-way. For example, clean electricity and renewable natural gas could be charged a lower rate than fossil-fuel based electricity and fracked gas, similar to the [franchise proposals that the City of Eugene is considering](#).

Regardless, the ruling's impact will be felt in all 39 Washington counties. Like King County, they also have the ability to impose franchise fees on utilities operating in their public right-

of-ways and they can raise utility taxes. The new ruling opens up an opportunity far greater than plugging county deficits; it provides counties a leadership opportunity for transforming the Northwest's carbon economy.

*Laura Feinstein volunteers with Sightline, researching energy policy. She spent 11 years in the utility industry, working in energy conservation and engineering.*

*Eric de Place is Sightline's Director of Thin Green Line. He is a leading expert on coal, oil, and gas export plans in the Pacific Northwest, particularly on fossil fuel transport issues, including carbon emissions, local pollution, transportation system impacts, rail policy, and economics.*

**You can power us forward on sustainable solutions. [Make a donation to Sightline now.](#)**

Tagged in: [Fossil fuels](#), [Fracked Gas](#), [franchise agreements](#), [Infrastructure](#), [Natural Gas](#)

**Previous article in series:**

« [The Northwest City Leader in Reducing Dependence on Fracked Gas](#)

**Next article in series:**

[Leaks In The City: Methane's Invisible Menace](#) »

© 2020 Sightline Institute. All Rights Reserved.



## THE NORTHWEST CITY LEADER IN REDUCING DEPENDENCE ON FRACKED GAS

Eugene is writing the playbook for using franchise agreements to advance clean energy.



Author: **Eric de Place and Laura Feinstein**

(@Eric\_deP) on November 26, 2019 at 9:11 am

This article is part of the series [Freeing our Cities from Fracked Gas](#)

Many Northwest communities are trying to free themselves from fossil fuels, but the region's widespread reliance on natural gas to heat and operate buildings poses a major challenge.

But cities have a hidden mechanism for cleaning up their energy supply: they can modify their contracts that govern how utilities can use the public right of way—their “[franchise agreements](#)”—to reduce gas consumption or replace it with cleaner energy. Probably no city has done more on this score than Eugene, Oregon, where policymakers and advocates are weighing innovative changes to the city's franchise agreements—changes that other cities could replicate to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions.

Eugene's City Council has engaged a voluntary advisory body, the Sustainability Commission, to develop various ideas for meeting the [City's climate goals](#). In a July 2019 presentation, the Commission laid out a series of [policy recommendations](#) to be included in the City's franchise agreement with its gas utility, NW Natural. These proposals represent perhaps the most sophisticated approach any government in North America has yet considered to reducing gas use through franchise agreements, and so they can serve as a template for other cities across North America.

The Commission's recommendations include the following:

- Gas customers should be incentivized to reduce their use of gas and to purchase greenhouse gas offsets for their carbon emissions.

- NW Natural should be prohibited from offering financial incentives to entice customers to switch to gas from other energy sources. (NW Natural currently offers customers up to \$2,550 to switch.)
- The City should limit the construction of new gas infrastructure.
- NW Natural should be required to supply low-carbon gas, such as “renewable gas” captured from landfills and dairy farms.
- Eugene should increase its franchise fees for NW Natural and use the revenue to encourage customers to switch from gas to renewable electricity.
- Eugene should reduce the term of its franchise agreement from 20 years to less than 10 years in order to give policymakers more ability to monitor, enforce, and revise the agreement.
- The City should provide a two-tiered franchise fee structure: a fixed fee plus a variable fee assessed in proportion to the carbon-intensity of gas supplied by the utility.
- Until NW Natural can offer a lower-carbon energy product than fracked or conventional gas, Eugene should disallow the expansion of gas infrastructure or incentives to convert customers to gas.

The proposal leans heavily on requirements for utilities to supply a low-carbon gas, such as methane gas captured from landfills and dairy farms. Some climate activists question whether these should really be promoted as sources of renewable energy, but for the moment both can supply a replacement for fracked gas cost-effectively, according to independent analyses by NW Natural and the State of Oregon.

And the proposal suggests that failing to meet the low-carbon gas requirements would result in penalties in the form of increased franchise fees or limitations on NW Natural adding new customers or offering incentives for customers to switch to gas.

Find this article interesting? [Please consider making a gift to support our work.](#)

Several of the recommendations are likely to increase customers’ out-of-pocket costs by at least a little, and so Eugene’s City Council must evaluate the potential impact on low-income gas customers. Yet there are ways to ameliorate any costs increases by investing money collected from penalties in things that benefit lower-income households, such as targeted energy bill assistance, subsidized efficiency programs, or switching customers from gas to electric appliances.



The recommendations that Eugene’s leaders are weighing are path-breaking, the first of their kind in the US as far as we know. Whether or not Eugene’s city council moves ahead with new ordinances or new contract language, the conversation happening there should be a source of inspiration—and, perhaps, replication—by other local governments. The real question is who will go next?

*Laura Feinstein volunteers with Sightline researching energy policy. She spent 11 years in the utility industry, working in energy conservation and engineering.*

*Eric de Place is Sightline’s Director of Thin Green Line. He is a leading expert on coal, oil, and gas export plans in the Pacific Northwest, particularly on fossil fuel transport issues, including carbon emissions, local pollution, transportation system impacts, rail policy, and economics.*

**You can power us forward on sustainable solutions. [Make a donation to Sightline now.](#)**

Tagged in: [franchise agreements](#)

**Previous article in series:**

« It’s Been 138 Years since  
Seattle Last Updated Its Fracked  
Gas Utility Contract

**Next article in series:**

King County’s Unexpected  
Opportunity to Stop Fracked Gas  
»

© 2020 Sightline Institute. All Rights Reserved.



## HOW FRANCHISE AGREEMENTS CAN FREE CITIES FROM FRACKED GAS

These contracts could help untangle cities' reliance on the gas industry.



Author: **Eric de Place and Laura Feinstein**

(@Eric\_deP) on October 9, 2019 at 1:45 pm

This article is part of the series [Freeing our Cities from Fracked Gas](#)

In the summer of 2019, a handful of cities in California banned developers from adding natural gas installations to new buildings. Soon several more cities, including Seattle, may [follow suit](#). Natural gas, as it turns out, might be even worse for the atmosphere [than other fossil fuels](#) like coal and oil, according to experts who study methane leakage along the gas supply chain, from fracking wells to pipelines to end-uses. The bans can prevent worsening one aspect of our entanglement with fossil fuels—burning gas in our buildings. But they do not solve the larger, related problem: we rely on a spiderweb of existing gas infrastructure that ensnares our cities and towns in the gas industry's clutches, tethering our most benign activities like cooking dinner or taking a shower to distant fracking fields and the many injustices that come with them.

Several rigorous [studies](#) of [decarbonization](#) show that if the Northwest is to live up to its climate commitments the region's cities must set an example by phasing out and eventually eliminating gas in both residences and businesses.

One strategy: local governments could modify franchise agreements, which are contracts that govern how private utilities can build and operate their infrastructure in public rights-of-way. These franchise agreements outline rules, rights, and fees associated with the entities using public property for a private reason—and it may be possible to amend them to slow the flow of fossil fuels into our cities.

Most gas utilities in the Northwest are privately owned and operated. Privately owned utilities—like Puget Sound Energy, Cascade Natural Gas, Avista, and NW Natural—are subject

to a range of state environmental and consumer regulations. But in many ways, they still act as an arm of the broader gas industry, sometimes playing **hardball politics** to continue selling fossil fuels. As influential as they may be, they're still somewhat at the mercy of local governments.

Increasing the costs associated with installing natural gas infrastructure is one mechanism that local governments can use to control utilities. In Washington, state law prohibits cities and towns from levying a franchise fee for use of the public right-of-way, but the law still allows cities and towns to collect a utility sales tax of up to 6 percent. Most collect the full amount in addition to recovering administrative costs associated with the franchise.

Increasing the legally permitted fees and taxes likely isn't an avenue to raise the cost of natural gas infrastructure enough to slow down the industry's expansion plans, but there are other components of franchise agreements that could. Franchise agreements contain multiple right-of-way conditions and requirements for working on, permitting and restoring a site upon completion of a project. As these franchise agreements expire and get renegotiated every few years, local governments can introduce new terms.

Find this article interesting? **Please consider making a gift to support our work.**

Here are three possible avenues for cities:

- Cities could strengthen “restoration” requirements of a franchise agreement so that utilities must repair streets and sidewalks to higher standards than the rough patch-jobs they can currently get away with. Such a requirement would drive up the costs of installing new gas infrastructure and also serve as a boon to drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians.
- Cities could augment restoration requirements to include paying for damage that gas inflicts on the environment. Even if cities in Washington cannot collect fees from their assessments of environmental damage, they may be able to require gas utilities to buy carbon offsets or fund some form of carbon sequestration or mitigation.
- Cities could even require utilities to remove their infrastructure after the multi-year agreements expire. Without access to the public right-of-way, utilities would be forced to obtain easements on private land to site their infrastructure, probably at much greater expense.

Finally, state lawmakers can give local governments more power over gas utilities. Simply changing the law so that cities and counties can levy franchise fees would create a valuable tool in the fight against fossil fuels. It could also provide a much-needed source of revenue for cash-strapped communities.

In forthcoming articles, we will take a closer look at the opportunities for key local governments in Washington to use franchise agreements, and we will explore some novel strategies already in development in Oregon.

*Laura Feinstein volunteers with Sightline researching energy policy. She spent 11 years in the utility industry, working in energy conservation and engineering.*

*Eric de Place is Sightline's Director of Thin Green Line. He is a leading expert on coal, oil, and gas export plans in the Pacific Northwest, particularly on fossil fuel transport issues, including carbon emissions, local pollution, transportation system impacts, rail policy, and economics. For questions or media inquiries about Eric's work, [contact Sightline Communications Manager Anne Christnovich](#).*

**You can power us forward on sustainable solutions. [Make a donation to Sightline now.](#)**

Tagged in: [Fossil fuels](#), [Fracked Gas](#), [franchise agreements](#), [Infrastructure](#), [Natural Gas](#)

**Previous article in series:**

« [Should Northwest Cities Ban Fracked Gas in New Buildings?](#)

**Next article in series:**

[Two Pen Strokes Could Help Wean Washington Off of Natural Gas](#) »



## TWO PEN STROKES COULD HELP WEAN WASHINGTON OFF OF NATURAL GAS

Giving local governments more power to leverage franchise fees could help combat the climate crisis.



Author: **Eric de Place and Laura Feinstein**

(@Eric\_deP) on October 29, 2019 at 5:43 am

This article is part of the series [Freeing our Cities from Fracked Gas](#)

Decarbonizing the Northwest's economy may seem like a herculean challenge, but local governments are well-positioned to advance on some key fronts. One prime opportunity for cities is figuring out how to gradually transition away from heating houses and businesses with oil and gas and instead use clean electricity. An obvious route is to simply [ban fossil fuel infrastructure in new buildings](#), a strategy already adopted by several California cities. A more subtle—and probably more politically viable—route is for local governments to leverage their “[franchise agreements](#)” with natural gas utilities.

Franchise agreements are contracts between local governments and utilities. They spell out the rules governing how private utilities can use the public right-of-way to build and operate infrastructure, including the natural gas pipelines that service many homes and businesses around the Northwest. Governments interested in decarbonizing could strategically modify their franchise agreements to pressure gas providers to be better stewards of ecological and public health, and perhaps even compel them to mitigate environmental impacts of using gas. All that is possible within [the framework of existing laws](#).

In Washington, restrictive state laws stymie more powerful contract changes by limiting how cities and towns can make use of franchise fees and taxes. Oregon takes a more permissive approach. It allows local governments to charge franchise fees and set utility tax rates, so long as ratepayers are given a transparent accounting of fees on their utility bills.

**Read on:** [How franchise agreements can free cities from fracked gas](#)

If Washington's laws were like Oregon's, local governments would be more empowered to slow the spread of climate-wrecking fracked gas. Communities that could establish franchise fees or more generous utility tax rates could generate new revenue for a variety of good purposes. Consider just a few possibilities:

- Expanding renewable energy supports
- Investing in measures to conserve gas
- Providing financial assistance to lower-income ratepayers who want to transition their homes from gas to clean electricity.

Plus, slightly raising the cost of installing gas would help tip the scales away from fossil fuels, perhaps even forestalling the gas industry's inexorable [expansion in residential developments](#).

Fortunately, it would be straightforward for the Washington legislature to fix the law. There are two places to focus:

Find this article interesting? [Please consider making a gift to support our work.](#)

[RCW 35.21.860](#) prohibits cities and towns from charging a franchise fee beyond recovery of actual administrative expenses. (Recoverable administrative expenses include only a narrow set of activities like receiving and approving permits, licenses, and franchises; inspecting plans and construction documents; and preparing state-required environmental statements.)

[RCW 35.21.870](#) caps the taxes that a city may collect from utilities at 6 percent of gross sales, though it does allow for higher rates if approved by voters. For Puget Sound Energy customers, for example, this tax is passed on to ratepayers and is shown as a "utility tax" line item on the monthly bill.

The state legislature needs only a couple of strokes with a black sharpie to amend the former to exclude natural gas businesses from the exemption of franchise fees. Like so:

- 1) No city or town may impose a franchise fee or any other fee or charge of whatever nature or description upon the light and power ~~, or gas distribution businesses,~~ as defined in RCW 82.16.010, or telephone business, as defined in RCW 82.16.010, or service provider for use of the right-of-way, except:
  - a) gas distribution businesses, as defined in RCW 82.16.010.

Similarly, the legislature can amend the latter to strike out language including natural gas businesses in the limits on utility tax rates. It would look like this:

- 1) No city or town may impose a tax on the privilege of conducting an electrical energy, ~~natural gas~~, steam energy, or telephone business at a rate which exceeds six percent unless the rate is first approved by a majority of the voters of the city or town voting on such a proposition.

These targeted fixes would help communities in Washington untangle themselves from fossil fuels while leaving electric utilities and others completely untouched. Extracting, transporting, and burning fracked gas yields a legion of environmental injustices—and just two simple changes to make Washington state law more like Oregon could help.

*Laura Feinstein volunteers with Sightline researching energy policy. She spent 11 years in the utility industry, working in energy conservation and engineering.*

*Eric de Place is Sightline's Director of Thin Green Line. He is a leading expert on coal, oil, and gas export plans in the Pacific Northwest, particularly on fossil fuel transport issues, including carbon emissions, local pollution, transportation system impacts, rail policy, and economics. For questions or media inquiries about Eric's work, [contact Sightline Communications Manager Anne Christnovich](#).*

**You can power us forward on sustainable solutions. [Make a donation to Sightline now.](#)**

Tagged in: [franchise agreements](#), [franchise fees](#), [Green Infrastructure](#), [Natural Gas](#)

**Previous article in series:**

« [How Franchise Agreements Can Free Cities from Fracked Gas](#)

**Next article in series:**

[It's Been 138 Years since Seattle Last Updated Its Fracked Gas Utility Contract »](#)

© 2020 Sightline Institute. All Rights Reserved.



**From:** [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comments on the Council Amendment Concepts to the 2020 Update to the King Co Comp Plan  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 10:23:01 AM  
**Attachments:** [FW Coms on Council Amendment Concepts 2020 Update to the King Co Comp Plan May 21 2020.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Tim Trohimovich <Tim@futurewise.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 9:20 AM  
**To:** Balducci, Claudia <Claudia.Balducci@kingcounty.gov>; Dembowski, Rod <Rod.Dembowski@kingcounty.gov>; Lambert, Kathy <Kathy.Lambert@kingcounty.gov>; Kohl-Welles, Jeanne <Jeanne.Kohl-Welles@kingcounty.gov>; McDermott, Joe <Joe.McDermott@kingcounty.gov>; von Reichbauer, Pete <Pete.vonReichbauer@kingcounty.gov>; Upthegrove, Dave <Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov>; Zahilay, Girmay <Girmay.Zahilay@kingcounty.gov>; Krekel-Zoppi, Leah <Leah.Krekel-Zoppi@kingcounty.gov>; Calderon, Angelica <Angelica.Calderon@kingcounty.gov>; Compplan <compplan@kingcounty.gov>  
**Cc:** Alex Brennan <alex@futurewise.org>  
**Subject:** Comments on the Council Amendment Concepts to the 2020 Update to the King Co Comp Plan

Dear Councilmembers and Staff:

Enclosed please find Futurewise's comments on the Council Amendment Concepts to the 2020 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan. Thank you for considering our comments.

If you require addition information, please contact me.

Tim Trohimovich  
Director of Planning & Law  
Futurewise  
816 Second Ave., Suite 200  
Seattle, WA 98104  
[tim@futurewise.org](mailto:tim@futurewise.org)  
(206) 343-0681 Ext. 102



816 Second Ave, Suite 200, Seattle, WA 98104  
p. (206) 343-0681  
[futurewise.org](http://futurewise.org)

May 21, 2020

The Honorable Rod Dembowski, Chair  
The Honorable Claudia Balducci  
The Honorable Jeanne Kohl-Welles  
The Honorable Kathy Lambert  
The Honorable Joe McDermott  
The Honorable Pete von Reichbauer  
The Honorable Dave Upthegrove  
The Honorable Girmay Zahilay  
King County Council  
Mobility and Environment Committee  
516 Third Ave, Room 1200  
Seattle, Washington 98104

Dear Chair Dembowski and Council Members Balducci, Kohl-Welles, Lambert, McDermott, von Reichbauer, and Zahilay:

**Subject: Comments on the Council Amendment Concepts to the 2020 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan.**

Send via email to: [claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov](mailto:claudia.balducci@kingcounty.gov); [rod.dembowski@kingcounty.gov](mailto:rod.dembowski@kingcounty.gov); [kathy.lambert@kingcounty.gov](mailto:kathy.lambert@kingcounty.gov); [jeanne.kohl-welles@kingcounty.gov](mailto:jeanne.kohl-welles@kingcounty.gov); [joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov](mailto:joe.mcdermott@kingcounty.gov); [Pete.vonReichbauer@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Pete.vonReichbauer@kingcounty.gov); [Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Dave.Upthegrove@kingcounty.gov); [Girmay.Zahilay@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Girmay.Zahilay@kingcounty.gov); [Leah.Krekel-Zoppi@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Leah.Krekel-Zoppi@kingcounty.gov); [Angelica.Calderon@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Angelica.Calderon@kingcounty.gov); [compplan@kingcounty.gov](mailto:compplan@kingcounty.gov)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Council amendment concepts for the 2020 Update to the King County Comprehensive Plan. This letter focuses on the amendment concepts. Futurewise is continuing to review the 2020 KCCP Striking Amendment S1 and will have additional comments before the County Council holds its next public hearing.

Futurewise works throughout Washington State to support land-use policies that encourage healthy, equitable and opportunity-rich communities, and that protect our most valuable farmlands, forests, and water resources. Futurewise has members and supporters throughout Washington State including King County.

## **Fall City Business District Special District Overlay Amendment Concept**

Futurewise supports allowing parks with uses that fit the community in the Fall City Business District Special District Overlay. The recreation opportunities and open spaces provided by parks can benefit business owners, employees, and customers.

## **Fossil Fuel and Fossil Fuel Facility Amendment Concept**

Futurewise strongly supports the amendments to remove coal, oil, and gas from County identified mineral land resource lands and to prohibit and adequately regulate these uses. This will help reduce greenhouse gas pollution, increase safety, and reduce the severity of the global climate crisis.

One of the comprehensive plan amendment concepts is to classify fossil fuel facilities as essential public facilities and to use an essential facility siting process to site them. The Growth Management Act, in RCW 36.70A.200(5), provides that “[n]o local comprehensive plan or development regulation may preclude the siting of essential public facilities.” “The term ‘essential public facilities’ refers to public facilities that are typically difficult to site.”<sup>1</sup> Privately owned fossil fuel facilities would not typically be classified as essential public facilities and they are not listed as an example of an essential public facilities in WAC 365-196-550(1)(d).

Preclude as used in RCW 36.70A.200(5) means “incapable of being accomplished by the means at the [project proponent’s] command.”<sup>2</sup> A comprehensive plan cannot oppose or prohibit an essential public facility, but a local government can require a project proponent to “comply with the [County’s] reasonable permitting and mitigation requirements.” “The fact that these requirements may make” a project “more costly does not relieve the” applicant “of these obligations.”<sup>3</sup>

The proposed comprehensive plan update proposes to prohibit the establishment of new coal mines and the expansion of existing coal mines which we support.<sup>4</sup> That prohibition is inconsistent with designating fossil fuel facilities as essential public facilities. The fossil fuel facilities are also not public. So we recommend they not be designated as essential public facilities.

## **Cottage Housing Amendment Concept to include a requirement to provide a variety of housing sizes within a cottage housing development**

“Cottage housing is generally defined as a grouping of small, single family dwelling units clustered around a common area and developed with a coherent plan for the entire site.”<sup>5</sup> One of the goals for cottage housing is to increase housing affordability.<sup>6</sup>

Futurewise supports measures to increase opportunities for cottage housing in urban growth areas. However, we are concerned that including a requirement to provide a variety of housing sizes within a cottage housing development may serve as a disincentive for cottage housing developments. Cottage housing works because of the smaller size of the units. Adding requirements that increase

---

<sup>1</sup> WAC 365-196-550(1)(a).

<sup>2</sup> *City of Des Moines v. Puget Sound Reg'l Council*, 98 Wn. App. 23, 847, 988 P.2d 27, 34 (1999).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> Attachment A to Proposed Ordinance 2019-04132020 *Update to 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan and 2017 Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan* p. 33 (April 17, 2020).

<sup>5</sup> Municipal Research and Services Center (MRSC), Cottage Housing webpage accessed on May 18, 2020 at: <http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Planning/Specific-Planning-Subjects-Plan-Elements/Cottage-Housing.aspx>.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

housing size can undercut the cottage housing model and discourage its use. We recommend that a requirement for a variety of housing sizes within a cottage housing development not be adopted.

### **Amendment Concept for accessory dwelling units changing the height limits so that the height of accessory dwelling units cannot exceed the height of the existing house**

Futurewise supports changes to increase the use of accessory dwelling units in urban growth areas. Common and desirable accessory dwelling formats including constructing garages with accessory dwelling units above the garage. In areas with single-story houses, limiting the height of the accessory dwelling units to the height of the existing houses can prevent this type of accessory dwelling unit from being built. We recommend that this amendment not be adopted.

### **Pacific Raceways Area Map Amendment Concept**

The 2020 comprehensive plan update is a “midpoint update” to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan. Midpoint updates are limited to the work plan development by the County Council and the County Executive and approved by the County Council.<sup>7</sup> The approved work plan does not include amendments to the Pacific Raceways area.<sup>8</sup> Amendments to this area have typically generated a great deal of community interest. Adding the Pacific Raceways Area Map Amendment that was not included in the work plan to the 2020 update during a global pandemic is not consistent with the high standard for public involvement that King County commonly achieves in its comprehensive plan updates. We recommend that the Pacific Raceways Area Map Amendment be postponed to the next periodic comprehensive plan update which the Growth Management Act currently requires King County to complete by June 30, 2024.

### **Raging River Quarry Area Map Amendment Concept**

Like the Pacific Raceways Area Map Amendment, Futurewise recommends that the County Council not add another map amendment, the Raging River Quarry Area Map Amendment, that was not part of the scope of work to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan Midpoint update during a global pandemic when public participation is limited for the foreseeable future.<sup>9</sup> We recommend that the Raging River Quarry Area Map Amendment be postponed to the next periodic comprehensive plan update which the Growth Management Act currently requires the County to complete by June 30, 2024.

---

<sup>7</sup> See 2020 KCCP Striking Amendment S1 p. 1 (4/17/20).

<sup>8</sup> King County Attachment A to Motion 15329 King County Comprehensive Plan 2020 Midpoint Update Scope of Work pp. 1 – 5 (Feb. 27, 2019) accessed on May 18, 2020 at: <https://www.kingcounty.gov/~media/Council/documents/CompPlan/2020/legislation/Motion15329.ashx?la=en>

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

## Equity and Social Justice Impact Analysis Amendment Concept

Futurewise supports requiring an equity impact analysis using the County's Equity Impact Review Tool as part of land use redesignation and zoning reclassification processes. This amendment has the potential to increase equality in land use decision making.

## Four-to-One Program Amendments

Futurewise believes the Four-to-One program benefits from clear standards and rules. In particular, we are opposed to change the ratios between the land protected and the land included in the urban growth areas. The current standards, which require four units of land protected for every unit of land added to the urban growth area in most circumstances, assures the public that there is a significant public benefit to balance the costs of expanding the urban growth area. Futurewise is opposed to changing to a lower or flexible ratio as the proposed amendments to Policy U-185 would allow.<sup>10</sup> We are also opposed to amending Policy U-185 to allow public owned lands to be included in the protected acreages as the County or other public agency already protects them.

Using rural roads to serve land in urban growth areas increases road maintenance costs without adding tax base to maintain the road and increases impacts on property owners and residents in rural areas and on agricultural and forest lands. This is the case for land added to the urban growth area through the Four-to-One program since it will ultimately be annexed to reduce public service burdens on King County. So we recommend the amendment proposed to Policy U-189 that would provide that "the County may allow roads to be located outside of the urban portion of the development to protect critical areas or for other ecological benefit" not be adopted.<sup>11</sup>

As the County Council is well aware, unincorporated urban areas increase costs to the County for public services including road maintenance, law enforcement, and other public facilities and services the county provides. Proposed Policy U-190a originally required that Four-to-One urban growth area expansions could only be developed after they were annexed by the adjacent city.<sup>12</sup> Once land is developed; it can be difficult to annex the land to cities and towns. We recommend that proposed Policy U-190a not be amended to only call for striving to conclude an interlocal agreement.<sup>13</sup> That will increase long-term costs for King County.

---

<sup>10</sup> Attachment A to Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413, 2020 Update to 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan and 2017 Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan p. 10 (April 17, 2020).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* p. 12.

<sup>12</sup> Attachment A to PO 2019-XXXX, Executive Recommended Plan 2020 Update to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan, as adopted by Ordinance 18427, and as amended by Ordinance 18623 and Ordinance 18810 p. 11 (Sept. 2019).

<sup>13</sup> Attachment A to Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413, 2020 Update to 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan and 2017 Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan p. 12 (April 17, 2020).

## **Do not amend the accessory dwelling unit regulations to allow an addition 1,000 or 1,500 square feet of unheated space**

Futurewise supports increasing flexibility and locational opportunities for accessory dwelling units in urban growth areas. However, the 2020 KCCP Striking Amendment S1, on pages 62 and 63, increases the allowed floor area for accessory dwelling units by 1,000 square feet of unheated floor area and 1,500 square feet of unheated floor area if a transferable development right is obtained. In our climate, unheated floor space is of limited use. After the floor area is built, it will be easy to convert the floor area to heated space violating the King County development regulations. If the County Council believes larger accessory dwelling units should be allowed, the best solution is to just allow larger accessory dwelling units in the urban growth areas. This would ensure the space is safe and usable and not encourage code violations. Allowing large areas of unheated space will just encourage code violations and, since the heating systems will be uninspected, potential fire hazards from unapproved wiring and heating systems.

As we have discussed in our earlier comment letters, Futurewise supports allowing internal and attached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and accessory living quarters in urban growth areas and rural areas without requiring that they be counted towards the maximum allowed residential density. These are ADUs and accessory living quarters located inside or attached to a house or in an accessory building, such as a garage, located close to the house. Detached or freestanding ADUs and accessory living quarters outside urban growth areas and Rural Towns must count towards and must comply with the maximum allowed density.<sup>14</sup> Detached or freestanding refers to separate dwelling units constructed on the same lot a primary dwelling. A county should analyze existing conditions, future projections, the need for ADUs, the impacts of future ADUs on public facilities and services, and the impacts of future ADUs on shorelines, critical areas, and resource lands before adopting development regulations that authorize ADUs outside of urban growth areas.<sup>15</sup>

Allowing freestanding ADUs and guest houses in the rural area or on natural resource lands without requiring that they meet the minimum lot size and density requirements effectively doubles the allowed rural density. The very limited water in rural King County makes this doubling unwise.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *Pierce County Neighborhood Association v. Pierce County* (PNA II), CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0071, Final Decision and Order (March 20, 1996), at \*18 – 19 accessed on May 18, 2020 at:

<http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Global/RenderPDF?source=casedocument&id=1923>; *Friends of the San Juans, Lynn Babrych and Joe Symons, et al. v. San Juan County*, WWGMHB Case No. 03-2-0003c Corrected Final Decision and Order and Compliance Order p.\*1, 2003 WL 1950153 p. \*1 (April 17, 2003). “The Thurston County Superior Court upheld the Board's ruling regarding the requirement that a freestanding ADU must be counted as a dwelling unit for the purposes of calculating density on a resource parcel. See *Friends of the San Juans v. Western Washington Hearings Board*, Thurston County Cause No. 03-2-00672-3 (January 9, 2004) at 10 and 11.” *Friends of the San Juans, Lynn Babrych and Joe Symons v. San Juan County*, WWGMHB Case No. 03-2-0003c, Compliance Order 2005 (July 21, 2005), at 12 of 22, 2005 WL 2288088, at 7 last accessed on May 18, 2020 at: <http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Global/RenderPDF?source=casedocument&id=277>

<sup>15</sup> *Friends of the San Juans, Lynn Babrych and Joe Symons, et al., v. San Juan County*, WWGMHB Case No.: 03-2-0003c Corrected Final Decision and Order and Compliance Order p.\*1, 2003 WL 1950153, at \*1 (April 17, 2003).

<sup>16</sup> 2016 *State of Our Watersheds: A Report by the Treaty Tribes in Western Washington* p. 111 last accessed on May 18, 2020 at: <https://nwifc.org/publications/state-of-our-watersheds/> and cited pages enclosed in separate emails accompanying Futurewise's July 31, 2019, letter to King County Performance, Strategy and Budget.



Allowing detached ADUs and guest houses without requiring that they meet the minimum lot size and density requirements in the rural area or on natural resource lands will not protect surface and ground water quality and quantity as the Growth Management Act requires in RCW 36.70A.070(1) and (5)(c)(iv).

The increased impervious surfaces allowed by freestanding ADUs and guest houses will also harm water quality. Research by the University of Washington in the Puget Sound lowlands has shown that when total impervious surfaces exceed five to 10 percent and forest cover declines below 65 percent of the basin, then salmon habitat in streams and rivers is adversely affected.<sup>17</sup> This will violate RCW 36.70A.070(1) and (5)(c)(iv) of the GMA.

### **Do not amend the accessory living quarters regulations to allow an addition 1,000 square feet of unheated space**

Futurewise supports increasing flexibility and locational opportunities for accessory living quarters in urban growth areas. However, the 2020 KCCP Striking Amendment S1, on page 64, increases the allowed floor area for accessory living quarters by 1,000 square feet of unheated floor area. In our climate, unheated floor space is of limited use. After the floor area is built, it will be easy to convert the floor area to heated space violating the King County development regulations. If the County Council believes larger accessory living quarters should be allowed, the best solution is to just allow larger accessory living quarters in the urban growth areas. This would ensure the space is safe and usable and not encourage code violations. Allowing large areas of unheated space will just encourage code violations and, since the heating systems will be uninspected, potential fire hazards from unapproved wiring and heating systems.

For the reasons documented above, detached or freestanding accessory living quarters outside urban growth areas and Rural Towns must count towards and must comply with the maximum allowed density.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Christopher W. May, Richard R. Horner, James R. Karr, Brian W. Mar, Eugene B. Welch, *The Cumulative Effects of Urbanization on Small Streams in the Puget Sound Lowland Ecoregion* pp. 19 – 20 of 26 (University of Washington, Seattle Washington) and enclosed in a separate email accompanying Futurewise's July 31, 2019, letter to King County Performance, Strategy and Budget with the filename: "chrisrdp.pdf." This report was identified as best available science in Washington State Office of Community Development. *Citations of Best Available Science for Designating and Protecting Critical Areas* p. 17 (March 2002) accessed on May 18, 2020 at: <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwiMgKWj2dLeAhViLH0KHxfdBBoQFjAAegQICBAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.czview.wa.gov%2FDesktopModules%2FDocuments%2FView.aspx%3FtabID%3D36890%26alias%3D1949%26mid%3D68545%26ItemID%3D4092&usq=AOvVaw0UCCoZhWjqD2uPnyKdnsnY>. A copy of this report was enclosed in a separate email accompanying Futurewise's July 31, 2019, letter to King County Performance, Strategy and Budget with the filename: "GMS-BAS-Citations-Final.pdf."

<sup>18</sup> *Pierce County Neighborhood Association v. Pierce County (PNA II)*, CPSGMHB Case No. 95-3-0071, Final Decision and Order (March 20, 1996), at \*18 – 19; *Friends of the San Juans, Lynn Bahrych and Joe Symons, et al. v. San Juan County*, WWGMHB Case No. 03-2-0003c Corrected Final Decision and Order and Compliance Order p.\*1, 2003 WL 1950153 p. \*1 (April 17, 2003).

King County Council Mobility and Environment Committee  
RE: Comments on the Council Amendment Concepts 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan  
May 21, 2020  
Page 7

Thank you for considering our comments on the amendment concepts. If you require additional information, please contact me at telephone 206-343-0681 Ext. 102 or email: [tim@futurewise.org](mailto:tim@futurewise.org).

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of two large, stylized, overlapping loops that resemble the letters 'S' and 'E'.

Tim Trohimovich, AICP  
**Director of Planning and Law**



**From:** [Koala Emu](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: king county comprehensive plan meeting june 9  
**Date:** Monday, May 25, 2020 9:19:14 PM

---

## Forwarded Conversation

**Subject: king county comprehensive plan meeting june 9**

-----

Date: Mon, May 25, 2020 at 8:57 PM  
To: Koala Emu <[pandacribz17@gmail.com](mailto:pandacribz17@gmail.com)>

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states:

In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

As a resident of this vibrant community (almost 20 years now), we feel that it NOT in the best interest of our community that you rezone our area. It would jeopardize our values, but most importantly it would jeopardize the safety of our community. We have schools here and it would jeopardize the safety of our children and our community if the proposed uses would be passed. We know this is really about generating tax revenue. Look elsewhere for some vacant land that isn't near any neighborhoods and schools.

We strongly object to any possible future Marijuana production, processing and retailing... (already a store in downtown Redmond); object to community residential facility of any kind (no sex offenders!!!); no waste -water treatment facility or transfer station (decrease our values); no jails or work release facilities; no helistop due to noise levels; and definitely a no on adult entertainment businesses of any kind!! We have families with children here. Would you want these businesses in your neighborhood? Your values are not our values. They do not reflect our desires or promote the vibrancy of our safe community. Please leave us alone!

Sincerely,  
Redmond ridge resident

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

-----

**From:** [Maxim Lukiyanov](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.  
**Date:** Monday, May 25, 2020 12:35:13 PM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Maxim and Irina Lukiyanov

**From:** [Rosaline Le](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Redmond Ridge area UDP  
**Date:** Monday, May 25, 2020 11:31:19 AM

---

Dear King County councilmembers, review committee and representatives of the Department of Local services:

I am writing to voice strong objections to the changes proposed to the land use near and around Redmond Ridge. The Redmond Ridge area, which includes Redmond Ridge, Redmond Ridge East and Trilogy, is a family-friendly neighborhood. We do not want any changes to the business park or marketplace that would impact our quiet, kid-friendly neighborhood. With the proposed zoning change in the Comprehensive Plan update, we see that there could potentially be marijuana processing plants, marijuana retail stores, jails, adult entertainment businesses, and other non-kid-friendly businesses.

Please remove such businesses from the land use proposal to keep our neighborhood safe for children and families.

Thank you for your consideration and understanding.

Sincerely,  
Rosaline Le

**From:** [Brijesh Desai](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff](#); [Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08  
**Date:** Monday, May 25, 2020 11:16:11 AM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Council members:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

I have been a resident of the Redmond Ridge community for more than 10 years. I am also a parent of two daughters. I love this community and I would like to express my concern regarding the subject. Not only my family but all of my neighbors and residents of Redmond Ridge are very concerned about the proposed permitted uses. After reading this I hope you will understand the citizens priorities and right to live in a clean, healthy neighborhood and raise our kids without the threat of violence, sex offences, pollution and vices. Further, I hope that you will put the welfare of the people above short-term benefits.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial.  
A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner

consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Brijesh Desai  
Redmond Ridge East resident

**From:** [Venkatesh Krishnan](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County  
**Date:** Sunday, May 24, 2020 8:06:41 PM

---

Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to strongly reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Venkatesh Krishnan and Sowmya Sekar,  
22529 NE 99TH WAY, REDMOND, WA 98053



**From:** [Sandra Carnahan](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#)  
**Cc:** [Sandie Carnahan](#)  
**Subject:** Redmond Ridge/Trilogy Special District Overlay Position  
**Date:** Saturday, May 23, 2020 5:11:58 PM

---

King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance [2019-0413](#).

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

From: George and Sandra Carnahan  
24566 NE Vine Maple Way (Trilogy at Redmond Ridge)  
Redmond, WA. 98053

**From:** [Travis Adams](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Cc:** [carissaa@live.com](mailto:carissaa@live.com)  
**Subject:** 2020 Proposed Land Use Updates  
**Date:** Saturday, May 23, 2020 7:14:15 AM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Travis Adams  
Redmond Ridge resident for 16 years

**From:** [Jamie Conner](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#)  
**Subject:** Redmond Ridge and Trilogy-area changes to land use/zoning  
**Date:** Friday, May 22, 2020 4:33:38 PM

---

To: King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services, and King County Council:

I am writing in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Jamie K Conner  
Global Account Lead, Google

**From:** [Shrinivas Panchamukhi](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 11:24:50 PM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be: 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Shrinivas

**From:** [Natalia Boldyreva](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff](#), [Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Cc:** [natalia.boldyreva@hotmail.com](mailto:natalia.boldyreva@hotmail.com); ["Arkadiy \(arkbold@gmail.com\)"](mailto:Arkadiy_arkbold@gmail.com); [Paul Boldyrev](#)  
**Subject:** 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Important Draft Land Use Updates for Redmond Ridge  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 9:31:53 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

Dear Councilmembers:

My name is Natalia Boldyreva. I am a resident of Redmond Ridge since year 2012. I am a registered voter. I reside with my husband, Arkadiy Boldyrev, who is also a registered voter, and our son, Pavel Boldyrev, a U.S. citizen who will turn 18 years of age on July 11, 2020, which means that we have another soon-to-be registered voter who is very much affected by your proposal. I am copying my family members here. Needless to state, we are very upset: we received the email from Redmond Ridge Homeowners' Association, and we could not believe what we were reading.

How can you propose these awful zoning changes during the COVID-19 pandemic? Councilmember Lambert has been to our community just recently, and we have invited each and every one of you to come meet us. Ms. Lambert has seen our schools, the number of children we have here, you all should know that that we care about our clean air, clean water, quiet peaceful, low crime environment – place we have chosen as a family to reside because all of that! Why are you propozing for these zoning changes to take place?

And why are these changes being proposed now, during COVID-19 pandemic? This whole proposal seems like a very dirty stunt of King County Council, given that it would be difficult for us, the affected residents, to organize public protests with the whole community involved, along with media coverage. Do you really want us to violate the Governor's orders and organize all these protests now, during the pandemic? What is really going on? Who is sponsoring all these zoning changes?

You should immediately vote, at the very least, that the zoning should be extended as it stands today for at least one more year to allow for the COVID-19 pandemic to end. Only then, after the pandemic, we, the affected people, will be able to meaningfully participate in the decision making process and get our voices heard again. It is imperative that you do not use this pandemic to conveniently pass the zoning changes without allowing the affected citizens meaningful participation.

The entire Council seems to have forgotten about our community, its needs, and our just very basic human right to feel safe in our homes, to breath clean odor-free air, to drink clean water, to have little or no crime, and to raise our children in safety and peace. What is this with all these prisons, shelters, work-release facilities, helipads, and marijuana processing? How can you possibly allow for all these things to potentially go into our community with your zoning changes?

This is not good politics, dear Councilmembers. Maybe Ms. Lambert is specifically representing our community, but you all are responsible to oversee the quality of basic human needs of your constituents here in Redmond Ridge.

Here is our additional comments, as they have been drafted by Redmond Ridge. We could not have expressed these points better, so here they are. We are sending them to you, so that our entire email becomes a matter of public record:

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalia and Arkadiy Boldyrev

Redmond Ridge residents since year 2012, registered voters.

425 633 4555 and 425 6334557

23611 NE 89<sup>th</sup> Street,

Redmond, WA 98053

**From:** [Nilan Shakya](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#)  
**Cc:** [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 8:10:32 PM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Nilan and Pranita Shakya



8558 233rd Place NE, Redmond, WA - 98053

**From:** [Bob Kliever](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#)  
**Subject:** 2020 King County Plan Update Ordinance 2019-0413  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 2:28:41 PM

---

Dear King County Council Members,

I am a homeowner in Trilogy Redmond Ridge in the Bear Creek UPD portion of the zoning and land use study. I have read through the document listing the proposed zoning amendment changes. Since the Ordinance still has proposals that could negatively impact the environment and the enjoyment and value of properties within Redmond Ridge, my wife and I are asking that the intent and tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact in the new zoning. We are particularly opposed to the removal of several p-suffix conditions listed on item # 7 of the notification letter that was sent out to affected King County residents. Please take this into consideration as you finalize the upcoming zoning changes for the Bear Creek area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,  
Bob Kliever

**From:** [KJ Lee](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding Redmond Ridge Zoning  
**Date:** Thursday, May 21, 2020 10:50:13 AM

---

Dears,

I am a long-time resident at Redmond ridge who is also a father of two kids. As you may hear from many of us, we can not allow any Marijuana production/processing in our neighborhood. As a leader in King county, you must consider all different perspectives. We understand and greatly appreciate all your hard works.

I just have one thing to say. Marijuana and kids should not be mixed at all costs. All my kids were born and raised in Redmond Ridge. An older one is now a teen in a new middle school in here. The impact of such a business is too big to them. This does not meet a high qualify life standard of King county. A whole WA state and nation will notice and look down our county if such happens.

Again, we appreciate your strong leadership and consideration. We should keep a high qualify of our life in Redmond Ridge and King county.

Sincerely,

Jin

**From:** [Michael Kimura](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Revising the current Comprehensive Plan to include new zoning regulations for Redmond Ridge  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2020 7:17:53 PM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Council members:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Mike Kimura

**From:** [Sachi Pradhan](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2020 7:14:36 AM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

**Sachi Bajracharya**

**From:** [Prince Bajracharya](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UDP Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2020 7:13:19 AM

---

To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County Councilmembers:

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UDP Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UDP guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UDP use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UDP be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals, which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

- Prince Bajracharya

**From:** [Ashish Consul](#)  
**To:** [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Policy Staff, Council CompPlan](#); [Dembowski, Rod](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [von Reichbauer, Pete](#); [Balducci, Claudia](#); [Lambert, Kathy](#); [Kohl-Welles, Jeanne](#); [McDermott, Joe](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Upthegrove, Dave](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Zahilay, Girmay](#); [Dunn, Reagan](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Krekel-Zoppi, Leah](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [Calderon, Angelica](#); [AskLocalServices](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [Taylor, John - Dir](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#); [LeClair, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 20, 2020 12:15:00 AM

---

**To King County Mobility and Review Committee, King County  
Representatives of the Department of Local Services and King County  
Council Members:**

This letter is in response to the review of the Redmond Ridge and Trilogy UPD Comparison Chart with King County Code Chapter 21A.08 – Permitted Uses, and Striking Amendment S1 to proposed ordinance 2019-0413.

I am a long time resident of Redmond Ridge and a concerned parent of two daughters. It is with great distress that I write this email to you regarding the subject.

Not only my family but all of my neighbors and residents of Redmond Ridge are very concerned about the proposed permitted uses. After reading this I hope you will understand the citizens priorities and right to live in a clean, healthy neighborhood and raise our kids without the threat of violence, sex offenses, pollution and vices. Further, I hope that you will put the welfare of the people above short term benefits which never materialize anyways.

Based on this detailed comparison chart which includes the Draft Comprehensive Use plan and new zoning changes, specifically referencing the Redmond Ridge Residential Owners Association and Master Planned Community, we would like to reiterate our position that it is imperative that the intent and the tested protections of the current UPD guidelines remain intact.

The only means to maintain the vitality of our community is to prevent negative business impacts and to preserve property values by upholding current UPD use restrictions for businesses.

Based upon King County Code 21A.38.100 Special district overlay - commercial/industrial. A. The purpose of the commercial/industrial special district overlay is to accommodate and support existing commercial/industrial areas outside of activity centers by providing incentives for the redevelopment of underutilized commercial or industrial lands and by permitting a range of appropriate uses consistent with maintaining the quality of nearby residential areas.

We strongly encourage the comparison chart's newly allowed uses be:

- 1) removed from the comprehensive plan, and/or
- 2) the adoption of an additional special district overlay to ensure the integrity of the UPD be maintained, and the land use remain consistent with maintaining the quality of the nearby residential areas, per K.C.C. 21.A.38.100.A.

We believe that this request is also consistent with King County Council's Motion 15329, Attachment A, Section II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals,

which states: In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration of the above requests and recommendations.

Best Regards,  
Ashish Consul  
Redmond Ridge Resident