



Comprehensive Plan Update Comments

To: City of Lake Forest Park
From: SCJ Alliance
Date: September 19, 2024
Project: Lake Forest Park Comprehensive Plan Update
Subject: Response to City and Planning Commission Comments

Introduction:

As part of the Comprehensive Plan Update, the project team heard a variety of comments as part of the editing process. The following table reflects where edits in the Draft Comprehensive Plan Update were made, and the responses and recommendations provided by SCJ Alliance.

Element/Goal/Policy	Comment	SCJ Response
<p>Policy LU-1.6: Collaborate with all residents during the land use planning process (e.g., comprehensive planning, ordinance development, etc.) and intentionally connect with people that have not historically been engaged, including racial and ethnic minorities, those with lower incomes, youth, seniors, and others.</p>	<p>Equity language: I believe that the best way to combat past discrimination is to doggedly pursue the guiding star of equal treatment for everyone. That being the case, I am against policies that would preference or discriminate against anyone based on their sex or race. Examples of this discrimination are present in the following policies: LU-1.6, LU 2.8, LU 2.9, 10.1, 10.4, H1.7, ED-4.6, T 1.18</p>	<p>We recommend keeping the policy language as presented here. Not only does it align with other Comprehensive Plan policies, PSRC’s Multicounty Planning Policies (MPP), and King County’s Countywide Planning Policies (CPP), it is a best practice recommended by the Department of Commerce and our national American Planning Association as a more effective way of achieving true equity. This type of policy language does not create prejudice or discrimination; instead, it elevates those who have been previously marginalized.</p> <p>For example, MPP-RC-2 states “Prioritize services and access</p>

		to opportunity for people of color, people with low incomes, and historically underserved communities to ensure all people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve quality of life and address past inequities.” By intentionally connecting with people that have historically not been engaged, the City is addressing the “prioritizing access to opportunity to improve quality of life and address past inequities” intention of said MPP.
Policy LU–3.4: Designate scenic vistas and water access to be conserved as development occurs.	“Have we done this? Where does the city apply this?”	Research with City staff. Update references and/or propose implementation action(s).
Policy LU–10.1: Collaborate with all residents during the comprehensive planning process and intentionally connect with people who self-identify as Black, Indigenous, or other people of color, those with lower incomes, youths, seniors, and other groups that have not historically engaged in long-range planning processes.	Strike 'people who self-identify.' While I would like the discriminatory language removed entirely, this policy has additional problematic language. The color of one's skin or genetic heritage is not up to self-identification but rather an unalterable reality. In addition, this language is inconsistent with the rest of the document. It should be removed.	We very strongly recommend keeping the language as presented. It is not discriminatory or prejudicial, but elevates the experiences of the BIPOC community. Historically, racial designations have changed many times in the US. This language also provides more inclusivity for people with multiracial backgrounds. If alternate wording would still be preferred, another option could be “...people who self-identify with a lived experience that has historically not been engaged in the planning process.” This policy concept is related to PSRC’s MPPs.
Policy EQ-3.9: Coordinate with the regional agencies and	The City has been an active member of the Lake	Research with City staff.

<p>neighboring jurisdictions to improve regional surface water management and salmon recovery efforts, resolve interjurisdictional concerns, and implement watershed-based action plans.</p> <p><i>Watershed action plans are multi-jurisdictional plans that coordinate efforts to address water quality and storm water runoff problems that can contribute to flooding and property damage within a watershed that crosses the boundaries of two or more jurisdictions. The cities of Lake Forest Park, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline, and Snohomish County have formed a watershed forum to guide the development of a watershed action plan for the Lake Ballinger/McAleer Creek watershed. Additionally, the City has been an active member of the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 8 Salmon Recovery Council since [year] along with 28 other local governments.</i></p>	<p>Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Salmon Recovery Council for nearly 25 years along with 29 other local governments.” Additional searching shows me that it’s 29 total local governments, but can anyone confirm which year LFP joined the SRC?</p>	
<p>Policy EQ-5.2: Encourage reduced energy demand, support energy management technology, and encourage greater reliance</p>	<p>Strike ‘Reduce energy demand’ I am not in favor of the city making policy to ‘reduce the energy demand’ , nor do I think it is the citizenry’s will.</p>	<p>While reducing energy demand helps with limiting the cost of upgrading the energy grid with growth, what this policy really</p>

<p>on sustainable energy sources compared to conventional sources.</p>		<p>gets at is energy efficiency for both economic reasons but also to reduce emissions, which is a part of the PSRC requirements under MPP-CC-2 and MPP-CC-3.</p>
<p>Policy EQ-6.3: Promote dark skies through measures that encourage reduced light trespass and use of lighting appropriate to the task. For properties along Lake Washington, encourage application of best practices such as DarkSky International standards to help reduce negative impacts on threatened salmon populations.</p>	<p>“Is this a policy or document? Needs referencing” – in reference to previous mention of “Artificial Light at Night” wording.</p>	<p>Removed language on “Artificial Light at Night” to instead reference the DarkSky International Standards.</p>
<p>Goal EQ-10 Promote education on sustainable production and a circular economy.</p> <p>Policy EQ-10.1: Support a sustainable and local food economy.</p> <p>Policy EQ-10.2: Promote education on sustainable food production and waste reduction methods, like composting, to avoid food waste.</p> <p>Policy EQ-10.3: Encourage zero waste through waste reduction programs and education on product lifecycles such as cradle to cradle design.</p> <p>Policy EQ-10.4. Coordinate efforts to reduce waste by making recycling and composting more accessible and efficient.</p>	<p>Goal EQ 10 and 11 could be combined and condensed. For example... Goal EQ-10: Promote education on sustainable food production and waste reduction. Policy 10.1 Support sustainable and local food options. 10.2 Promote education on composting and other methods to avoid food waste. 10.3 Encourage zero waste through waste reduction programs and education on the lifecycle of goods. 10.4 Reduce landfill material by making recycling and composting more accessible and efficient.</p>	<p>Agreed. Edits were made to combine Goal EQ-10 and EQ-11 and adjust policies as needed to fall under one. The use of “circular economy” in the goal covers waste prevention, diversion, and reduction. “Cradle to cradle design”, found in Policy EQ-10.3, is a sustainable product production principle that looks at a product’s life holistically and seeks to build efficient and waste free systems.</p> <p>For 10.4, we recommend leaving the coordination piece to make it a larger impact than just the City. This can go to the region, with schools, with community partners, etc.</p>
<p>Housing Element</p>	<p>Planning Commission did not review an underline-strikethrough version of policy edits for the Housing Element, but did review the proposed Housing Element and included it in the recommendation. The changes reflect state legislative requirements, regional PSRC MPPs, and King</p>	

	County CPPs. The changes are substantial and the new Element is significantly different than the 2015 Element.	
<p>Housing Element Introduction “Lake Forest Park’s housing element ensures that there will be enough housing to accommodate expected growth in the city,”</p>	<p>Change the second sentence.....Lake Forest Park’s housing element ensures that the zoning for the city prepares for and can accommodate expected growth in the city..... As the city does not build, this reflects the reality that the city zones and encourages development and builders build.</p>	<p>The proposed language captures the City’s role. The City is in charge of more than just zoning but also the development code that tells the developers what they can build and how they can build it. This action-oriented statement also starts to get at addressing barriers in policy and codes, as required under state law. With the state legislation on housing (HB 1110, 1220, and 1337), the City has a lot of changes within its housing element and development code to ensure that there not only is enough housing in the City to accommodate growth but that it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for housing availability across all income bands • Allows for a diverse range of housing types • Treats middle housing the same as single family housing • Identifies and works to undo racially disparate impacts
<p>Goal H-1: Housing Supply and Diversity Ensure that Lake Forest Park has sufficient quantity and variety of housing types to meet projected growth and needs of people of all income levels and demographic groups.</p>	<p>Again, the city does not build housing and, therefore, cannot “ensure quantity.” The city can zone for and promote housing through regulation/policy. All wording should reflect this reality and avoid words such as “provide, ensure, and meeting needs.</p>	<p>We recommend keeping the goal language as written. The City does not itself build housing, but it guides development and has a direct role in the quantity and variety of housing types that can be built. Per the WA Department of Commerce, the City needs to identify and analyze projected</p>

		housing needs, identify the capacity of land for housing. and ensure “Adequate provisions for existing and projected housing needs for all economic segments of the community” see RCW 36.70A.070(2)
Policy H–1.1: Promote fair and equitable access to housing for all persons, regardless of lived experience.	Return to original wording. All means all – no need to have a laundry list. In reference to this policy previously mentioning “regardless of race, religion, ethnic origin, age, household composition or size, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or income.”	Language changed per comment. The list was meant as an added measure to protect individuals who have faced discrimination in housing practices historically. This added language reflects RCW 36.70A.070(2)(f)
Policy H–1.3: Increase the variety of residential densities and housing types allowed throughout Lake Forest Park’s residential areas to meet the needs of people of all incomes and life stages and increase access to housing for both renters and homeowners.	Return to the original wording.	“Original wording” stated “Provide for a variety of residential densities and housing types.” HB 1220 requires that cities update language to include all income bands and diverse needs
Policy H–1.4: Consider the impact of land use policies and regulatory decisions on housing capacity and diversity, and regularly monitor and assess existing and projected housing needs, gaps in partnerships, policies and dedicated resources for meeting housing needs of all segments of the population.	Return to the original wording.	“Original wording” stated “Consider the impact on housing capacity and diversity when making land use policy and regulatory decisions.” See earlier comment, HB 1220 requires that cities update language to meet the needs for all income bands
Policy H–1.7: Create opportunities for a variety of housing types, sizes, and affordability levels throughout the city that address historic inequities in access to homeownership options for	Return to the original wording.	“Original wording” stated “Create opportunities for housing in a variety of settings, sizes, and affordability levels throughout the City.”

<p>Black, Indigenous and People of Color communities.</p>		<p>Language is needed for the City to address homeownership opportunities for communities of color (per PSRC MPP-H-5)</p>
<p>Policy H–1.10: Adopt policies and strategies that promote equitable development, mitigate displacement of low-income households and address impacts of past and present racially exclusive and discriminatory policies and practices.</p>	<p>Strike policy. Many of these have already been covered in prior policies. Where are the present racially exclusive and discriminatory policies and practices?</p>	<p>We recommend leaving the policy as proposed to address the state (HB 1220), regional (PSRC MPPs on housing and equity), and county requirements (King County CPPs on equity and affordability).</p> <p>Policies and practices that are racially exclusive and discriminatory have been baked into the field of planning and housing development throughout history in cities across the country through zoning, redlining, exclusionary homeownership opportunities, racially restrictive covenants (see LCG’s RDI report and https://depts.washington.edu/civilr/covenants.htm), and more. While some of these are from the past, they show up in modern ways and have lasting impacts on who lives where across cities like Lake Forest Park.</p>
<p>Policy H–2.2: Promote residential neighborhoods that protect and promote quality outdoor spaces and contribute to an equitable distribution of parks and open space throughout the city.</p>	<p>Return to the original wording.</p>	<p>“Original wording” stated “Promote site planning techniques that create quality outdoor spaces and are in harmony with neighboring properties.”</p> <p>We recommend keeping the proposed policy language to address PSRC MPP-En-15, which promotes open space and park access for all</p>

		<p>residents, prioritizing access to historically underserved communities.</p> <p>Historically within land use practices, parks and open space have not been placed equally across communities. Often, those with lower socioeconomic status and of a racial or ethnic minority have less access to quality outdoor spaces, parks, open spaces, etc. This can contribute to poorer health outcomes that are exacerbated by other outside factors such as climate change.</p>
<p>Policy H-2.4: Enhance the condition of neighborhoods by supporting the maintenance and improvement of existing housing through both public and private investment.</p>	<p>I’m not sure what this means. In the previous language, I assume that the goal was to preserve and enhance the condition of neighborhoods through things like landscaping/signage, etc, which makes sense to have both public and private investment. The new language refers to maintaining and improving existing housing, so I am not sure what public investment would be involved.</p>	<p>This addresses the condition of residential dwellings that are developed or managed through funding from both public and private investments (i.e., multi-unit structures) so that they can be consistent with the standards required to exist in LFP neighborhoods without increasing costs disproportionately to residents (especially renters who may earn lower incomes). Public investment may come from grant funding, a separate public housing entity, or other public funding source.</p>
<p>Policy H-4.5: Partner with public and private partners to preserve existing affordable housing, and prioritize the use of resources to support housing services for people experiencing homelessness and others with disproportionately greater housing needs.</p>	<p>Return to the original wording.</p>	<p>“Original wording” stated “Support public and private housing services for people who are homeless.”</p> <p>We recommend keeping the policy language as presented. The City needs to show the state, PRSC, and King County how they plan to address affordable housing across all income bands and emergency</p>

		<p>housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing for those experiencing or at-risk of homelessness. Per RCW 36.70A.070(2)(c) It also should be noted that in addressing homelessness, people experience it differently with different needs based on their identity and lived experiences.</p>
<p>Economic Development Element: Introduction</p> <p>Lake Forest Park’s many amenities, including open space, high quality urban design, green landscape, and Lake Washington access, are an important economic development asset and the element provides guidance for preservation and enhancement of these amenities.</p>	<p>Infrastructure?</p>	<p>Planning Commission has used the term “green resource” to mean the many environmental, open space, and other natural resources in the city. This include not only parks and open spaces, but also street trees and other features that provide a natural and green counterpoint to urban development. The term has a draft definition in the Glossary, but it has remained somewhat ephemeral for the duration of discussion and review.</p> <p>City Council to provide input and select a preferred term: green resource, green character, green landscape, or something else?</p>
<p>Policy ED-4.7: Evaluate the impacts of City regulations and policies on economic development, particularly in the Southern Gateway, including development standards and regulations, permitting fees and timelines, parking requirements, and implement strategies to address impacts and overcome barriers.</p>	<p>I think we need a similar analysis that applies also to commercial and multi-use per our discussions about the Southern Gateway in particular. Possible a parallel policy in ED-4</p>	<p>We recommend one or more implementation actions, such as:</p> <p>Prepare an economic development analysis for Southern Gateway, including a market assessment. Incorporate recommendations related to reducing development barriers and reducing or eliminating parking requirements prepared for this</p>

		Comprehensive Plan and other planning projects.
Policy CS-2.5: Promote trainings for police and other public servants to support safe and positive interactions with community members across backgrounds.	I prefer to strike this policy. Having something as specific as de-escalation training here is out of place. I also mentioned in our meeting that it seems like a tragic jab at our police to have the only mention of them being in this derogatory manner. They deserve better. I also mentioned in the meeting that I would like to add policy 3.7 back in.	Language edited to be more generic. We still recommend the City consider trainings that support healthy conflict navigation with individuals across lived experiences, including de-escalation training. Specific trainings can appear in the implementation actions. We have also added policy 3.7 back in (below) with language that encourages more civic involvement overall between youth and public authorities.
Goal CS-8: Community Resilience Foster a friendly, caring, and mutually supportive community to improve climate resilience.	Strike Goal CS-8	We recommend keeping this goal as it aligns with LFP’s strong commitment to community-building and is a key factor in addressing challenges posed by natural hazards, disaster situations, and the impacts of climate change.
Policy CS-8.1: Enhance partnerships between the City and community-based organizations to support equity in decision-making.	Which community-based organization are we talking about? It also seems repetitive, with ideas already in earlier sections.	This should be considered an open invitation to work with <i>any</i> CBO on relevant issues in LFP. This could include nonprofits, NGOs, charitable organizations, etc. Partnerships will help LFP be more successful at addressing current and future community needs by understanding issues directly from those deeply involved and relying on community-sourced solutions that are typically very readily deployed and supported.

<p>Policy CS-8.2: Support community stewardship of community resources to build strong social connections through service, such as events to clean up beaches and parks and restore riparian zones.</p>	<p>These ideas would be better fitted to EQ/Parks.</p>	<p>Language revised to clarify focus on stewardship and community-building.</p>
<p>Goal CF-2: <i>The City's drainage ordinance is contained in Title 16.24 of the Lake Forest Park Municipal Code, which can be accessed online at: www.codepublishing.com/wa/lakeforestpark/. The City intends to develop multimodal transportation LOS standards, consistent with Policy T-1.16 in the Transportation Element</i></p>	<p>Check links to make sure they are active and point to the correct document.</p>	<p>The link provided is to the overall LFP Municipal Code; here is the link for LFPMC 16.24 in case that one is preferred.</p>
<p>Goal PT-2: Trails Promote a safe, interconnected system of trails throughout the city, that serve important recreational and transportation roles for regional and local bicycle and pedestrian trail systems.</p>	<p>Perhaps it is just my copy, but PT 2.2-2.4 are missing.</p>	<p>Those were relocated to the implementation actions draft document during the July revisions.</p>
<p>Goal PT-7: Arts and Culture Encourage inclusive representation in and expanded public access to art and cultural heritage in public places.</p> <p>Policy PT-7.1: Support visual and performing arts in the community and promote art education and participation.</p> <p>Policy PT-7.2: Encourage private and corporate support of the arts.</p>	<p>"If I remember correctly, during our discussion of this goal, we decided that 'inclusive representation' did not belong in this. How about.....Develop and expand public access to art and cultural heritage through the utilization of public spaces.</p>	<p>Consider additional policies to address inclusive representation.</p>
<p>Policy PT-10.1: Prioritize historically underserved neighborhoods for parks, trails,</p>	<p>Strike historically. The priority for parks/ trails investments should be (in addition to many other practical things</p>	<p>The policy as written addresses PSRC's MPP-En-15, "Provide parks, trails, and open space within walking distance of</p>

<p>and open space improvements and investments.</p>	<p>such as land availability) focus on current gaps in service.</p>	<p>urban residents. Prioritize historically underserved communities for open space improvements and investments.”</p> <p>Prioritizing underserved neighborhoods more generally could continue patterns of disinvestment in historically marginalized areas.</p>
<p>Goal U-2: VISION 2050 is available online at: https://www.psrc.org/planning-2050/vision-2050.</p>	<p>Check links to make sure they are active and point to the correct document.</p>	<p>The provided link goes to the VISION 2050 main page; here is the direct link to the document, in case that’s preferred.</p>
<p>Goal U-2: The King County Comprehensive Plan is available online at: https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/executive/governance-leadership/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/king-county-comprehensive-plan.</p>	<p>Check links to make sure they are active and point to the correct document.</p>	<p>The provided link goes to the King County Comp Plan main page; here is the direct link to the document, in case that’s preferred.</p>
<p>Goal U-5: Climate Commitment Enhance community resilience and suppose address historic inequities in environmental and health conditions support environmental justice outcomes through the provision of reliable utility services.</p>	<p>I would prefer not to use the environmental justice language.</p> <p>Previous language was: “Enhance community resilience and suppose environmental justice outcomes through the provision of reliable utility services”</p>	<p>We moved the language away from stating environmental justice.</p> <p>MPP-RC-2 states “Prioritize services and access to opportunity for people of color, people with low incomes, and historically underserved communities to ensure all people can attain the resources and opportunities to improve quality of life and address past inequities.”</p> <p>Also MPP-RC-3 states “Make reduction of health disparities and improvement of health outcomes across the region a</p>

		<p>priority when developing and carrying out regional, countywide, and local plans.” Climate change does not impact individuals equally based on previous practices and policies. It makes existing harms worse. So to ensure cities are not causing more harm today they need to addressing the root service inequities that already exist.</p>
<p>Policy U-5.5: Encourage a transition from natural gas energy usage to electric energy for homes and businesses.</p>	<p>Strike Policy. I do not favor the city encouraging or mandating a transition from natural gas to electric energy, nor do I think it is the citizenry’s will.</p>	<p>This language is based on the state pursuing a reduction in GHG emissions and improving public health. Natural gas has shown to have a negative impact on human health. HB 1589 was passed by the state legislature in 2023 which “Prohibits any large gas company that serves more than 500,000 retail natural gas customers in Washington as of June 30, 2023, from providing natural gas service to any commercial or residential location that did not receive gas service or have filed applications for gas service as of June 30, 2023.”</p> <p>While there is a ballot initiative this November that addresses this and other climate legislation, we recommend the City keep this policy due to the health impacts from natural gas usage.</p> <p>Following discussion on 9/10, multiple Commissioners have concerns about pivoting away from natural gas.</p>

<p>Policy T-1.2: Coordinate with planned light rail and bus rapid transit services coming to and near Lake Forest Park if a park & ride facility is funded and designed. Work with neighboring communities to develop additional regional “upstream” park & ride facilities.</p>	<p>If I remember, there was a discussion about whether a park & ride facility in town was something people wanted.</p>	<p>The facility is planned by Sound Transit. This policy lays the groundwork to coordinate with ST to make sure the facility fits more readily into LFP.</p>
<p>Policy T-1.12: Encourage Commute Trip Reduction Program strategies and practices to reduce drive-alone miles and vehicle miles traveled especially during peak hours.</p> <p><i>Travel Demand Management (TDM), is intended to reduce the need for roadway expansion by encouraging options such as telecommuting, employers providing free bus passes, and working flex hours.</i></p>	<p>If I remember, we discussed striking this as it is impractical for our city. We do not have many businesses for which this would or could apply.</p>	<p>It is correct that there are not many businesses to which a TDM program would currently apply. This could be stricken, but it is aligned with PSRC policies and there is no harm in keeping it.</p> <p>Staff prefers to retain the policy.</p>
<p>Policy T-2.14: Promote appropriate street conditions for people walking, rolling, and biking to feel safe around different levels of traffic.</p>	<p>Awkward wording. I would be fine with striking the policy as it seems redundant, but going back to the old 2.15 language would be better, or just saying, pedestrians.</p> <p>Previous version: Policy T-2.15, “Promote motor vehicle driver awareness of the need to honor the space of pedestrians, joggers, and bicyclists.”</p>	<p>Policy revised to address awkward phrasing. The policy as proposed replaced “joggers” with “rolling” to address accessibility.</p> <p>Alternative: “Promote driver awareness of people walking, rolling and biking...” Alternative: “Promote driver awareness of active mode users, such as pedestrians and bicyclists...”</p>

Land Use Element Introduction, Context and Background	Commissioner recommended to add text regarding recent state legislative changes, including the 2021 Climate Commitment Act (which is currently at risk under Initiative 2117); appropriate to include?	SCJ to add discussion of current legislative context - climate, housing, transportation, etc.
Land Use Element Introduction, The Comprehensive Plan & Other Land Use Policy Guidance	Check links to make sure they are active and point to the correct document.	Unsure if link is needed for 2019 Town Center Vision.
EQ, Planning Context, Shoreline Master Program (2019)	Verify the current version of the referenced studies is listed.	Both LFP and Ecology websites link to 2013 SMP; the 2019 update does not seem to be posted anywhere.
Housing Element: Housing Development Trends Single-unit housing production in Lake Forest Park has followed prevailing economic trends over the past few decades, as shown below in Figure II-30. About 15-30 units per year were permitted in from the mid-1990s until the 2008 recession. After the economy recovered, single-family development resumed a similar pace with the addition of some multifamily, triplex and four-plex construction in 2015-2018.	Worth mentioning that while single-unit, the one large development in the Southern Gateway added many (not sure how many) units in a very different style than LFP traditionally?	New language recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. Additional information needed from City staff.
Housing Element: Rental Market Trends “The median rent in 2021 was \$1,839”	Explain what the assumption is about size or bedroom count or whatever	Staff is addressing this.
Housing Element: Housing Affordability “Freddie Mac mortgage interest rates as of August 2023,”	Since this is a long-term document, would be good to list the average 30-yr fixed rate or something like that. People may not remember 10 years from now what was going on with rates compared to the recent past	Staff is addressing this.
Figure II-1: Lake Forest Park Employment Location Heatmap, 2020	Some of the more faded “hot spots” make no sense. Might be worth reviewing the data or only showing the true hot spots.	Staff is addressing this.

Commented [CH1]: Housing comments should be addressed by Leland.

<p>Housing Element: Housing Tenure</p> <p>“Lake Forest Park’s older, wealthier resident base is likely to prefer home ownership due to their ability to afford the home purchase and their plan to stay in Lake Forest Park for an extended period.”</p>	<p>There’s an important nuance here - many folks have been here already for a long time and couldn’t afford even a smaller home in the area, so they stay in their big 1950s ramblers</p>	<p>Staff is addressing this.</p>
<p>Table II-9: Work Locations of Lake Forest Park Residents, 2021</p>	<p>Remove the word “city.”</p>	<p>Removed the word “city”.</p>
<p>Housing Element: Key Takeaways</p> <p>“The population of Lake Forest Park is older, wealthier, more highly educated, and has a higher share of homeowners than nearby peer communities, suggesting potential demand for ownership housing and significant spending potential.”</p>	<p>See earlier note that absent smaller, accessible homes within the city, the “old and wealthy” are just going to stay put. They are not going to buy a new place.</p>	<p>Staff is addressing this.</p>
<p>Capital Facilities Element: Public Facility Providers</p> <p>“REET I allows local jurisdictions to levy up to 0.25 percent of the selling price of real property for financing capital improvements. REET II allows local jurisdictions fully planning under the Growth Management Act to levy an additional 0.25 percent to finance capital projects identified in the capital facilities element of the comprehensive plan.”</p>	<p>Maybe say what REET is and how much LFP utilizes it</p>	<p>Staff is addressing this.</p>
<p>Table II-27: Misc. Main Replacement – on 38th and 38th Streets</p>		<p>Are the streets meant to be different?</p>
<p>Parks, Trails, and Open Space Element: Planning Context</p> <p>“The primary purpose of the <i>Legacy 100-Year Vision</i> is to promote the enhancement of the</p>	<p>In Volume I, there were several uses of the term “green resource” which is odd and confusing. Is there a reason we don’t use infrastructure in Volume I?</p>	<p>Using “Green Infrastructure” has the possibility to not be as inclusive of language and could be misleading to some audiences. Green infrastructure is primarily</p>

<p>City's green infrastructure over the next century."</p>		<p>thought of as stormwater management in uses such as rain gardens, bioswales, permeable pavements, and green roofs. There are co-benefits to green infrastructure, like reducing heat, but the use of "green resource" is broader and more encompassing.</p> <p>"Green resource" includes "green infrastructure" but the reverse is not necessarily true.</p>
<p>Table II- 35: Inventory of Parks and Recreation Facilities in Lake Forest Park</p>	<p>Five Acre Woods and Brookside Park need to be added to inventory and map.</p>	<p>Staff added Five-Acre Woods, but working with City staff to confirm if "Brookside" indicates Brookside Park.</p>
<p>Utilities, Electricity, <i>The City's Surface Water Management Plan</i> is available online at: www.cityoffp.gov/DocumentCenter/View/396.</p>	<p>Check links to make sure they are active and point to the correct document.</p>	<p>This document is no longer available; is there an updated version that the City can provide? Additional reference to that same document within body text on the same page.</p>
<p>Transportation Element: Safe Streets Priority List</p> <p>Tier 2 (Lower Priority)</p> <p>7. Perkins Way Pedestrian/Bike Infrastructure</p>	<p>This needs to be elevated. When rail opens at 185th and I-5, traffic is going to increase significantly on Perkins and it is already a very dangerous pedestrian route due to speeding by cars and limited sight lines.</p>	<p>City Council should work with Public Works to make changes to the Safe Streets priority list. This list comes directly from the Safe Streets plan.</p>