

Question & Answer Matrix
April 21, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	yaStaff Response
1	6904	Reynolds	I am very confused about the new 10" line. Where is the 10" line going in contrast to the 24" line? Can I tell from the maps?	<p>The 10" line will run the entire distance of Gallagher Hill Road, from SE 40th Street to SE 36th Street. It is shown in Exhibit 2 as the blue line. The new 10" main will be located in the downhill (northbound) lane of Gallagher Hill Road. The new 24" supply pipeline will be located in the uphill (southbound) lane of Gallagher Hill Road. The existing AC main lies primarily in the uphill (southbound) lane and conflicts with the 24" pipeline's location.</p> <p>This AC main was previously scheduled for replacement in 2024, but timing was adjusted to align with the Water Supply Pipeline Project to minimize construction impacts and allow for more utility space within the available ROW.</p>
2	6904	Reynolds	Two maps are shown. I am map-challenged. Is one a before and one after? Does the second one not show the 16" line to the south or the Shorewood line? Why not?	<p>Exhibit 1 is an overview map – delineating how the City currently receives water from SPU, which follows the purple route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The blue route is an existing City water main that can be used as an emergency supply line to the fill City Reservoirs. • The green line is the water main that connects to Shorewood, and this pipe is owned by <u>Shorewood</u>Seattle Public Utilities. <p>Exhibit 2 displays the work that will be completed with the new Water Supply Pipeline Project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The orange line is the new 24" supply pipeline. • The yellow line is the SPU main that is being replaced by the orange line. • The red line is existing SPU supply pipeline that will be transferred to City ownership. • The green dot shows the new master meter, where SPU responsibility will terminate and City ownership will start. With the abandonment of the SPU supply pipeline along SE 40th

Question & Answer Matrix
April 21, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	yaStaff Response
				<p>Street, a new connection point will be required to provide water to Shorewood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pink dots represent two new connection points to feed Shorewood from existing City water mains. These two new connection points will loop the Shorewood system and improve water quality.
3	6908	Reynolds	<p>Is a track changes on fee schedule available or practical to create? If not, can you conceptually describe how things changed? Did anything other than special event parking go up by materially more than the CPI increase? Did any fees decrease?</p>	<p>The tracked changes are shown on page 3 & 4 of the Agenda Bill. Changes included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adding special event parking at the Town Center Parking Area. Including the option for promotional and seasonal fee reductions in the Parks & Recreation fees. Adding special event parking at the MICEC. <p>No other fees were changed as part of this agenda item.</p>
4	6909	Reynolds	<p>Is it safe t assume we can still easily meet the FAR requirements even if we continue the daylight plane, modulation, feature, etc requirements since the buildings can go up to 8 stories?</p>	<p>No, its not safe to assume that we can easily meet the FAR requirements in HB 1491 by increasing building heights in the Town Center alone. In Phase 2, the City will need to consider additional changes to development regulations for the Town Center as well as additional height/density increases throughout the station area to comply with the 3.5 FAR requirement in HB 1491.</p>
5	6909	Reynolds	<p>Did the modeling we did for affordable units created plan for retention of the daylight plane and modulation and feature requirements? If not, how would that modeling be impacted?</p>	<p>The modeling did not specifically take these requirements into account. Instead, it used conservative assumptions about the amount of square footage that could be achieved on a lot. These assumptions align with the reductions in square footage required with regulations like the daylight plane, facade modulation and major site feature requirements. If the City considers modifying these requirements to reduce the impact on building size/scale, the model could be adjusted with less conservative assumptions.</p>

Question & Answer Matrix
April 21, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	yaStaff Response
6	6909	Reynolds	Can we ban other types of businesses, e.g., firearm sales?	<p>Warehousing and adult entertainment are the two uses discussed in AB 6909 because they are the two uses that are not consistently allowed or prohibited in the Town Center subareas so the decision to allow or prohibit them is needed in order to consolidate the subareas in the Town Center from six subareas to two.</p> <p>Should the Council wish to consider permitting/disallowing additional uses in the Town Center, it should be added to the work plan for consideration after GMA compliance has been achieved.</p> <p>Specific to the sale of firearms, State law almost fully regulates the sale and purchase of firearms, leaving limited authority to local jurisdictions. RCW 9.41.300 provides that a business selling firearms may not be treated more restrictively than other businesses in the same zone. However, local jurisdictions may prohibit businesses selling firearms within 500 feet of primary and secondary school grounds.</p>
7	6909	Reynolds	Is \$25 / sq ft already decided as the fee in lieu or still under discussion? How was that amount picked?	<p>The City Council will have the opportunity to set the fee in lieu amount at a future meeting. The Nexus Study conducted by CAI evaluated the fee level that can be supported and staff will bring additional information and a recommendation to the Council on the fee amount, along with a resolution to amend the City's Fee schedule.</p>
8	6909	Reynolds	I do not understand the implications of the daylight plane (etc) requirements. Yes, it reduces the FAR that can be built. But do we have to REQUIRE a minimum FAR in TC under our GMHB plan, or just allow it? Because if we require it, all it means is someone needs to build higher. But if we just allow it, does it impact us at all since we already plan to allow up to 8 stories?	<p>FAR requirements are not part of the GMHB order. Rather, FAR will come into play in Phase 2, when the City works to comply with HB 1491. State law does not require a FAR minimum, just an average of 3.5 FAR for the Station Area (RCW 36.70A.840(2)(a)(i)). The City is awaiting further guidance from the Department of Commerce on how the average station-area-FAR is to be calculated for HB 1491 compliance. Staff expect that the guidance will direct cities to adopt</p>

Question & Answer Matrix
April 21, 2026 - City Council Meeting

Log #	AB No.	Received From	Question	yaStaff Response
				<p>regulations under which the 3.5 FAR is achievable, meaning the regulations allow for a building that is economically feasible and constructable. Additionally, staff expect there will be guidance on how to calculate an average FAR across the station area.</p> <p>If the City maintains requirements such as the daylight plane, the corresponding reduction in achievable FAR would impact the amount of FAR that must be allowed elsewhere in the station area. It is likely that limiting the maximum allowed FAR with a standard like the daylight plane requirement could have a corresponding effect of requiring a greater maximum FAR in another part of the station area. If the City would like to reduce impacts to neighborhoods outside the Town Center, then steps should be taken to maximize achievable FAR in the TC.</p> <p>The staff recommendation for this item is to plan on reviewing this standard for these standards during Phase 2 of the Station Subarea Plan.</p>
9	6910	Reynolds	The letter to Senator Wellman thanks us for her “vote”. Did she not have a bigger role than just voting for this? What about Zahn/Thai?	The City closely engaged with all three members of the 41 st delegation in securing the state funding for MICEC HVAC replacement project throughout the legislative session. While there is no official record of this, you are correct that it is staff’s understanding that Senator Wellman likely had a key role in increasing the funding amount for this project near the end of budget negotiations. Councilmembers are encouraged to personally acknowledge and thank Senator Wellman for her efforts on this funding, in addition to Representatives Zahn and Thai, if you have not already done so.