

December 4th, 2002 Special Meeting was called to order at 7:00pm.

Councilmembers Tom Tregoning, Marshall Brendan, Gwendolyn High, Oscar Bandelin, Tom Fisher and David Rockabrand were present.

Elliot Bridge Letter

At the last regular meeting, the council decided to draft a letter to express our concerns with the Preferred Alternative being proposed for the replacement of the Elliot Bridge. Additional contextual data was presented in the form of the letter drafted by the Cedar River Council and the Maple Valley Council on this same subject. Oscar B. and Joe Korbecki met and drafted a letter since the last regular meeting. Oscar read the letter and discussion ensued.

- Tom T. suggested the David Irons should be CC'd. Joe J. asked that we also CC the representatives of the Cedar River and Maple Valley councils since our letter references their efforts and concerns.
- Marshall B. expressed concerns that we reference some issues of concern without details. Oscar responded that by referencing the Cedar River and Maple Valley letter we echo their concerns and agree with them, while maintaining a diplomatic tone.
- David R. was concerned that the phrase "will destroy know salmon spawning grounds" was too concrete an assertion. "Do we know that for sure? Do we expect it?" Joe related data from the SEIS for this project that specifies critical circumstances known to cause salmon not to spawn:
 - Noise, vibration and fumes from the traffic passing over the bridge
 - Presence of humans
 - Non-optimum habitat
- All three circumstances exist at the present bridge location. None of them presently exist at the proposed new site. David R. suggested that qualifying language be added to this passage to reflect these specifics.
- Tom Fisher asked for a clarification of the safety issue mentioned in the second to last paragraph of the letter. Discussion concluded that the reference to the safety concerns related to the 10% approach to the bridge was sufficiently clearly stated.
- Oscar B. read letter with amendments according to the various suggestions.
- David R. made motion to accept the letter and send as addressed. The motion passed unanimously.

Transportation Concurrency and Growth

Gwendolyn High gave a report on the activity of the King County Transportation Concurrency Advisory Committee, on which she serves as a voting member, and on the latest data she has found in the form of the King County Buildable Lands Report.

- The King County Transportation Concurrency Advisory Committee is in the final stages of preparing their report and recommendations. This report must be transmitted to the Executives office and to the full King County Council before the end of this year. After transmission of this report to Council, briefing sessions and consultations will be scheduled and conducted by County Staff to even more fully inform Councilmembers on the details of the study and the resultant recommendations. There is not likely to be opportunity for comment from the public until the end of January 2003 at the earliest. Council is required to make some kind of judgment and to take action by March 2003, as the current Concurrency legislation expires at that time.
- Gwendolyn High suggested, and the council agreed, that it would be prudent to engage the other UACs on the concurrency issue. Changes to the way transportation concurrency is calculated, measured and enforced will affect the growth impacts to the entire county. These issues are complex, and it will take time to share the data that exists and to come to consensus – if consensus is possible on this issue.
- Oscar B. asked for volunteers to coordinate this effort with Gwendolyn. Oscar and John Gillingham volunteered. Gwendolyn will suggest arrangements for this committee to meet and start planning, next week.
- The relationship between the Buildable Lands Report and Transportation Concurrency, and the chief concerns of Gwendolyn in relation to the work of the King County Transportation Concurrency Advisory Committee is illustrated in the following excerpt from comments she submitted to the KCTCAC on its draft report:

- Finally, I would be seriously negligent if I failed to mention two fundamental concerns I have with the work of this Committee. I am not sure how to suggest that these points be communicated in this report, but I think these are important issues to be brought before the Council.
- **Suggestion 8**
- Without the ability to provide, consider, measure or predict transportation capacity based on any element but individual automobiles as the basic mobility component of overall transportation concurrency, we are limited to the single option of pavement as both measure and method of transportation capacity. Physical and fiscal realities are already imposing situations that make it impossible to provide additional traffic capacity required to meet the needs of growth. As time and growth progress, situations such as demonstrated by the 208th/212th corridor in the study area will become more and more common. Even if a change to the methodology is adopted as a result of

the recommendations of this committee, 'positive' results will only be temporary. The need for real additional transportation capacity will continue to grow. Future committees will face exactly the issues we have debated.

- **Suggestion 9**

- The King County Buildable Lands report clearly indicates that sufficient land is available to meet every existing growth target in King County. Without the identification of any specific and fairly catastrophic technical flaw in the existing methodology, and in light of multiple correspondences from Linda Dougherty's office and the Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council in which King County's Concurrency program was fervently defended as working exactly as intended, I find it impossible to explain to my neighbors the justification for the proposed/studied modifications of the King County Concurrency. The concurrency map adopted in spring of 2002 is acknowledged by the people of my community as having finally approached an accurate reflection of the conditions in which we live and attempt to drive/commute every day. Changes to standards or methodology which will result in a concurrency map that would appear to reverse the failure ratings adopted as law by the Council - with zero additional transportation capacity having been made available or having been committed in the CIP - will be seen as a serious misrepresentation of the data and a significant failure of King County government to provide transportation capacity to meet the needs of growth as mandated by the Growth Management Act.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:52pm.