

## Industrial Lands Advisory Panel

# **DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS TO MAYOR OF SEATTLE**

*DRAFT DATE: September 25, 2017*

## **BACKGROUND**

On August 18, 2016, former Mayor Ed Murray announced the creation of the Industrial Lands Advisory Panel, tasked with providing recommendations to ensure that the Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) balances growth with the needs of Seattle's maritime and manufacturing industries.

The Advisory Panel was asked to recommend a new industrial lands framework that:

- Supports Seattle's maritime and industrial communities;
- Acknowledges the varying development pressures on current industrial lands;
- Recognizes the shifting nature of industrial business activity and its labor market; and
- Balances the livability needs of residents with industrial requirements.

The Industrial Lands Advisory Panel and the Industrial Lands Working Group (a subgroup of the larger Advisory Panel) convened for more than a year, from July 2016 to October of 2017, including more than 40 in-person meetings.

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Members of the Advisory Panel and the Working Group support the following recommendations, except where critical issues are identified, provided in summary below. Additional information on each recommendation is available in the Detailed Recommendations section of this document:

1. Adopt Comp Plan policy language, originally proposed in 2013, that strongly discourages removal of land from Manufacturing Industrial Centers (MICs), except for potential results from future city-initiated planning processes; and prohibits new Industrial Commercial and Industrial Buffer zones within MICs.

**Issue for Consideration:** Advisory Panel members representing the Port of Seattle, Labor Organizations, and other industrial interests assert that adoption of the Comp Plan language in the near term is necessary. The language would allow for future analysis of industrially-zoned land as part of careful planning processes (e.g., Interbay Corridor, Ballard, and Georgetown) but would discourage one-off Comp Plan amendment requests to remove specific properties from the MIC. Other

members suggest that such changes should be delayed until studies for the Interbay Corridor, Ballard, and Georgetown are completed.

2. Develop and adopt citywide industrial protection regulations to fix platting loopholes and stop unintended non-industrial development.
3. Conduct a citywide analysis of Commercial 1, Commercial 2, Industrial Buffer, Industrial Commercial Zones, and other industrially-zoned land outside of the M/ICs, where market forces over time have prevented these zones from achieving their intended purposes. Findings from the analysis should be used to show the effectiveness of existing zoning; and to determine how much auto-oriented industrial and commercial land is needed to support current/future local and regional populations.
4. Develop the “SODO Concept,” an innovative incentive program that would allow new transit-oriented office development when new industrial development is provided, and would severely limit single occupancy vehicle (SOV) and other non-freight trips in the area. Fees generated by the incentive program would be used to make freight mobility and safety improvements in SODO and contribute to the City’s Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) program. To explore the SODO concept, a pro forma analysis, a mobility study, and an environmental impact statement should be completed.

**Issue for Consideration:** Advisory Panel support to explore the SODO concept is dependent on the following conditions:

- a. Prohibition on residential uses would be maintained;
- b. Land within the shoreline district would not be included;
- c. A requirement for approximately one floor of industrial uses<sup>1</sup>;
- d. Strict parking maximums for office uses;
- e. On-street parking management that allows industrial activities (e.g., parking and loading) to continue in the right-of-way;

---

<sup>1</sup> Industrial uses are non-office uses allowed outright in industrial zones per Seattle Municipal Code 23.50.012, including Food processing, Custom and craft work, light manufacturing, general manufacturing, heavy manufacturing, warehouse, wholesale showroom, construction services, marine sales and services, and urban farm.

- f. Use of traditional and innovative transportation demand management solutions;
- g. Use of fees generated by the incentive program to make freight mobility and safety improvements for all modes; and
- h. The incentive program will be evaluated to verify that it is creating space for industrial activities and is contributing towards transportation improvements.

**Issue for Consideration:** Some developers on the Advisory Panel advocated to include housing in close proximity to SODO Link Light Rail Stations as part of the City's response to the current housing crisis. However, the City is creating substantial additional housing capacity through the City-wide MHA rezones, and SODO could serve as a job center near high-capacity transit. In addition, after considering existing Comp Plan policies to separate residential and industrial uses, noise and emissions typically associated with industrial uses, environmental contamination issues that exist in much of SODO, proximity to major roadway and railway pollution generators, and the lack of amenities (e.g., parks, open space, schools, etc.) needed to support residential uses, the majority of the Advisory Panel agreed that residential uses should not be considered for the SODO Concept.

With the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda, we are adding 20,000 more units over the no-action alternative, for a total of 95,000 over 20 years. The SODO Concept would help to achieve Seattle's housing goals by requiring, as part of an incentive program, contributions to the City's MHA program.

- 5. Complete the Georgetown Mobility Study and prioritize near-term projects that will improve mobility for all users in Georgetown.

**Issue for Consideration:** Industrial stakeholders want to that ensure that specific improvements, including speed reduction and safety improvements along Airport Way South and a trail connection between Georgetown and South Park, don't impact freight mobility.

- 6. Conduct three planning processes, one for the Interbay corridor, one for a portion of the Ballard MIC, and one for Georgetown to determine future zoning for these changing areas.

## ADVISORY PANEL

Members of the Advisory Panel included the following representatives from the Port of Seattle, developers, industry, labor and the community:

- Councilmember Rob Johnson, City of Seattle
- Commissioner John Creighton, Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance
- Warren Aakervik, Ballard Oil
- Roger Bialous, Georgetown Brewing
- Dave Gering, Manufacturing Industrial Council of Seattle
- Ginny Gilder, Interbay property owner/Seattle Storm
- Erin Goodman, SODO Business Improvement Area
- Nicole Grant, M.L. King County Labor Council
- Mikel Hansen, Sabey Corporation
- Johan Hellman, BNSF Railway
- Henry Liebman, American Life (alternate, Greg Steinhauer)
- Matt Lyons, Nucor Corporation
- Jill Mackie, Vigor/Kvichak Shipyards
- Don Marcy, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Development Association
- Terri Mast, Inland Boatman's Union
- Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary
- Fred Mendoza, Public Stadium Authority
- John Odland, MacMillan-Piper
- Greg Ramirez, Georgetown Community Council
- John Persak, International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 19
- Joe Ritzman, SSA Marine
- Doug Rosen, Alaskan Copper/Property Owner
- Tony Ross, Ocean Beauty Seafoods
- Greg Smith, Urban Visions
- Jose Vasquez, South Park Area Redevelopment Committee
- Eugene Wasserman, North Seattle Industrial Association
- Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance

## WORKING GROUP

A working group composed of City of Seattle staff and members of the Advisory Panel was created to translate findings from the Land Use and Employment Study and the observations and priorities of the Advisory Panel into recommendations for Mayor Ed Murray to consider.

Members of the Working Group included:

- Rebecca Lovell, Office of Economic Development
- Roque Deherrera, Office of Economic Development
- Tom Hauger, Office of Planning and Community Development
- Mike Podowski, Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections
- Michelle Caulfield, Office of Sustainability and Environment
- Tracy Krawczyk, Seattle Department of Transportation
- Diane Wiatr, Seattle Department of Transportation
- Sara Belz, Department of Neighborhoods
- Robert Feldstein, Mayor's Office of Policy and Innovation
- Quinn Majeski, Mayor's Office of Policy and Innovation
- Spencer Williams, Councilmember Rob Johnson's Office
- Dave Gering, Manufacturing Industrial Council of Seattle
- Henry Liebman, American Life (alternate, Greg Steinhauer)
- Don Marcy, NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Development Association
- Jack McCullough, McCullough Hill Leary, PS
- Greg Ramirez, Georgetown Community Council
- John Persak, International Longshore and Warehouse Union Local 19
- Greg Smith, Urban Visions
- Eugene Wasserman, North Seattle Industrial Association
- Lindsay Wolpa, Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance

## **LAND USE AND EMPLOYMENT STUDY**

In October of 2016, Community Attributes, Inc. (CAI) was selected through a competitive process to conduct a study that would provide the Advisory Panel with a clear understanding of the existing conditions of Seattle's maritime, manufacturing and industrial lands; so that it could make informed and balanced recommendations to the Mayor on how to manage the City's growth through the policies of the 2035 Comp Plan.

CAI was asked to perform three specific objectives:

1. Catalog and locate the current mix of industrial activity in Seattle;
2. Quantify the contribution of Seattle's industrial uses to the City's workforce composition.
3. Considering infrastructure and fixed and essential assets, quantify the cost of bringing existing assets up to current standards, and weigh opportunity costs potential rezoning. This third objective was later modified, with agreement between the Advisory Group

and the City of Seattle, to map transit infrastructure and infrastructure that is critical to manufacturing and maritime industries.

The findings of the Industrial Lands Land Use and Employment Study (attached) show two healthy industrial centers with extraordinarily low vacancy rates. However, within those centers exist several “notable areas,” where inadequate land use controls and market forces have resulted in significant non-industrial land uses:

1. The majority of parcels (56%) and the majority of land area (80%) within the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing Industrial Center (MIC) and the Ballard North-end Manufacturing Industrial Center are devoted to industrial use;
2. Vacancy rates in the MIC and BINMIC are extraordinarily low;
3. Approximately 50% of all industrial jobs in Seattle are located within the Duwamish MIC and BINMIC; and
4. Within the Duwamish MIC and BINMIC, there are a few isolated “notable areas” where there are higher concentrations of nonindustrial uses.

## DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

1	Citywide Industrial Protections
<p>The Industrial Lands Land Use and Employment Study recognizes “notable areas,” areas within industrial zones where there are high concentrations of non-industrial uses. These “notable areas” were created by a combination of market forces and inadequate land use controls to protect industrial lands for industrial uses.</p> <p>The following industrial protection recommendations are required to realize the full, original intent of a regulatory program designed to protect and grow Seattle’s industrial economy.</p>	

### A. Adopt New Comprehensive Plan Language to Protect Industrial Lands for Industrial Uses

**Responsible Agency:** Office of Planning and Community Development

**Timing:** Adopted Q2 2018

**Related Work:** 2013 Duwamish MI/C Policy and Land Use Study

The recommended language shown below was originally developed as part of the study of the Greater Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center Policy and Land Use Study, released in December 2013. Maritime and industrial stakeholders have been advocating for its adoption ever since. The language is would raise the threshold to remove any land from Seattle’s two M/ICs and to prohibit new Industrial Commercial zoning within M/ICs, where new development has been predominantly office buildings.

The 2013 language has been modified (changes are underlined) by this proposal to acknowledge future planning processes, including one for the Interbay corridor, one for a portion of the Ballard M/IC, and one for Georgetown. The new language does not presuppose any outcomes but preserves the ability to remove land from the M/ICs if recommended as a result of a planning process initiated by the City that includes a wide range of industrial and non-industrial stakeholders.

The Advisory Panel recommends that the following language be added to the Comp Plan:

- A. *Do not remove land from a designated M/IC unless either:*
1. All of the following are true:
    - a. *the proposed use is identified;*
    - b. *there is insufficient appropriately zoned land elsewhere in the city for the proposed use;*
    - c. *the proposed use would not displace an existing industrial use; and*
    - d. *the proposed use would not adversely affect nearby industrial operations; or*
  2. Removal is recommended as a result of a planning process initiated by the City that includes a wide range of industrial and non-industrial stakeholders.
- B. *Do not allow new IC or IB zoning in the M/IC, except when new IC or IB zoning is recommended as a result of a planning process initiated by the City that includes a wide range of industrial and non-industrial stakeholders;*

## **B. Fix Platting Regulations and Size of Use Regulations to Close Loopholes That Have Resulted in Unintended Non-Industrial Development**

**Responsible Agency:** Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD), Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)

**Timing:** Adopted Q2 2018

**Related Work:** 2013 Duwamish MI/C Policy and Land Use Study

On December 17, 2007, City Council approved an amendment to the Land Use Code that lowered the maximum size of office and retail uses allowed in industrial zones. These changes were intended to:

1. Keep industrially-zoned land primarily in industrial use because industrial activities bring diversity to the City's economy and family-wage jobs to local residents;
2. Direct non-industrial uses to the many places outside industrial areas where the City has ample land zoned for office and retail uses; and
3. Maintain consistency with local and regional planning goals and policies, including the Comprehensive Plan Container Port Element.

The new rules became effective in January 2008. However, the size limits have sometimes been circumvented on large lots by dividing the property into multiple smaller lots. A single large building can even be constructed spanning these lots provided there are firewalls or other separations along lot lines.

The Advisory Panel recommends that OPCD and SDCI prepare legislation that fixes these unintended loopholes.

## **C. Revise the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment Process for Industrially-zoned Land within MI/Cs from Annual to Once Every Four Years**

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD

**Timing:** Q2 2018

The City considers amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) annually as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. For many years, the process has



yielded proposals to remove land from the MI/Cs, a required step in the process of rezoning land to a non-industrial zone. In addition, the standards governing cases in which a FLUM amendment is necessary to support a proposed rezone lack clarity.

In order to allow for more measured consideration of such requests, the Advisory Panel recommends that the FLUM amendment process for industrially-zoned land within the MI/Cs be changed from an annual process to one that occurs once every four years. The Panel further recommends that SDCI, through proposed legislation and/or Director's Rules, clarify the scenarios when a FLUM amendment is required to support a proposed rezone.

#### **D. Conduct a Citywide Zoning Analysis of IC, IB, C1, and C2 Nones; and Other Industrially-zoned Land Outside of MI/Cs**

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD

**Timing:** TBD (not funded)

The intent of the Industrial Buffer (IB) zone is to provide an appropriate transition between industrial areas and adjacent residential zones, or commercial zones having a residential orientation and/or a pedestrian character.

The intent of the Industrial Commercial (IC) zone is to promote development of businesses that incorporate a mix of industrial and commercial activities, including light manufacturing and research and development, while accommodating a wide range of other employment activities.

Similar to IB and IC zones, C1 and C2 zones were intended to be employment centers. The intent of the Commercial 1 (C1) zone is to promote an auto-oriented, primarily retail/service commercial area that serves surrounding neighborhoods as well as citywide or regional clientele.

The intent of the Commercial 2 (C2) zone is to promote an auto-oriented, primarily non-retail commercial area, characterized by large lots, parking, and a wide range of commercial uses serving community, citywide, or regional markets.

IB, IC, C1, and C2 zones have generally not achieved their intended purposes, especially, IC, C1, and C2 zones. Development in IC zones is dominated by single-

tenant office buildings and has not resulted in production, distribution, and repair businesses. C1 zones function more like neighborhood commercial zones, favoring residential mixed-use buildings instead of auto-oriented commercial uses. C2 zones allow residential uses if a Conditional Use Permit is granted. Proliferation of residential uses in C1 and C2 zones reduces the amount of land available for commercial uses, thereby adding pressure on industrial zones to accommodate those commercial uses.

In addition to unintended development, many former C1 and C2 zones have been rezoned to neighborhood commercial zones to promote increased housing density in Seattle's urban centers and urban villages. To date, no analysis has been completed to determine how much land is need for auto-oriented commercial uses that support our growing population.

The Advisory Panel recommends that OPCD conduct a citywide analysis to show the effectiveness of IB, IC, C1, and C2 zoning; and other industrially-zoned land outside of the M/ICs; and to determine how much auto-oriented industrial and commercial land is needed to support current/future local and regional populations.

## **E. Explore Revisions to the Noise Ordinance in Support of Normal Maritime and Manufacturing Operations**

**Responsible Agency:** SDCI

**Timing:** TBD (not yet funded)

The Seattle Noise Ordinance contains rules to minimize Seattle resident's exposure to excessive noise. The ordinance:

1. Sets limits for exterior sound levels in residential, commercial, and industrial districts;
2. Specifies required quiet hours and hours during which construction and maintenance are allowed; and
3. Establishes guidelines for granting variances from the noise ordinance.

When noise complaints are made, noise levels are measured at complainant's property line, not from the interior of a structure. This has led to conflicts between legacy maritime and manufacturing businesses and nearby residents.

The Advisory Panel recommends that SDCI explore noise code changes, including but not limited to measuring noise levels from inside a residence or business, that allow normal operations of legacy maritime and manufacturing businesses.

## **F. Increase Funding for Workforce Training Programs**

**Responsible Agency:** Office of Economic Development (OED)

**Timing:** Q1 2019

In support of maritime and manufacturing job growth, the Advisory Panel recommends that OED allocate additional funding for workforce training programs. Examples include but are not limited to expanding the Core Plus Curriculum.

## **G. Re-Establish OED and SDCI Support for Maritime and Manufacturing Companies**

**Responsible Agency:** OED, SDCI

**Timing:** TBD (not yet funded)

In support of maritime and manufacturing job growth, the Advisory Panel that OED re-instate a full-time Maritime and Manufacturing Advocate to attract new industrial firms to Seattle, provide individual business assistance to existing industrial firms, and to inform policy decisions that impact this key economic sector.

The Advisory Panel also recommends that SDCI re-instate a part-time Industrial Permit Liaison, a position that was originally created in 2003 and has since lapsed.

## **2 SODO CONCEPT**

The SODO Concept is an innovative incentive program that would require approximately one-floor of new industrial development and allow new transit-oriented office development, while severely limiting SOV trips and related transportation impacts normally associated with office development. Factors that lead to the creation of the SODO Concept are:

1. High land costs in SODO that aren't likely to yield new, one-story industrial development;

2. Limited development sites downtown for office buildings;
3. Existence of two Link Light Rail Stations, Stadium Station and SODO Station, in SODO; and the potential for high-capacity bus service and additional Link Light Rail stations in SODO; and
4. The need to maintain and improve freight mobility in and around SODO for the Port of Seattle/Northwest Seaport Alliance and transportation, logistics, and other industrial companies.

The following recommendations outline the necessary steps to refine and implement the SODO Concept. Results from the Pro Forma, the Mobility Action Plan, and the EIS will inform the scope and rollout (i.e., geography and timing) of the SODO Concept.

[INSERT MAP]

## A. Pro Forma Analysis

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD, OED

**Timing:** Complete Q2 2018

**Related Work:** SODO Concept EIS, SODO Concept Mobility Action Plan

OPCD and OED should complete a Pro Forma Analysis to understand which development scenario yields the best results for the SODO Concept (see attached SODO Concept Development Fees/Incentive Examples). Goals for the analysis include:

1. Determine the appropriate floor area ratio that should be allowed for office in SODO (when approximately one floor of industrial space is required);
2. Determine the appropriate transportation management fee to charge future development;
3. Determine the appropriate Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) fee to charge future development;
4. Determine the appropriate level of environmental building standards required for future development, and

5. Consideration of development costs in SODO associated with soil conditions, environmental contamination, and high water table.

## B. Mobility Action Plan

**Responsible Agency:** Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)

**Timing:** Complete Q2 2018

**Related Work:** SODO Concept EIS, SODO Concept Pro Forma Analysis

SDOT should complete a Mobility Action Plan to understand what transportation management tools should be implemented to severely limit SOV and other non-freight trips, and to identify physical and programmatic improvements that will improve freight mobility in the area. This should include the creation of a transportation management program to collect, prioritize, and administer transportation development fees generated by future development.

The Mobility Action Plan should include a disciplined technical analysis of the potential for future office uses in SODO to achieve downtown SOV rates using widely accepted mode share models.

The Advisory Panel and City staff acknowledge that, if the SODO Concept is applied within a quarter mile or half mile of Stadium Station and SODO Station, that the following transportation management solutions will be necessary:

1. Strict parking maximums for office uses;
2. On-street parking management that allows industrial activities (e.g., parking and loading) to continue in the right-of-way; and
3. Use of fees generated by the incentive program to make freight mobility and safety improvements for all modes in SODO.

The Advisory Panel and City staff further acknowledge that, if the SODO Concept is applied beyond a half mile of Stadium Station and SODO Station:

1. More aggressive transportation management solutions, including but not limited to increased Metro bus service, a SODO bus circulator, toll roads, freight-only roads/lanes, freight bypasses, etc., must be used to connect future workers with high-capacity transit and improve mobility in and around SODO; and

2. Necessary transportation solutions must have dedicated funding and completed implementation plans prior to the adoption of regulations that would allow SODO Concept development beyond .5 miles from Stadium Station and SODO Station.

### C. Environmental Impact Analysis (EIS)

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD

**Timing:** Complete Q4 2018

**Related Work:** SODO Concept Pro Forma Analysis, SODO Concept Mobility Action Plan

OPCD should complete an EIS to examine the impacts of allowing significantly more office development in SODO than is allowed under current regulations. The EIS should explore the SODO concept under a variety of different geographies and allowable floor area ratios.

The EIS may also include environmental analysis of Citywide Industrial Protections and considerations for formalizing an “auto row” along Airport Way S.

<b>3</b>	<b>Georgetown</b>
<p>The Industrial Lands Land Use and Employment Study recognized portions of Georgetown as a “notable area,” where high concentrations of non-industrial uses exist. However, no consensus on land use and zoning issues surfaced through the Industrial Land Advisory Panel process. The Advisory Panel was made aware of general concerns regarding zoning in all of Georgetown, even outside of the “notable area,” by the Georgetown Community Council.</p>	

### A. Complete Georgetown Land Use and Zoning Study

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD/OED

**Timing:** TBD (not funded)

**Related Work:** Citywide Zoning Analysis of IC, IB, C1, and C2 Zones

The Advisory Panel recommends that City staff conduct a land use and zoning study that will evaluate potential new land use designations and new zoning regulations within the boundaries of the Georgetown neighborhood.

In support of the land use and zoning study, and subsequent recommendations, the City will form a Georgetown task force to include stakeholders such as:

1. Georgetown Community Council;
2. Georgetown Merchants Association;
3. Seattle Design Center
4. Area property owners;
5. Area business owners;
6. Port of Seattle
7. Workforce/labor advocates

[INSERT MAP]

## **B. Complete Georgetown Mobility Plan and Prioritize Plan Implementation**

**Responsible Agency:** SDOT

**Timing:** Plan complete Q4 2017

**Related Work:** Freight Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, Bicycle Master Plan

The Advisory Panel recommends that SDOT complete the Georgetown Mobility Plan, a study that was asked for by the community during the development of the Freight Mobility Plan (FMP). The Study recommendations will improve connections for residents to parks, employees to dining and amenities, and provides increased safety and predictability for all users, including freight mobility.

SDOT should prioritize funding for the near-term projects outlined in the Georgetown Mobility Study, as resources allow, including a trail connection between Georgetown and South Park and speed reduction and safety improvements along Airport Way South, provided that such improvements don't impact freight mobility.

#### 4 Interbay Corridor

The Ballard-Interbay Corridor Land Use Corridor Study (attached) was initiated in 2012 and continued until April of 2013, including a stakeholder process and a series of public meetings. Preliminary zoning and land use recommendations were drafted on April 3, 2013 but a final report was never issued. The only legislative outcome was a small change to the Comp Plan Future Land Use Map that removed a parcel on the north side of QFC block in Interbay from the MIC.

The planning principals identified as part of the 2012/2013 study are still valid and the need for a long view of future land use and zoning in Interbay is still needed.

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD/OED/SDOT

**Timing:** TBD (not yet funded)

[INSERT MAP]

The Advisory Panel recognizes that the Interbay corridor<sup>2</sup> is already a high-capacity transit corridor, connecting neighborhoods north of the ship canal directly to

---

<sup>2</sup> \*Interbay corridor is defined as:

- South of the Ballard Bridge
- East of BNSF tracks
- West of 14<sup>th</sup> Ave. NW
- North of Denny Way



downtown Seattle. Voters approved Sound Transit 3 last fall, which includes light rail from Ballard through downtown to West Seattle with stations along the Interbay corridor. Rapid Ride already exists on along the Interbay corridor

Since City Council passed a rezone in 2008 along Dravus Street, nearly all of the buildable sites have been used to create new multifamily housing, all within a block of the Dravus Street Rapid Ride station and possible future Sound Transit station stop. Without an updated zoning plan, the Interbay corridor is likely continue to develop low-density, larger box retail or self-storage.

Ensuring north/south mobility for 15<sup>th</sup> Ave NW is paramount for freight mobility. The legislature may pass a one-year PDA to review possible long-term uses (including workforce housing) for the 30-acre Armory site in Interbay. This work is scheduled to be complete in 2018.

The Advisory Panel recommends that City staff conduct a land use and zoning study of the Interbay corridor. Existing industrial uses should be accommodated and the study area should not include Port of Seattle or BNSF property. The study and accompanying zoning recommendations should be completed by December 2018.

Additionally, the zoning recommendations must be accompanied with an implementation plan that includes input from Central Staff, OED, OPCD, SDCI and the Mayor's Office.

The City should coordinate with Sound Transit, given their plans to conduct an EIS and community engagement for ST3 (an 18-month process slated to begin in January 2018).

The Industrial Lands Advisory Panel recommends that the Interbay Task Force to include stakeholders such as:

1. North Seattle Industrial Association
2. NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Development Association
3. Property owners
4. Neighborhood leaders
5. Business operators
6. Transit advocates
7. National Guard

8. Washington State Department of Commerce
9. Port of Seattle
10. Workforce/labor advocates
11. BNSF

It is anticipated that most of the work will focus on the area north of Magnolia Bridge, and recommended that additional stakeholders be engaged for the portion of the work that focuses on the area south of the bridge. Those additional participants could include:

1. Business operators (e.g., Expedia, Puget Sound Energy)
2. Business owners (e.g., TacoTime and Starbucks)
3. Property owners (e.g., Art Hayes)

<b>5</b>	<b>Ballard</b>
<p>The Industrial Lands Land Use and Employment Study recognized portions of Ballard as “notable areas,” where high concentrations of non-industrial uses exist. However, no consensus on land use and zoning issues surfaced through the Industrial Land Advisory Panel process. Consensus was reached by the Advisory Panel for further study of the IB zone located within BINMIC east of 15th Ave NW, north and south of the Ship Canal, and outside of the Shoreline Environment. The study area would include the “notable areas” identified in the Study and IB zoned land located outside of the “notable areas.”</p>	

**Responsible Agency:** OPCD/OED  
**Timing:** TBD (not funded)

**[INSERT MAP]**

The Advisory Panel recommends that City staff conduct a land use and zoning study of land zoned IB that is located within BINMIC east of 15th Ave NW, north and south of the Ship

Canal, and outside of the Shoreline Environment that will evaluate potential new land use designations and new zoning regulations.

In support of the land use and zoning study, and subsequent recommendations, the City will form a Ballard task force to include stakeholders such as:

1. North Seattle Industrial Association;
2. NAIOP Commercial Real Estate Development Association
3. Area property owners (e.g., Foss Maritime, Coastal Transportation, Sue Dills);
4. Area business owners;
5. Neighborhood leaders
6. Port of Seattle
7. Workforce/labor advocates

DRAFT