



City of Seattle
Edward B. Murray, Mayor

Department of Construction and Inspections
Nathan Torgelson, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR
OF THE SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND INSPECTIONS**

Application Number: 3023160
Applicant Name: Ellie Ziegler for Sound Transit
Address of Proposal: 1402 R Lakeside Ave S

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION

Shoreline Substantial Development Application to install new light rail track on the Seattle portion of the I-90 Bridge. (Sound Transit East Link). Project includes structural retrofitting the existing bridge. The East Link Project extends the light rail system 14 miles between Seattle and the east side of Lake Washington. East Link Project Final Environmental Impact Statement dated July 15, 2011 and Addendum to the FEIS dated March 26, 2013 has been prepared by Sound Transit.

The following approvals are required:

Shoreline Substantial Development Permit to allow development in the Urban Residential (UR), Conservancy Recreation (CR), and Conservancy Navigation (CN) shoreline environments.

SEPA - Conditioning pursuant to Seattle's SEPA policies. Chapter 25.05.660, Seattle Municipal Code.

SEPA DETERMINATION: Exempt DNS MDNS EIS

DNS with conditions

DNS involving non-exempt grading, or demolition, or involving another agency with jurisdiction.

Proposal Background

The Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority (Sound Transit) is seeking a City of Seattle Shoreline Substantial Development Permit (SSDP) for the portion of the East Link Project

located within the City of Seattle's Shoreline District. The planned alignment of the light rail project is in the existing reversible Interstate 90 (I-90) HOV lanes of the Homer M. Hadley Memorial Bridge (the newer northerly portion of the I-90 floating bridge) as it crosses Lake Washington. The only project components in the City's Shoreline District are the fixed-span and floating bridge structures connecting the east portal of the Mount Baker Tunnel to the mid-point of the I-90 floating bridge between Seattle and Mercer Island.

Sound Transit is a regional transit authority created pursuant to RCW 81.104 and 81.112, and authorized to implement high capacity transit systems within its boundaries in Pierce, King and Snohomish Counties. On November 4, 2008, Central Puget Sound area voters approved the Sound Transit 2 Plan, a package of transit improvements and expansions including increased bus service, increased commuter rail service, an expansion of link light rail, and improved access to transportation facilities.

The expansion of link light rail approved in the ST2 Plan includes the East Link Project. The East Link Project extends the light rail system approximately 14 miles between Seattle and the east side of Lake Washington, and includes 10 stations serving Seattle, Mercer Island, South Bellevue, downtown Bellevue, and the Bel-Red and Overlake areas in Redmond. The Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A) provides that regional transportation facilities are essential public facilities.

On September 16, 2013, the Seattle City Council passed Resolution No. 31465 approving the alignment of the light rail line, the location of the light rail station, and the general profile of the East Link Project for the purposes of the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) 23.80.004.C.2. On April 25, 2013, the Sound Transit Board adopted Resolution No. R2013-09, thus formally adopting the route, profiles and station locations for the East Link Project.

The planning process and engineering design for the East Link Project has spanned a number of years. There have been hundreds of public meetings, stakeholder briefings, hearings, and open houses. The federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) environmental reviews have been completed and Records of Decision (ROD) have been issued by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in November, 2011.

Proposal Summary

The elements of the East Link Project that are located within the City's municipal boundaries include the following light rail transit facilities: approximately 3.2 miles of new light rail tracks (one track in each direction), two turn-back tracks, one passenger transit station, two traction power substations (TPSS), and other minor facilities as described in appendices to the City of Seattle's Resolution 31465. All of these light rail facilities will be located within the WSDOT right-of-way of I-90 and generally be in the center roadway where the existing express lanes are currently located.

Not all of these facilities are located within the City's shoreline district. The jurisdictional boundaries encompass those elements of the project that are east of Lakeside Avenue South (east of the Mount Baker Tunnel) and extend to the mid-point of Lake Washington between Seattle and Mercer Island. Construction activities in this portion of the alignment are limited to construction of the two rail tracks, structural retrofits, and installation of cathodic protection

along the floating bridge pontoons. The rail track work will include removal of a thin layer of concrete overlay in certain places, removal of the existing barriers, installation of the rail tracks, and finally installation of the overhead catenary system (OCS) comprised of cantilever support poles and portal frames to the sides of the rail tracks, and overhead power lines for operation of the light rail trains. At the connection points between the fixed and floating bridges, a specially designed “track bridge” section will be placed by barge-mounted crane to connect the rail tracks on the fixed and floating bridge sections. The track bridge will allow for movement of the floating bridge while maintaining a smooth and safe transition for trains.

Structural retrofitting is planned for the existing fixed-span West Approach of the floating bridge. This will include reinforcement of the columns supporting the existing bridge piers, and superstructure post-tensioning work conducted inside of the bridge deck where the bridge piers meet the bridge deck. In addition, cathodic protection anodes will be attached to the pontoons of the floating bridge in order to capture stray current from the light rail that might otherwise damage the rebar in the bridge.

The project passes through approximately 3,960 linear feet of the City’s Shoreline District, with a footprint of approximately 3.6 acres. All work would take place on or below the two reversible HOV lanes that are immediately south of the three westbound lanes of the Homer M. Hadley Memorial Bridge. The three eastbound lanes of I-90 are on the Lacey V. Murrow Bridge.

The light rail alignment crosses through three Shoreline Environment designations (Urban Residential, Conservancy Recreation and Conservancy Navigation) within the City’s shoreline jurisdiction which spans from a point 200 feet upland of the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of Lake Washington extending to a point in the middle of Lake Washington between Seattle and Mercer Island. At the west end, the two rail tracks would be in the center roadway, currently approximately 70 feet above the ground. The project continues east, descending to the middle of the existing I-90 floating bridge (elevated approximately 25 feet above the water surface), at the east limit of Seattle’s shoreline jurisdiction.

It is currently anticipated that construction phasing will require completion of the bridge retrofit work before construction can begin for the rail tracks and associated facilities. The rail track work will include removal of a thin layer of concrete overlay in certain places, removal of the existing barriers, installation of the rail tracks and cathodic protection anodes, and finally installation of the OCS.

For purposes of this summary, the work within the Shoreline District has been broken into three areas within shoreline jurisdiction: the I-90 West Approach Bridge, the I-90 center roadway deck surface, and the floating bridge pontoons.

I-90 West Approach Bridge:

Structural retrofitting will be conducted using barge-mounted equipment. Round, steel jackets will be installed around as many as four of the existing bridge piers (Piers 4 – 7). The space between the round jackets and the columns will be filled with concrete grout. Pile caps on Piers 4 - 7 will also be retrofitted by the addition of a “ring” of concrete round the existing pile cap. The new rings will be approximately 5 feet high and 3 feet wide, with 6-foot-high and 5-foot-wide corners, and will be embedded with anchored high-strength bars. Wood or steel forms will be constructed to contain the new concrete ring until it has cured. All structural retrofitting will

be above the OHWM, however the temporary forms for the retrofits may extend below the OHWM during construction. The OHWM is defined by a lake elevation of 18.6 feet above sea level, when based on North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). The Army Corps of Engineers controls the mean high water level of the lake at the Corps' datum of 21.8 feet. This computes to an OHWM of 18.6 feet NAVD 88, which is the datum used by the City of Seattle.

Superstructure post-tensioning will be conducted from inside of the bridge superstructure, which will be accessed either from a port on the underside of the bridge or through an opening in the bridge deck.

Post-tensioning is a method to increase the strength of cured concrete when under a load by applying a system of steel strands, comprising a tendon, which are then stretched to achieve a set amount of tension and fixed to the concrete. Staging for this portion of the project will take place either in uplands outside of shoreline jurisdiction, west of Lakeside Avenue South, or on barges.

I-90 center roadway:

Two pairs of light rail tracks will be installed on the I-90 deck, along with the associated special track bridge sections, utilities and safety barriers. The light rail facilities will occupy approximately 40 feet of the center roadway on the floating bridge and West Approach Bridge. Site preparation will include removing existing barriers and removing a portion of the existing roadway concrete overlay. Placement of the pre-fabricated track bridge sections will be by barge-mounted crane; the remaining work elements will be conducted from the bridge deck.

The OCS will also be installed within the I-90 center roadway. The OCS is comprised of OCS support structures (cantilevered poles and portal frames), communication wires, and the electrical lines providing power to operate the light rail trains. One cantilevered OCS pole structure will be in the Shoreline District. The pole portion of this OCS support structure is approximately 24 inches in diameter and extends about 32 feet above the bridge deck. Portal frames will be approximately 100 feet apart on the West Approach to the floating bridge and 140 feet apart on pontoons A-J.

The frames consist of an 8-inch wide flanged beam and are approximately 30 to 32 feet tall and 44 feet across. They will either be installed in line with the existing barriers or will be mounted in some locations on the outside of the barrier depending on space availability. These OCS structures will be installed along the bridge at varying distances, dependent on the specific locational considerations of the bridge structure. Two portal frames will be located in the UR zone, three in the CR zone and 25 in the CN zone.

Floating Bridge pontoons:

Two anode cables will be suspended from the side of each of the floating bridge pontoons. Each anode cable will be 1.25 inches in diameter. These anodes will be similar in nature to the existing anodes (approximately 100) that are currently suspended from the bridge pontoons for the purpose of collecting and then discharging stray current that might otherwise corrode the steel cables anchoring the pontoons. The anode cables added by the Project will hang between 70 and 100 feet below the water's surface and will not be visible from above the water or reach the lake bottom. They will not result in modifications to water temperature, water quality, aquatic vegetation, or other aquatic life.

Public Comment

The public comment period for this proposal ended on July 5, 2016. No public comments were received.

ANALYSIS - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Section [23.60A.030](#) of the Seattle Municipal Code provides criteria for review of a shoreline substantial development permit and reads: “The Director may approve or approve with conditions an application for a development, shoreline modification, or use that requires a shoreline substantial development permit, shoreline conditional use permit, shoreline variance permit, or special use approval if the Director determines the applicant has demonstrated that the development, shoreline modification, or use:”

1. *Is consistent with the policies and procedures of RCW 90.58.020;*
2. *Is not prohibited in any shoreline environment, underlying zone and overlay district in which it would be located;*
3. *Meets the standards in this Chapter 23.60A and any applicable development standards of the underlying zone or overlay district, except where a variance from a specific development standard has been granted; and*
4. *If the development, shoreline modification, or use requires a special use approval, shoreline conditional use permit, or shoreline variance permit, the project meets the criteria for the same established in Sections 23.60A.032, 23.60A.034, or 23.60A.036, respectively.*

These criteria are analyzed below:

1. Is consistent with the policies and procedures of RCW 90.58.020;

Chapter [90.58](#) RCW is known as the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. It is the policy of the State to provide for the management of the shorelines of the state by planning for and fostering all reasonable and appropriate uses. This policy seeks to protect against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life, while protecting generally public rights of navigation and corollary incidental rights. Permitted uses in the shorelines shall be designed and conducted in a manner to minimize, insofar as practical, any resultant damage to the ecology and environment of the shoreline area and any interference with the public’s use of the water. The project has been reviewed by Seattle DCI and determined to be consistent with all applicable use and development standards in the City’s Shoreline Master Program, as discussed in more detail below. The subject application is consistent with the procedures outlined in RCW [90.58](#).

2. Is not prohibited in any shoreline environment, underlying zone and overlay district in which it would be located;

The proposed project is a permitted use in the Urban Residential Shoreline Environment (SMC 23.60A.540), the Conservancy Recreation Shoreline Environment (SMC 23.60A.282), and the Conservancy Recreation Shoreline Environment (SMC 23.60A.240) and the underlying Single Family zone. Pursuant to SMC 23.80.004.C.1, light rail transit facilities necessary to support the operation and maintenance of a light rail transit system are permitted in all zones and shoreline environments within the City of Seattle, except the CP Environment.

3. Meets the standards in this Chapter 23.60A and any applicable development standards of the underlying zone or overlay district, except where a variance from a specific development standard has been granted;

The Shoreline Management Act provides definitions and concepts, and gives primary responsibility for initiating and administering the regulatory program of the Act to local governments. The Department of Ecology is to primarily act in a supportive and review capacity, with primary emphasis on ensuring compliance with the policy and provisions of the Act. As a result of this Act, the City of Seattle adopted a local shoreline master program, codified in the Seattle Municipal Code at Chapter [23.60A](#) that also incorporates the provisions of Chapter [173-27](#), WAC. [Title 23](#) of the Municipal Code is also referred to as the Land Use and Zoning Code. Development on the shorelines of the state is not to be undertaken unless it is consistent with the policies and provisions of the Act, and with the local master program. The Act sets out procedures, such as public notice and appeal requirements, and penalties for violating its provisions which have also been set forth in the Land Use Code.

In evaluating requests for substantial development permits, the Director must determine that a proposed use and subsequent development meets the relevant criteria set forth in the Land Use Code. The Shoreline Goals and Policies, part of the Seattle [Comprehensive Plan](#), and the purpose and location criteria for each shoreline environment must be considered and this project was found to comply. The proposed project is designed to improve public transportation in Central Puget Sound and along the I-90 corridor while protecting the ecological resources and functions of Lake Washington and the adjacent land within the City's Shoreline District and is thus consistent with the purpose of the UR, CR, and CN Environments (SMC 23.60A.220). A proposal must also be consistent with the general development standards of SMC 23.60A.152, the specific standards of the applicable shoreline environments and underlying zoning designation, which is discussed below.

SMC 23.60A.152 - Development Standards for all Environments

These general standards apply to all uses in the shoreline environments. The standards require that design and construction of all uses be conducted in an environmentally sound manner, consistent with the Shoreline Management Program and with best management practices for the specific use or activity. Compliance with applicable codes and ordinances for construction of the project will reduce or eliminate most potential adverse long-term impacts to the shoreline environment. The applicant will implement Best Management Practices during development to ensure, in part, protection of water quality and potential adverse impacts to the shoreline environment and Lake Washington during construction. More details on these BMPs and the project's consistency with these general development standards are contained in the application and a "Shoreline and Zoning Analysis" document submitted by the applicant (dated April 6, 2016) and available in the project file.

Standards for UR, CR, and CN Shoreline Environments and the underlying Single Family (5000) zone.

The project will be located in the Urban Residential Shoreline Environment on land and the Conservancy Recreation and Conservancy Navigation Shoreline Environments as the facility crosses Lake Washington over the existing I-90 bridge. The proposed rail transit facility on an existing bridge is an allowed use in each of these Shoreline Environments, as discussed above.

Further, pursuant to SMC 23.80.004.C.1, light rail transit facilities necessary to support the operation and maintenance of a light rail transit system are permitted in all zones and shoreline environments within the City of Seattle, except the CP Environment.

The project has been reviewed by Seattle DCI staff and found to be consistent with all applicable development standards in the SMP, such as height and setbacks. A complete analysis of project's consistency with applicable development standards is contained in a "Shoreline and Zoning Analysis" document submitted by applicant (dated April 6, 2016) and available in the project file.

4. If the development, shoreline modification, or use requires a special use approval, shoreline conditional use permit, or shoreline variance permit, the project meets the criteria for the same established in Sections 23.60A.032, 23.60A.034, or 23.60A.036, respectively.

The proposed project does not require special use approval, a shoreline conditional use permit or a shoreline variance permit.

Conclusion

SMC Section [23.60A.063](#) provides authority for conditioning of shoreline substantial development permits as necessary to carry out the spirit and purpose of and assure compliance with the Seattle Shoreline Code, Chapter [23.60A](#), and with RCW [90.58.020](#) (State policy and legislative findings). To be consistent with shoreline general development standards for protection of the aquatic environment (SMC 23.60A.152), the project will be required to employ Best Management Practices during construction and installation to protect the shoreline environment.

Thus, as conditioned below, the proposal is consistent with the criteria for a shoreline substantial development permit and may be approved.

DECISION - SHORELINE SUBSTANTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED** subject to the conditions listed at the end of this report.

ANALYSIS – STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

Seattle DCI's SEPA review of the portion of the East Link project in the City of Seattle is limited to application of substantive authority and mitigation, as found in Seattle's Environmental Policies and Procedures ([SMC 25.05.660](#)). This is because Sound Transit, as lead agency for purposes of compliance with the SEPA, RCW Chapter 43.21C (SEPA) and WAC 197-11 (SEPA Rules, has already completed the threshold determination process, which resulted in a Determination of Significance, and publication of the subsequent Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Sound Transit has conducted an evaluation of the environmental consequences of the East Link Project, including all project elements associated with this SSDP application. The Project has been subject to procedural and substantive SEPA through issuance of the following environmental documents:

- East Link Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), issued by Sound Transit on July 15, 2011
- East Link Records of Decision (RODs) issued by FTA and FHWA on November 2011
- SEPA Addendum to the FEIS, issued by Sound Transit on March 26, 2013

The related documents referenced in the FEIS, RODs, and SEPA Addendum Appendix A outlines the commitments applicable to this Project that are analyzed in the FEIS and incorporated in the ROD.

The substantive authority role allows the City to consider mitigation for impacts that were identified in the EIS for this project using the ‘policies, plans, rules, or regulations’ designated in the city’s SEPA ordinance (SMC 25.05).

The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665) establishes the relationship among codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for specific elements of the environment, certain neighborhood plans, and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority. The Overview Policy states in part:

"[W]here City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact; it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" (subject to some limitations).

Under certain limitations/circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) additional mitigation can be considered. The information in the EIS documents, supplemental information provided by the applicant (plans, further project descriptions), and the experience of the City with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision.

Short-term Impacts

A number of temporary or construction-related impacts are expected from this project, which are discussed in detail in the FEIS (Chapter 4 and 5) and relevant Appendices. Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: Stormwater Code (SMC 22.800-808), Grading Code (SMC 22.170); Street Use Ordinance (SMC Title 15); and the Noise Ordinance (construction noise). In addition Federal and State regulations and permitting authority are effective to control short-term impacts on water quality. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances will reduce or eliminate most of the short-term impacts to the environment. Some of these impacts are further discussed below.

Air Quality

Construction impacts for the project are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS and Appendices. Air quality effects from construction of the project would occur primarily as a result of emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment (such as bulldozers, backhoes, and cranes), diesel-fueled mobile sources (such as trucks, brooms, and sweepers), diesel- and gasoline-fueled generators, and on- and offsite project-related vehicles (such as service trucks and pickups). Chapter 4 of the FEIS addresses construction-related air quality impacts from the project, including the results of analyses conducted to evaluate the potential effects during project-related

construction and focused on estimates and modeling of criteria pollutant emissions from construction activities and associated construction-related vehicle traffic.

The FEIS and Attachment C of the Record of Decision includes description and discussion of mitigation measures to address the potential impacts identified in these analyses. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Greenhouse Gas Impacts

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions that adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. The analyses described above in Air Quality address project-related impacts due to greenhouse gas emissions. Mitigation measures are discussed in Chapters 4 the FEIS and the Record of Decision to reduce and mitigate for these impacts. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Surface Water Quality

Construction impacts for the project with respect to water resources are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS and in the Appendices, including the Ecosystems Technical Report. Mitigation measures for these effects are addressed in more detail in the FEIS (Chapter 4), the Ecosystems Technical Report and Attachment C of the Record of Decision. No additional mitigation for construction-related impacts to surface water quality pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Traffic and Parking

The construction-related effects related to traffic and parking are addressed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and the Transportation Technical Report. Construction-related mitigation measures are discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS, the Transportation Technical Report and Attachment C of the Record of Decision. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Noise

Construction-related impacts related to noise are addressed in Chapter 4 the FEIS and the Noise and Vibration Report. Chapter 4 of the FEIS, the Noise and Vibration Report and Attachment C of the Record of Decision provide mitigation measures to minimize the potential noise impacts of this project. Nighttime construction activities are expected for this project, which will generate specific mitigation requirements from the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections that will be specified in a noise variance to be reviewed and approved by Seattle DCI. Additional temporary noise variances may be required. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Plants and Animals

Construction-related effects on natural resources (i.e., fish, wildlife and vegetation) are analyzed and discussed in more detail in Chapter 4 the EIS and the Ecosystems Technical Report. These documents and Attachment C of the Record of Decision contain measures to be employed during construction to mitigate for potential impacts to these resources. The applicant has addressed

Best Management Practices to be employed during construction for protection of the shoreline environment and Lake Washington, as discussed above. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Long Term Impacts

Several long-term or use-related impacts are anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including impacts on air quality, transportation, and plants and animals.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Generally, compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts. However, due to the nature of the proposal, some of the potential impacts warrant further analysis.

Air Quality

Operational effects of the project on air quality is addressed in the FEIS and, in particular, Chapter 4 and 5. The FEIS and the Record of Decision contain mitigation measures that will be employed to minimize and mitigate potential impacts to air resources following completion of the project. No additional mitigation pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Transportation

Operational effects of the project to traffic and parking are analyzed and discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS and the Transportation Discipline Report. Mitigation measures for these effects are addressed in more detail in these documents and the Record of Decision. No additional mitigation for long-term impacts pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Surface Water Quality

Operational impacts for the project to water resources are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS and in the Appendices, including the Ecosystems Technical Report. Mitigation measures for these effects are addressed in more detail in these documents and the Record of Decision. No additional mitigation for long-term impacts to surface water quality pursuant to SEPA is warranted.

Conclusion - SEPA

Environmental impacts for the proposal were identified and analyzed in the FEIS issued by Sound Transit and in the FTA and FHWA Record of Decisions. While Seattle DCI has the authority to mitigate impacts pursuant to the city's SEPA practices, existing City codes and regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation for the proposal's environmental impacts. The Director hereby incorporates by reference the mitigation measures and commitments in the FEIS and Record of Decision. No additional SEPA conditions are required.

CONDITIONS – SHORELINE

During Construction

1. The contractor and Sound Transit shall be responsible for compliance with the City of Seattle Noise Regulations or the modified requirements listed in any approved Noise Variances.
2. The contractor and Sound Transit shall be responsible for implementing Best Management Practices for protection of aquatic habitat as identified in the FEIS and the Ecosystems Technical Report and the Record of Decision.
3. The contractor and Sound Transit shall implement any BMPs and mitigation measures required by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife through the HPA process, including limiting in-water work to approved work windows established by WDFW.

Ben Perkowski, Land Use Planner
Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

Date: August 25, 2016

BP:drm

K:\Decisions-Signed\3023160.docx

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ISSUANCE OF YOUR MASTER USE PERMIT

Master Use Permit Expiration and Issuance

The appealable land use decision on your Master Use Permit (MUP) application has now been published. At the conclusion of the appeal period, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance”. (If your decision is appealed, your permit will be considered “approved for issuance” on the fourth day following the City Hearing Examiner’s decision.) Projects requiring a Council land use action shall be considered “approved for issuance” following the Council’s decision.

The “approved for issuance” date marks the beginning of the **three year life** of the MUP approval, whether or not there are outstanding corrections to be made or pre-issuance conditions to be met. The permit must be issued by Seattle DCI within that three years or it will expire and be cancelled. (SMC 23-76-028) (Projects with a shoreline component have a **two year life**. Additional information regarding the effective date of shoreline permits may be found at 23.60.074.)

All outstanding corrections must be made, any pre-issuance conditions met and all outstanding fees paid before the permit is issued. You will be notified when your permit has issued.

Questions regarding the issuance and expiration of your permit may be addressed to the Public Resource Center at prc@seattle.gov or to our message line at 206-684-8467.