

## 2 Updated Description of the Proposed Action

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) provides an updated description of the Proposed Action and brief environmental analysis of changes to the Proposed Action that have occurred since issuance of the Draft EIS. Major sections of this chapter include:

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>2.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.2 Organization of this Final EIS .....</b>	<b>2-2</b>
<b>2.3 Updated Proposed Action .....</b>	<b>2-2</b>
<b>2.4 Updated Environmental Analysis .....</b>	<b>2-13</b>

The proposed action is the 10-year update of the City of Kirkland’s Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA). In general, the proposed update is intended to revise and refine the 1995 GMA Comprehensive Plan policy direction, rather than markedly depart from the original Plan vision. A previous EIS was originally prepared in 1995 as a part of the Comprehensive Plan adoption process. The City has been continually updating and revising the Plan and associated development regulations since 1995 to respond to new GMA legislation and case law.

#### 2.1.1 Overview of Plan Area

The City of Kirkland is located in King County, immediately adjacent to the eastern shore of Lake Washington. The City is bounded by the communities of Bellevue, Yarrow Point and Clyde Hill to the south, Redmond to the east, and unincorporated King County to the north, northwest and northeast (Figure 2-1). Within its incorporated boundaries, the City’s gross land area consists of approximately 7,000 acres. Excluding public rights-of-way, the total net land area is approximately 5,200 acres.

The City of Kirkland's population as of April 2003 is 45,630 persons; Kirkland is the eighth largest city in King County and the seventeenth largest city in Washington State (Source: Office of Financial Management, April 1, 2003).

## 2.2 Organization of this Final EIS

Chapter 1 of this Final EIS contains a summary of the impacts and mitigating measures associated with the Proposed Action. Chapter 2 contains a description of the updated Proposed Action and brief environmental analysis of changes to the Proposed Action that have occurred subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS in July 2004. Chapter 3 contains comments received on the Proposed Action during the EIS comment period and responses to the comments. This Final EIS also includes updated information in Appendices B and D, as well as two new Appendices. New Appendix G contains the text of plan revisions since issuance of the Draft EIS. New Appendix H contains meeting summaries from two public meetings held on the Draft Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments.

## 2.3 Updated Proposed Action

The No Action Alternative is described in the Draft EIS. No changes have been proposed to the No Action Alternative and it is not discussed further in this Final EIS.

The Proposed Action is an update to the City of Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan and other related actions, described below. Changes to the proposal that have occurred after issuance of the Draft EIS are shown in *italic text*.

### 2.3.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action consists of the following components:

#### **1. Updated Growth Targets and Land Use Capacity Data**

- Extension of the City's GMA planning horizon from 2012 to 2022;
- Adoption of new housing and employment targets to meet 2022 population and employment growth forecasts as required by GMA or by the Countywide Planning Policies from King County.

#### **2. Policy and Text Amendments**

- Revisions associated with court or Growth Management Hearing Board decisions or changes to GMA;
- Technical and editorial refinements to Comprehensive Plan goals and policies;
- Creation of a new Human Services Element;
- Rewrite of the Economic Development Element that generally maintains the same intent of the existing element, except for industrial areas;
- Revisions to the Land Use Element policies on "Regional and Community Facilities" to incorporate state law on essential public facilities and on industrial uses;
- Few minor new policies in other elements (see Table 2-3 for more detail);

- Addition of new or updated information since adoption of the 1995 GMA Comprehensive Plan.

### **3. Zoning Code Amendments**

- Zoning Code Amendments to Chapters 135, 140, 160 and minor changes to other chapters relating to the Comprehensive Plan Update items above.

### **4. Private Comprehensive Plan Amendment Requests**

- Consideration of potential Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments relating to two private amendment request study areas.

### **5. Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Zoning Map Consistency Amendments**

- Map changes to the City Wide Land Use Map, the Subarea Neighborhood Maps and the Zoning Map to correct a few mapping errors and to change the land use designations and zoning to Park/Open Space for several parcels of land obtained by the City for park use;
- Neighborhood map corrections to the Subarea Neighborhood Plan Land Use Maps and implementing Zoning Map corrections to make them consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Map for all land use designations and residential density.
- Correction to Split Zone Parcels in Planned Area 6B

Map changes are shown in Figures 2-2 and 2-3. All of the proposed action components are described below.

#### **2.3.1.1 Totem Center Environmental Analysis**

In addition to these proposed changes, this Final EIS includes a specific review of the potential development envelope within the Totem Center Study Area (Figure 2-4) based upon the land use goals and policies addressed in the Totem Lake Neighborhood Plan and implemented by the Kirkland Zoning Code. This Final EIS provides a more detailed analysis for the Totem Center Study Area in compliance with the provisions of RCW 43.21C.229. This provision allows for a categorical exemption of environmental review for new residential or mixed use development if (1) the development is within an urban growth area and, (2) the current density and intensity of use is called for in the goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan; provided that the Plan was previously subjected to environmental analysis through an EIS. This analysis provides the necessary environmental analysis to apply the categorical exemption under RCW 43.21C.229. Updated Totem Center land use forecasts and analysis are contained in Chapter 2 of this Final EIS.

#### **2.3.1.2 Proposed Action Growth Targets and Land Use Capacity**

##### **Citywide Growth Targets and Land Use Capacity**

Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS in July 2004, the City refined and updated its forecasted growth through 2022. This change was based primarily on improved information about potential future development in the Totem Lake neighborhood. In general, the updated citywide growth targets and land use capacity estimates are similar to those studied in the Draft EIS. Between neighborhoods, the targets and capacity estimates are also similar, but

provide for an increased share of growth in the Totem Lake neighborhood. Updated information is described below.

The updated 2022 target and capacity information for the Proposed Action is summarized in Table 2-2. Compared to 2003 housing units and employment levels, an additional 5,191 new residential units and 6,341 employees are necessary to achieve the 2022 target.

Table 2 - 1 Citywide 2022 Housing and Employment Targets and Capacity

	2000	2003	Capacity of Proposed Plan <sup>5</sup>	2022 Target <sup>1</sup>
Population <sup>1,4</sup>	45,054	45,630	Not applicable	54,790
Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	21,831	22,120	28,751	27,311
Employment <sup>2</sup>	32,384 <sup>3</sup>	34,843	54,565	41,184

<sup>1</sup>Year 2000 and 2003 based on State Office of Financial Management. Year 2022 Population based on 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Statistics. Capacity population applies same persons per household as 2022 target. 2022 Housing and Employment Targets based on Year 2000 plus assigned targets.  
<sup>2</sup>2000--2022 net household target equals 5,480 households. Year 2000--2022 net employment target equals 8,800 jobs.  
<sup>3</sup>Year 2000 employment based on City estimates. State Employment Security Department/PSRC estimates of employment were later found to have significant discrepancies.  
<sup>4</sup>The City is assigned a household target as the method to accommodate the forecasted population.  
<sup>5</sup>Capacity analysis prepared by the City in June 2004. Capacity may extend beyond 2022.

### Totem Center Study Area

As of 2003, the Totem Center Study Area includes 200 residential units, 308,888 square feet of office space, 329,587 square feet of commercial space, and approximately 1,895 employees (see Table 2-3). In 2022, development under proposed zoning regulations and consistent with growth forecasts for the Totem Center Study Area would result in approximately 1,010 additional dwelling units for a total of 1,210 units. This represents an increase in housing of 500% over current conditions. Office development would grow by 259,557 square feet for a total of 568,445 square feet, or an 84% growth rate. Commercial square footage would also increase, with a growth rate of 34% for a total of 441,954 square feet. No industrial growth is anticipated. This intensification of land uses in the study area would result in an estimated 3,738 total employees in the study area, representing a 97% increase in employees over 2003 conditions.

Table 2 - 2 Totem Center Study Area Land Use Forecasts

Land use	2003 Citywide	Totem Center Study Area		
		2003 Totem Center Study Area	Proposed Action 2022 Forecast <sup>1</sup>	Capacity of Proposed Action <sup>2</sup>
Dwelling Units	22,120	200	1,210	1,598
Office (sf)	4,969,448	308,888	568,455	988,647
Commercial (sf)	3,125,419	329,587	441,954	475,000
Industrial (sf)	3,325,049	0	0	0
Employment (Employees)	34,843	1,895	3,738	4,905

Source: City of Kirkland, Jones & Stokes, 2004

<sup>1</sup> Based on study area's estimated capacity compared to Citywide estimated capacity and then the percent applied to the city-wide targets to determine study area's general forecasted share of the Citywide targets.

<sup>2</sup> Capacity analysis prepared by the City in June 2004. Capacity may extend beyond 2022.

### 2.3.1.3 Policy Amendments

The proposed policy refinements consist primarily of editorial changes, text clarifications, and minor modifications for plan consistency. There are some substantive changes as well. In addition, some revisions have been made to achieve compliance with GMA updates and new State laws.

Updates are proposed to the following elements of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Introduction
- Vision/Framework Goals
- General
- Community Character
- Natural Environment
- Land Use
- Housing
- Economic Development
- Transportation
- Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
- Utilities
- Public Services
- Capital Facilities

- Implementation Strategies
- Appendices

In addition, a new Human Services Element has been prepared. A summary of the Comprehensive Plan amendments is provided in Table 2-3. Changes to the proposal since issuance of the Draft EIS are shown in *italic text* and are included in Appendix G of this Final EIS.

Table 2 - 3 Summary of Comprehensive Plan Update

<b>Comprehensive Plan Element</b>	<b>Nature of Revision</b> <i>(italics indicate a change to the proposal since issuance of the Draft EIS)</i>
<b>Introduction</b>	Plan Consistency-data/dates updated in Community Profile to reflect 2022 planning horizon; Text revisions editorial changes and supplemental text to refine Historical Perspective & How the Plan was Prepared. Correction to the City's projected population based on an updated estimated decline in the average number of persons per household. The updated estimate projects an estimated 54,790 City population (compared to 55,300 in the Draft EIS), or 9,160 more than live in the City in 2003 (compared to 9,700 in the Draft EIS).
<b>Vision/Framework Goals</b>	Plan Consistency Data/dates updated in A Vision of Kirkland to reflect planning horizon through 2022; Text revisions editorial changes and supplemental text to refine A Vision of Kirkland and Framework Goals; Addition of four (4) new Framework Goals concerning sense of community, low impact development and sustainable building practices, public safety, and regional coordination. In response to comments on the Draft Plan, the Vision Statement description of residential areas is modified to mention traditional subdivisions, waterfront-oriented neighborhoods, urban villages and an equestrian community.
<b>General</b>	Text revisions-editorial changes and supplemental text to refine language within Plan Applicability and Consistency & Plan Amendment; GMA compliance-text revisions regarding language for an emergency amendment within item D. Plan Amendment.
<b>Community Character</b>	Text revisions- editorial changes and minor supplemental text; Appendix C- Historic Resources and Community Landmarks is placed within the body of the element and is updated; New policy on mitigating light, glare, noise and odor impacts; Updated Table CC-1 to reflect a recently approved historic overlay for the Malm House in the South Juanita Neighborhood.

<b>Comprehensive Plan Element</b>	<b>Nature of Revision</b> <i>(italics indicate a change to the proposal since issuance of the Draft EIS)</i>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	<p>Plan text revised and new goals and policies added to ensure consistency with the City’s Natural Resource Management Plan, adopted August 5, 2003 (see discussion below);</p> <p>Add updated version of Kirkland’s Sensitive Areas Map, which serves as a guide to approximate locations of known critical areas and drainage basins, Topography Map, Landslide and Seismic Hazard Map, Impervious Surfaces and Tree Canopy Map.</p>
<b>Land Use</b>	<p>Plan Consistency data/dates updated to reflect 2022 planning horizon; integrates Land Use from the Totem Lake Neighborhood Plan and the North Rose Hill Plan;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text;</p> <p>A comparison of household units and employment for 2000 Existing, 2022 Growth Targets and Available Capacity are provided and discussed;</p> <p>Appendix H-Residential Densities and Comparable Zones is placed within the body of the element and revised;</p> <p>Revised policy on industrial areas;</p> <p>Revised goal and policies on regional and community facilities to include the state law requirements for essential public facilities;</p> <p>Correction to Figure LL-2 classification of the commercial area at Market Street to “Market Neighborhood Center” consistent with the definitions of commercial area classifications in the Land Use Element.</p>
<b>Housing</b>	<p>Plan Consistency-Data/dates updated to reflect 2022 planning horizon;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text;</p> <p>Policy changes that reflect the Housing Strategy Plan.</p>
<b>Economic Development</b>	<p>Rewrite of the element using some of the existing goals and policies, but with some new goals and policies General intent the same, except change on industrial policy;</p> <p>In response to public comment, revised supporting text in Policy ED-2.2 states that the City should proactively work with businesses and neighborhoods to improve the business climate in our community for everyone’s benefit.</p>

<b>Comprehensive Plan Element</b>	<b>Nature of Revision</b> <i>(italics indicate a change to the proposal since issuance of the Draft EIS)</i>
<b>Transportation</b>	<p>Plan Consistency-Data/dates updated to reflect 2022 planning horizon; updated Table T-5: Transportation Project List;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text;</p> <p>LOS revisions including Tables T-2 and T-3 LOS and Table T-4 Signalized Intersections Not System Intersections, <i>including revisions to Tables T-2 and T-3 subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS;</i></p> <p>Proposed change from LOS 1.4 to LOS 1.3 for Individual System Intersections;</p> <p>Revised Figure T-1, Street Functional Classifications and State Routes, <i>including updates since the Draft EIS was issued;</i></p> <p>Policy refinement to reflect Non-Motorized Transportation Plan;</p> <p>Section on State Transportation Plans and Policies in Appendix A is placed within the body of the element and is updated.</p> <p>Added level of service standards to Policy T-5.5 for completed bicycle and pedestrian corridors, consistent with the adopted Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Revised the project at the intersection of NE 132<sup>nd</sup> St/100<sup>th</sup> Ave NE (a second southbound left turn lane). Change is to meet the maximum LOS for this intersection.</p> <p>Revised the text and Tables T-6 and T-7 to respond to comments from the Washington Department of Transportation. Changes are to reflect the State’s new level of service methodology and standards for state facilities and to replace the term “Highway of Strategic Significance” to “Highway of Statewide Significance.”</p> <p>Combined Draft Plan Figures T-2 and T-8 (existing and proposed pedestrian systems) into one figure (Final Plan Figure T-2), and Figures T-3 and T-7 (existing and proposed bicycle systems) into one figure (Final Plan Figure T-3). New figures include a correction to the pedestrian and bicycle systems for Totem Lake (see Figures 2-5 and 2-6)</p>
<b>Parks, Recreation, &amp; Open Space</b>	<p>Plan Consistency-Data/dates updated to reflect 2022 planning horizon;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text.</p>
<b>Utilities</b>	<p>GMA/State Law Compliance- revisions to existing policies;</p> <p>Plan Consistency-Data/dates updated in to reflect 2022 planning horizon;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text;</p> <p>LOS revisions and refinements, see discussion below;</p> <p>New goal and policies on telecommunications.</p>
<b>Public Services</b>	<p>Plan Consistency-data/dates updated in to reflect 2022 planning horizon;</p> <p>Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text;</p> <p>Solid waste section moved from Utilities to Public Services element;</p> <p>LOS revisions and refinements, see discussion below;</p> <p>Change to Policy PS- 2.1 addressing potential mitigation for noise, odor and traffic impacts at the Houghton Transfer Station.</p>

<b>Comprehensive Plan Element</b>	<b>Nature of Revision</b> <i>(italics indicate a change to the proposal since issuance of the Draft EIS)</i>
<b>Capital Facilities</b>	Plan Consistency data/dates updated in to reflect 2022 planning horizon; Text revisions-minor editorial changes and supplemental text; LOS revisions and refinements including revisions to Tables CF-2 through CF-5 for LOS, see discussion below; Update CF Tables to match capital improvement programs for year 2005-2009.
<b>Human Services</b>	New element to the Plan; see discussion below.
<b>Implementation Strategies</b>	Plan Consistency data/dates and implementation tasks revised to reflect Comprehensive Plan update and 2022 planning horizon.
<b>Appendices</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Appendix A - Plan Consistency is deleted with section on State Transportation Plans and Policies moved to the Transportation Element.</li> <li>▪ Appendix B - Community Profile is deleted with some information placed within the Introduction Element. The City published a separate Community Profile document in 2003.</li> <li>▪ Appendix C - Historic Resources and Community Landmarks is deleted, and text is placed in the Community Character Element and updated.</li> <li>▪ Appendix D - Level of Service Methodology is revised and converts to Appendix A.</li> <li>▪ Appendix E - The Public Process is deleted.</li> <li>▪ Appendix F – Glossary is revised and converts to Appendix B.</li> <li>▪ Appendix G – Has previously been repealed.</li> <li>▪ Appendix H – Residential Densities and Comparable Zones is deleted, and text is placed in the Land Use Element and revised.</li> <li>▪ Appendix I – Design Principles converts to Appendix C.</li> </ul>

### Natural Environment Element

Although the GMA does not require a Comprehensive Plan element for critical areas, Kirkland’s 1995 Plan included a Natural Environment Element, which provided goals and policies supporting the City’s critical areas designations and regulations. In early 2000, as part of an annual Comprehensive Plan Update, Kirkland updated the Natural Environment Element to more fully reflect GMA goals and requirements. Although further amendments were not needed to achieve compliance with the GMA, during 2004, minor changes to the Natural Environment Element have again been undertaken. These revisions further emphasize the City’s commitment to consideration of best available science and protection or enhancement of the habitat of anadromous fish; and incorporate some key concepts from the City’s Natural Resource Management Plan, which was adopted in August 2003. These amendments also include an updated version of Kirkland’s Sensitive Areas Map, which serves as a guide to approximate locations of known critical areas, streams and drainage basins.

## Human Services Element

A new Human Services element has been added as a part of the Comprehensive Plan Update. This new element has been a goal of the City since the adoption of the 1995 Comprehensive Plan and is a priority task item listed in the Implementation Strategies chapter of the Plan. The new Human Services element incorporates existing City goals and policies addressing youth, seniors, and other human services needs that had not been placed in a formal document, but does not represent new City direction.

## Updated Levels of Service

Within the Transportation, Public Services, Capital Facilities, and Utilities elements, level of service standards have been revised and/or refined. These changes include the following:

- The level of service standard for roads would potentially change from a V/C ratio of 1.4 LOS to a maximum 1.3 V/C ratio for Individual System Intersections;
- The transit level of service would change to achieve a 65% SOV and 35% non-SOV level of work trips by 2022;
- The level of service standards for bicycle lanes would be modified from 41.5 miles to 46.2 miles;
- The level of service standards for pedestrian facilities would be amended from 105.7 miles to 118 miles;
- The level of service for fire and emergency medical services would change from a standard of one fire station per 14,200 persons to a standard based on response times. This is based upon recommendation of the Fire Department and the City's Fire Safety Commission. A response time level of service is a more appropriate measure than the number of fire stations for the City;
- The City's 1995 Comprehensive Plan identifies a surface water management standard of 24-hour event, 100-year detention with 0.2 cubic feet per second per acre. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update would generalize the level of service to: convey, detain, and treat surface water to provide for the public safety and welfare and to protect the hydrologic regime and fish and wildlife habitat;
- The level of service standard for water distribution would change from 119 gallons/day/capita to 112 gallons/day/capita as a correction. This is consistent with the City of Kirkland Water System Plan;
- Levels of service standards have been added for solid waste collection and recycling (52% residential recycling rate/city wide average of 33 lbs maximum/household/week for garbage collection). The City adopted these standards in the past as part of the City's solid waste management program.

### 2.3.1.4 Zoning Code Amendments

Proposed revisions to the City of Kirkland's Zoning Code include the following procedural changes:

- **Chapter 135- Zoning Code Amendments.** Proposed revisions would include: adding an emergency amendment definition and process, adding a process to review amendments in response to court or Growth Management Hearing Board appeals or

decisions, describing the current two step process for private amendment requests and establishing criteria for selecting which requests will be studied.

- **Chapter 140- Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.** Proposed revisions would include: adding an emergency amendment definition and process, adding a process to review amendments in response to court or Growth Management Hearing Board appeals or decisions, describing the current two step process for private amendment requests, establishing criteria for selecting which requests will be studied, and revising the factors to consider and criteria for amending the Comprehensive Plan.
- **Chapter 160- Process IV.** Proposed revisions would describe the current two-step process for private amendment requests and make minor changes to the criteria for selecting requests to be studied.

As described above, the Natural Environment Element includes an updated version of Kirkland's Sensitive Areas Map, which serves as a guide to approximate locations of known critical areas and drainage basins. Corresponding Chapter 90 Zoning Code amendments include minor modifications to definitions of primary and secondary basins for purposes of stream regulations. The modification of the definitions are based on more accurate basin boundary mapping, and would not result in any areas being subject to less restrictive regulations.

### 2.3.1.5 Private Amendment Study Areas

The City received two private amendment requests to change one or more of the following: the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Map and text, the Zoning Map and/or the Zoning Code's applicable Use Zone text (Figure 2-7). The City decided to expand the study to consider the changes for part or all of the surrounding zone to review similar issues for similarly situated properties. The proposed amendments were:

- **Amendment A – Lakeshore Clinic/PLA6B Study Area.** Correct the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Office/Multifamily and change the allowable residential density from 12 dwelling units per acre to 24 dwelling units per acre for the Planned Area 6B zone generally located north of 7th Avenue S, south of 2nd Avenue S, east of 2nd Street S, and west of 3rd Place S.

*At their August 26, 2004 public meeting, the Kirkland Planning Commission recommended no change to the land use and zoning designations for the Amendment A Study Area. Under this recommendation, the existing Comprehensive Plan designation of Office/Multifamily at 12 dwelling units per acre and existing zoning would be maintained. Further clarification is being sought on the Planning Commission's intent with respect to the split-zone parcels. The City Council will consider the Planning Commission recommendations as well as citizen and agency comments as they consider adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update.*

- **Amendment B – Sedorco Partnership/6th Street South Study Area.** Change the land use designation from Industrial to Office/Multifamily potentially up to 24 dwelling units per acre and rezone from LIT (Light Industrial Technology) potentially up to PR 1.8 for the area located east of the BNSF railroad tracks and west of 6th Street South).

*At their August 26, 2004 public meeting, the Kirkland Planning Commission recommended a comprehensive plan amendment for the Sedorco site (7.23 acres at 733*

*and 815 6th Street South) to office/multifamily (maximum 18 dwelling units/acre) and rezone to PR 2.4. No change is recommended to the map for the balance of the study area, which includes the Western Pneumatic Tube Company site (815 6th Street South) and the Hirschler Manufacturing site (916 6th Street South). Under the recommendation, the LIT designation at these locations would be retained (Figures 2-2 and 2-3). The Planning Commission did, however, recommend changes to the Comprehensive Plan text to anticipate the transition of the remainder to the study area over time to Office/Multifamily. The City Council will consider the Planning Commission recommendations as well as citizen and agency comments as they consider adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update.*

### 2.3.1.6 Land Use and Zoning Map Corrections

The Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Map was changed with the 1995 GMA update of the Plan. However, the Neighborhood Subarea Land Use Maps were not changed in 1995. Since 1995, the North Rose Hill Neighborhood and Totem Lake Neighborhood Subarea Plan Land Use maps and implementing Zoning Map corrections have been updated to be consistent with the 1995 GMA Citywide Land Use Map for all land use classifications and residential density.

The neighborhood subarea plan land use maps need to be updated to be consistent with the 1995 GMA Citywide Land Use Map. These consistency amendments have a negligible effect on growth capacity. Since the overall Citywide Land Use Plan controls, the land use vision has been implemented consistently. These Neighborhood Map Amendments serve to provide full internal plan consistency with regard to future land use.

The land use designation and zoning for several city park/open space parcels need to be changed to reflect their use as park/open space.

In addition, the City Wide Land Use Map needs to be revised to re-designate RS 5.0 parcels (8 to 9 dwelling units per acre) from medium to low density residential. The RS 5.0 zones have always been regulated in the Zoning Code and shown on the Zoning Map as low density residential uses. This change would make consistent the Land Use Map and text, the Zoning Map and the development regulations. This change is also needed to implement the proposed revisions to the text in Comprehensive Plan Appendix H (text is revised and moved to the Land Use Element). Updated Comprehensive Plan and Zoning maps are shown in Figures 2-2 and 2-3.

A detailed description of the map corrections is included as Appendix B, *and includes corrections to the North/South Juanita, South Rose Hill, Moss Bay, Everest, Market/Norkirk/Highlands, and Central Houghton neighborhood maps identified after issuance of the Draft EIS. These revisions are corrections for consistency with existing land use designations only and do not represent changes in land use designations.*

### 2.3.1.7 Split Zone Parcels

There are currently parcels split by two or more zone classifications within the PLA6B study area. Minor boundary adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map are proposed for five of the parcels and would have a negligible effect on capacity. The existing development on these five parcels is bisected by the PLA 6B boundary. This effort will address the nonconforming uses and inconsistent land use designations and zoning for these parcels.

A map depicting the affected parcels (#1875000190, 4070700165, 2120200005, 0825059009, and 7654900165) that are proposed for edits is included as Appendix C to the Draft EIS. The boundary line for the sixth parcel (#7786600000) will not be changed since its split boundary problem was resolved using a planned unit development (PUD) process. City staff is pursuing further clarification of the Planning Commission recommendation with respect to these parcels.

The boundary line changes are subject to City Council approval.

## 2.4 Updated Environmental Analysis

The purpose of this EIS is to assist the public and agency decision makers in considering future decisions on Comprehensive Plan goals, policies, and development regulations for the City of Kirkland as part of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan Update. These broad decisions will provide direction and support for more specific actions by the City, such as capital improvements and implementing regulations.

The Draft EIS analyzed potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives. This section of the Final EIS provides a brief environmental analysis of changes that have been made to the Proposed Action since issuance of the Draft EIS. No changes are proposed for the General; Housing; Parks, Recreation, Open Space; Utilities; Capital Facilities; Human Services; Implementation Strategies and Appendices sections of the Draft Plan. Therefore, no further analysis is conducted of these sections. In addition, the minor policy changes and updates proposed to the Vision/Framework Goals; Community Character; Land Use; Economic Development; Public Services and Map Corrections are not anticipated to result in environmental impacts and are not analyzed further in this Final EIS.

The following analysis focuses on proposed changes and refinements to the City’s population projections; transportation analysis, and transportation network that have been prepared since issuance of the Draft EIS.

### 2.4.1 Population, Employment and Housing

#### 2.4.1.1 Citywide

The Proposed Action Alternative accommodates growth to the year 2022. A comparison of growth targets to growth capacity is presented in Table 2-4.

Table 2 - 4 Proposed Action Growth Targets and Capacity

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>Capacity of Proposed Plan<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>2022 Target</b>
<b>Housing Units<sup>1</sup></b>	21,831	22,120	28,751	27,311
<b>Employment<sup>3</sup></b>	32,384 <sup>3</sup>	34,843	54,565	41,184

<sup>1</sup>2000—2022 net household target = 5,480 households. Year 2000—2022 net employment target = 8,800 jobs.

<sup>2</sup>Capacity analysis was prepared by the City in June 2004. Capacity may extend beyond 2022.

<sup>3</sup>Year 2000 employment based on City estimates. State Employment Security Department/PSRC estimates of employment were later found to have significant discrepancies.

In 2022, population, household, and employment levels would increase over current households. There is sufficient capacity to accommodate growth targets. Household and employment distribution is further described below.

### 2.4.1.2 Employment

In the year 2022, total employment targets (existing plus future) as estimated for the neighborhoods as shown in Table 2-5.

Generally, the top locations for employment are similar to 2003 levels. The Totem Lake neighborhood would have the most total employment in the City, followed by the Lakeview Neighborhood. The greatest net increases are in the Totem Lake and Moss Bay (formerly Central) neighborhoods. The relative distributions are similar to those reviewed in the Draft EIS, except that the Totem Lake neighborhood would have a greater share of employment. The overall citywide target has not changed significantly.

Table 2 - 5 Proposed Action: Employment by Neighborhood

Neighborhood	2003 Employees <sup>1</sup>	2003 Percent Share	2022 Target Employees <sup>2</sup>	2022 Percent of Total	2003 – 2022 Net Target Employees <sup>2</sup>	2022 Net Percent of Total
Lakeview	8,152	23%	8,306	20%	150	3%
Moss Bay	5,243	15%	6,253	15%	1,066	18%
Houghton	494	1%	586	1%	33	1%
Bridle Trails	604	2%	604	1%	0	0%
Everest	2,132	6%	2,379	6%	244	4%
South Rose Hill	259	1%	497	1%	238	4%
North Rose Hill	1,947	6%	2,609	6%	549	9%
Market	838	2%	955	2%	135	2%
Norkirk	933	3%	1,126	3%	121	2%
Highlands	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
South Juanita	1,047	3%	1,099	3%	74	1%
North Juanita	9	0%	91	0%	80	1%
Totem Lake	13,227	38%	17,396	42%	3,257	55%
Sum	34,885	100%	41,902	100%	5,947	100%

Source: City of Kirkland 2003 and 2004; Jones & Stokes, this analysis.

<sup>1</sup>The total employment in 2003 includes special generators and institutions. Because the neighborhood breakdown of special generators (e.g. hospital) and institutions (e.g. retirement homes, day care centers, etc.) was available by TAZ and neighborhood for the year 2002 and the general employment estimates are based on 2003 data, the results are slightly different than the 2003 gross employment estimate of 34,843.

<sup>2</sup>Appendix D provides an updated description of the method to develop 2022 target estimates.

### 2.4.1.3 Households

Total households targets in 2022 (existing plus future) would be allocated to neighborhoods as shown in Table 2-6.

The distribution of total households in 2022 among the neighborhoods is similar to existing conditions. South Juanita, Moss Bay, North Rose Hill and Totem Lake will continue to accommodate much of the 2022 housing target for the City. The North Rose Hill, Moss Bay, South Juanita and Totem Lake neighborhoods are estimated to have the greatest increases between 2003 and 2022. The relative distribution among neighborhoods is similar to that studied in the Draft EIS, but Totem Lake would take a greater share overall. The relative distribution among neighborhoods is similar to that studied in the Draft EIS, except that the Totem Lake neighborhood would accommodate a greater share of housing overall. The citywide target has not changed significantly.

Net dwellings added would be comprised of 60% multifamily units based on 2022 targets, but added to the existing housing stock, would minimally change the split between single family and multifamily units: about 55% of total dwellings Citywide would be multifamily in 2022, compared to 54% in 2003. Multifamily dwellings and single-family dwellings would be allowed in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning districts. Multifamily dwellings would help meet fair share housing targets established in the Countywide Planning Policies as multifamily tends to be a unit type that is more affordable. While the capacity for multifamily exists, if the previous trend in providing affordable housing are maintained the affordable housing goals of the Countywide Planning Policies may not be met.

Table 2 - 6 Proposed Action: Housing by Neighborhood

<b>Neighborhood</b>	<b>2003 Dwellings</b>	<b>2003 Percent Share</b>	<b>2022 Target Dwellings<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>2022 Percent Share</b>	<b>2003-2022 Net Target Dwellings<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>2022 Net Percent Share</b>
Lakeview	1,617	7%	1,717	6%	100	2%
Moss Bay	2,469	11%	3,178	12%	709	13%
Houghton	1,383	6%	1,649	6%	266	5%
Bridle Trails	858	4%	1,024	4%	166	3%
Everest	635	3%	769	3%	134	2%
South Rose Hill	1,106	5%	1,621	6%	515	10%
North Rose Hill	3,154	14%	4,140	15%	986	18%
Market	935	4%	1,002	4%	67	1%
Norkirk	1,512	7%	1,700	6%	188	3%
Highlands	974	4%	1,130	4%	156	3%
South Juanita	3,777	17%	4,515	16%	738	14%
North Juanita	1,812	8%	1,938	7%	126	2%
Totem Lake	1,888	9%	3,141	11%	1,253	23%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>22,120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27,524<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,404</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: City of Kirkland 2003 and 2004; Jones & Stokes, this analysis.

<sup>1</sup>Appendix D provides a description of the method to develop 2022 target estimates.

<sup>2</sup>The target number in this chart is a little higher than the more precise Citywide target of 27,311 due to the method to proportionally reduce capacity to the target level.

#### 2.4.1.4 Totem Center Study Area

The Totem Center Study Area (Figure 2-4) would provide a significant amount of employment and residential capacity for the City. As shown in Table 2-5, the Totem Lake Neighborhood would accommodate 42% of the City's 2022 employment target and account for 55% of the increased employment capacity in the City. The Totem Lake Neighborhood would accommodate 11% of the City's 2022 housing target and account for 23% of the increased housing capacity in the City. Much of this new neighborhood growth will occur in the Totem Center Study Area.

#### 2.4.1.5 Private Amendment Study Areas

Under the August 26, 2004 Kirkland Planning Commission recommendation, capacity in Private Amendment Area A (Lakeshore Clinic), would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Existing land use designations would be maintained. The City Council will consider the Planning Commission recommendations as well as citizen and agency comments as they consider adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update.

As recommended by the Kirkland Planning Commission on August 26, 2004, a portion of Private Amendment Area B (Sedorco), would change to decrease capacity for industrial and office development, and increase capacity for residential development. This change would apply to the center 7.23 acres of the Study Area. The remaining north and south parcels in the Study area would continue as currently designated with a Light Industrial land use designation and LIT zoning designation. The City Council will consider the Planning Commission recommendations as well as citizen and agency comments as they consider adoption of the Comprehensive Plan update.

In the case of both private amendment requests, the Planning Commission recommendation is within the range of the No Action and Action alternatives studied in the Draft EIS.

### 2.4.2 Transportation Analysis and Network

The Draft EIS identified the Affected Environment, including the existing roadways, existing levels of service, parking, traffic control, public transportation, bikeways and walkways, freight transportation and transportation demand management and should be referenced for environmental context. This section of the Final EIS presents revised LOS analysis results and standards that result from the revisions in projected land use that occurred after issuance of the Draft EIS, and lists revisions to the Draft EIS that are not expected to result in additional environmental impacts.

#### 2.4.2.1 Roadway LOS

##### LOS Standards

In June 2004, the City re-ran the transportation model using the revised June 2004 land capacity data (described previously in the Population, Employment and Housing section of this FEIS). The results of the revised analysis are shown in Table 2-7. This table shows that under the revised land use projections, average V/C values in the vicinity of Totem Center are expected to slightly increase, while the average V/C in other subareas is projected to decrease, compared to the projections presented in the Draft EIS.

Table 2 - 7 Maximum Allowed Subarea Average V/C Ratio for System Intersections and Individual Intersection LOS

<b>Use as Maximum Allowed Average V/C after January 1</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Forecast for Year</b>	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Subarea</b>	<b>Average V/C Ratio</b>				
<b>Southwest</b>	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.90
<b>Northwest</b>	0.88	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.91
<b>Northeast</b>	0.86	0.87	0.87	0.88	0.89
<b>East</b>	1.04	1.04	1.05	1.05	1.05
<b>Maximum allowed individual system intersection V/C ratio</b>	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30

Note: Italics represent a change in the proposal subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS.

### Roadway LOS Results

Table 2-8 summarizes the existing and forecasted average subarea V/C values that resulted from analysis of the revised land use projections.

Table 2 - 8 2003 and Forecasted Subarea Average LOS for System Intersections

<b>Subarea</b>	<b>Subarea Average V/C</b>		
	<b>2003 Traffic Count</b>	<b>2003 Traffic Plus Projects approved but not yet built</b>	<b>2022</b>
Southwest	0.77	0.89	0.92
Northwest	0.83	0.88	1.01
Northeast	0.76	0.86	0.99
East	0.94	1.04	1.10

Note: Italics represent a change in the proposal subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS.

With two exceptions, all individual intersections are projected to operate at or below the proposed new standard of a V/C of 1.3 through 2022. The intersection of NE 124th Street/124th Ave NE is projected to reach a V/C of 1.31, and NE 85th Street/132nd Ave NE is projected to reach a V/C of 1.37 by 2022. No feasible improvements have been identified at this time that would maintain the LOS at these two intersections. Given that these projected V/Cs are only slightly greater than the LOS standard of 1.3, and are not expected to occur until 2022, the projected differences are not considered to be significant because conditions at the intersections will undergo annual review, as described in the following mitigation measure.

### 2.4.2.2 Mitigation Measure Under Adopted Regulations

The City regulates development by applying concurrency requirements in KMC Title 25: Concurrency, and requiring impact fees in KMC 27.04: Impact Fees. Concurrency regulations require that LOS results are met, projects are amended, or facilities are put into place to ensure that LOS standards are met at the time of development or within six years of development.

*As part of its commitment to the consistent application of concurrency regulations, the City will monitor system intersections each year as part of the annual review of the network LOS and road concurrency, as described in the Implementation Strategies Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The annual review will place particular focus on intersections that have been identified as having higher risk of exceeding the adopted standards. If the measured V/C approaches the 1.3 standard for individual intersections, the City could take one or more of the following actions:*

- 1. Implement additional improvement projects to improve the LOS; or*
- 2. Limit, phase or deny development that affects the intersection; or*
- 3. Refine the LOS methodology or standard at some or all intersections.*

### 2.4.2.3 Totem Center Study Area

Revised land use projections reflect a higher level of projected development than the projections that were analyzed for the Draft EIS. The results presented in the previous section reflect these revisions.

### 2.4.2.4 Private Amendment Study Areas

In the Draft EIS, analysis was presented that compared the difference in PM peak hour trips that would be expected to result under different mixes of office and multifamily residential development within the Sedorco private amendment request study area. Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, the Kirkland Planning Commission has recommended a change in land use and zoning designation for a portion of the study area (to Office/Multifamily 18 units per acre), and retention of the remainder of the area as light industrial (as described previously in the Population, Employment and Housing section of this chapter of the Final EIS). This recommendation is within the range of scenarios that were analyzed in the Draft EIS.

Light industrial development would be expected to generate fewer trips in the PM peak hour than office or residential development in the same geographic area. Thus, the analysis that was completed for the Draft EIS and updated Final EIS reflects a conservative estimate of potential traffic impacts, as compared to a development scenario in which some light industrial development would occur in the area. The identified impacts and proposed mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIS would be adequate to address a mix of office, residential, and light industrial development as well.

The revised transportation analysis for the Final EIS assumed higher intensities of office and residential development at 24 units per acre in both private amendment request areas than is currently being recommended by the Planning Commission. The transportation model and supporting land use assumptions are reviewed annually and will be reviewed next year to

ensure consistency with the final City Council decision on land use designations in these areas.

#### 2.4.2.5 Other Revisions to Draft EIS

The following revisions that were made to the Draft EIS are not anticipated to result in environmental impacts and have not been analyzed further in this Final EIS.

##### Street Functional Classifications

Since issuance of the Draft EIS, the City updated the street functional classification system, to better reflect the functions the roadways are serving, and to achieve consistency with adjacent jurisdictions. The updated Street Functional Classifications are presented in Figure 2.8 of this Final EIS.

##### State Facilities

Revisions were made to the Transportation Element to reflect the State of Washington's new LOS methodology and standards for state facilities. In addition, the term "Highway of Strategic Significance" was revised to "Highway of Statewide Significance" in the description of State Transportation Plans and Policies. These revisions are presented in Appendix G of this Final EIS.

##### Non-Motorized Facilities

LOS standards were added to the Transportation Element for completed bicycle and pedestrian corridors, consistent with the adopted Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, and are presented in Appendix G of this Final EIS.

The existing bicycle system figure and the proposed bicycle system figure in the Draft EIS were combined into one figure, as shown in Figure 2-6 of this Final EIS. The existing pedestrian system figure and the proposed pedestrian system figure in the Draft EIS were combined into one figure, as shown in Figure 2-5 of this Final EIS.

##### Roadway Improvements

Subsequent to issuance of the Draft EIS, two connector roadways were added to the transportation model analysis of the Totem Center Study Area: NE 130th Street, between Totem Lake Boulevard and 120th Avenue NE; and 119th Avenue NE, between NE 128th Street and NE 130th Street. These two connector roadways have been recommended to improve connection and circulation in the area, in light of new proposed development in the area. Completion of these two roadway connector projects is not expected to result in any significant LOS changes in the area. These projects were identified in the Draft EIS and are included in the Totem Lake Neighborhood Plan.

