



SUMMARY

This chapter summarizes environmental impacts, mitigation measures and significant unavoidable adverse impacts for No Action Alternative, Proposed Action Alternative, alternative development scenarios and lower density alternative associated with the Potala Mixed Use Development evaluated in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). This summary provides a brief overview of the information considered in this EIS. The reader should consult Chapter 2 for a detailed description of the alternatives and Draft EIS Chapter 3 for more information concerning the affected environment, environmental impacts, and mitigating measures for each alternative.

1.1 PROPOSAL

Lobsang Dargey of Dargey Enterprises is proposing to develop a 52,600 square foot site located at the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Lake Street South and 10th Avenue South. The site consists of three parcels. One parcel, located in the northwest quarter of the site currently has a 2114 sf commercial building containing a dry cleaner and a restaurant. A second parcel fronts on 10th Avenue S, up the hill from the first parcel, and is developed with a single family residence. The third parcel consists of the southern half of the site and is undeveloped. All structures would be removed in the site construction.

The proposed development would consist of a mixed use building containing approximately 6,200 sf of commercial use (general office and medical office) and 143 residential units. Two levels of underground parking would be provided and vehicular access would be from Lake Street South.

1.1.1 Objectives of the Proposal

For purposes of SEPA (WAC 197-11-440), the following are the primary objectives of the proposal:

- Maximize site development potential within the context of regulatory requirements and environmental and market conditions.
- Redevelop the site to create an attractive residential mixed use development.
- Ensure that site development is financially feasible and sustainable.

- Create a development that is an asset to Kirkland’s citizens and is compatible with the surrounding area.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The approximate 52,600 sf (1.21 acres) site is located at the southeast quadrant of Lake Street South and 10th Avenue South, approximately ½ mile south of downtown Kirkland (Figure 1.1). The site slope falls to the west from the eastern boundary toward Lake Washington, falling about 14 feet along the south boundary and 22 feet along the north boundary.

The site is zoned Neighborhood Business (BN). The western boundary of the site is within 200 feet of the designated Lake Washington shoreline and is subject to regulation through the City’s Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The affected shoreline area consists of approximately 10,370 sf along the western boundary of the site.



FIGURE 1.1 VICINITY MAP

1.3 ALTERNATIVES

1.3.1 Alternative 1: No Action

The No Action Alternative would retain the site as it currently exists. There would be no new development or changes to access, parking or vegetation on the site.

The existing 2,114 sf commercial building would remain as it currently exists on the northwest corner of the property and the existing single family residence would remain as it currently exists on the eastern portion of the property. The remainder of the site would remain in its current vacant condition.

1.3.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action

Alternative 2 consists of a mixed use development containing approximately 6,200 sf of commercial use (general office and medical office), 143 residential units and 316 parking stalls. The development would be contained in a single building with a total area of 227,961 gross sf. The site will be excavated below existing grade to achieve an additional floor of development and two levels of underground parking for a total of four floors above the final grade of the development. Based on the site plan provided by the applicant, the total lot

coverage would be approximately 36,835 sf, or approximately 70% of the total lot area.¹ Upon submittal of a formal permit application, this information will be reviewed to confirm that it includes all hard surfaces included in the Kirkland Zoning Code lot coverage calculation.

The proposed mixed use building would consist of four stories with two underground parking levels. Retaining walls would be constructed along 10th Avenue South and along the eastern and southern boundaries of the site to accommodate the change in finished grade between the project site and adjoining properties. In general, excavation will range from 25 to 40 feet of vertical cuts. Greatest excavation would be in the eastern portion of the site. Near the northeast corner of the site, along 10th Avenue South, approximately 38 vertical feet would be excavated and two floors of residential units and residential parking would be below existing grade. In the southeast corner of the site, approximately 38 vertical feet would be also excavated and one floor of residential units and commercial and residential parking would be below existing grade.

Along Lake Street South, approximately 24 feet of vertical cut is planned to accommodate commercial and residential parking. The main entrance to the building would slope down from Lake Street South approximately six feet below existing street grade.

Building modulation in the proposal would be provided by four courtyards, two opening toward Lake Street S and two towards the eastern site boundary. These courtyards, together with other open areas, will provide a total of 13,035 sf of common open space in the development. In addition, proposed building elevations include balconies and color for modulation and relief.

The building would have a flat roof and is proposed to meet the maximum allowable height under the KZC of 30 feet above existing average grade.

1.3.3 Alternative Development Scenarios

In addition to the two alternatives described above, Draft EIS Section 3.3 Aesthetics and Section 3.4 Transportation consider alternative development scenarios and/or development thresholds to address potential impacts. In Section 3.3, three alternative development scenarios are considered as potential mitigation to address building height and bulk and compatibility with the surrounding area. These scenarios are modeled and discussed in terms of their potential to mitigate identified impacts of the Proposed Action. In Section 3.4, development thresholds are discussed in terms of development levels that would reduce any identified transportation impacts. Please see Draft EIS Sections 3.3 and 3.4 for a complete discussion of these alternative scenarios.

¹ Based on lot coverage of 36,835 sf (data provided by applicant) and 52,600 sf lot size. Note that a maximum 80% lot coverage is allowed in the BN zone.

1.3.4 Lower Density Alternative

In addition, this Final EIS provides a qualitative review of potential impacts from a lower density alternative. Potential impacts are discussed in comparison to the Proposed Action and potential changes to mitigating measures are identified.

Assumptions about the alternative include the following:

- 6,200 sf of commercial space, comparable to the Proposed Action
- 30 to 44 residential dwelling units (24 to 36 units/acre)
- Development in a single building, comparable to the Proposed Action
- Total building area would depend on the size of the residential dwelling units. If 1,300 sf to 1,600 sf units are assumed, the estimated total building area is estimated to be 90,000 to 160,000 sf²
- Development consistent with the Kirkland Zoning Code Neighborhood Business (BN) zoning standards and Shoreline Master Program Urban Mixed designation standards are assumed

Please see Final EIS Section 3.2 for a discussion of this Alternative.

1.4 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This document is organized into the following sections:

1 Summary. Contains a description of the proposal and alternatives, proposal location, summary of significant adverse impacts, mitigation measures to address significant adverse impacts, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

2 Description of Proposal and Alternatives. Contains a description of the Proposed Action and No Action alternative, as well as additional background information on the proposal.

3 Key Issues. Contains a discussion of key issues identified by comments on the Draft EIS and City review of issues. These issues include alternatives, existing residential densities, the Residential Market designation, and aesthetics mitigation.

4 Comments and Responses. Contains all comments received on the Draft EIS during the formal comment period and responses to comments. This section includes all written comments and verbal comments received at the August 14, 2012 public hearing.

The document also includes a distribution list (Chapter 5) and appendices that provide additional background information.

² Based on King County Assessor's data, the average multifamily unit size for the units shown in Final EIS Figure 3-1 is 1,600 sf. Based on floor plans provided by the applicant, the total residential area at approximately 44% of the total building square footage. This information was used to estimate total building area for a 30 to 44 unit residential development scenario.

1.5 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Final EIS Section 1.5 provides a short summary of impacts of alternatives, based on analysis contained in the Draft EIS and Final EIS. Summary information for Alternatives 1 and 2 is as shown in the Draft EIS. For comparison purposes, impacts associated with the Alternative Design Scenarios and the Lower Density Alternative have also been included in this Final EIS.

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
Land Use			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new significant land use compatibility impacts are anticipated. Existing site features in the vacant portion of the site may be considered incompatible with the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed multifamily use would be consistent with surrounding land use pattern. Small area of commercial use not expected to significantly impact existing land use patterns. Proposed residential density is denser than the surrounding residential area, except for one over-water development. Due to location below existing site elevations, proposed landscape buffers would not be visible from adjoining properties and would not serve intended purpose of mitigating noise and visual impacts to surrounding area. Proposed landscape buffer widths meet requirements for office use, but not for retail use. Proposal meets fundamental use standards for BN zone and Urban Mixed designation in the designated shoreline area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed multifamily use would be consistent with surrounding land use pattern. Small area of commercial use not expected to significantly impact existing land use patterns. Potential residential densities in all scenarios are more dense than surrounding neighborhood, but less dense than Alternative 2. Development in Scenarios 2 and 3 would generally be closer to existing topography, allowing landscape buffers to mitigate noise and visual impacts to adjacent properties. Landscape buffers in Scenario 1 would be similar to the Proposed Action. Proposal meets fundamental use standards for BN zone and Urban Mixed designation in the designated shoreline area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed multifamily use would be consistent with surrounding land use pattern. Small area of commercial use not expected to significantly impact existing land use patterns. Proposed residential density is denser than the surrounding residential area, but less than Alternative 2 and the Alternative Design Scenarios. Potential site grades and landscape buffers are not known, but smaller building footprint provides greater flexibility for landscaping and site grading.
Plans and Policies			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing site development generally does not support Comprehensive Plan vision, goals and policies calling for compact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan vision, and many of the goals and policies. However, potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposal is consistent with Comprehensive Plan vision, and many of the goals and policies. However, potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Proposal is generally consistent with Comprehensive Plan vision, goals and policies. However, consistency with

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
<p>land use pattern, range of residential densities, and continuing to allow new residential growth throughout the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Policy CC-4.6, the existing on-site landform would be maintained. No further investigation into potential site contamination and site would remain in its current state. 	<p>inconsistencies exist with Policies LU-1.3 and LU-5.9, which seek to ensure that development is compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area and with Policies LU-5.9 and ED-3.5, that support retail in mixed use developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential contamination would be required to be cleaned up in accordance with the Washington Department of Ecology Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). 	<p>inconsistencies exist with Policies LU-1.3 and LU-5.9, which seek to ensure that development is compatible in scale and character with the surrounding area and with Policies LU-5.9 and ED-3.5, that support retail in mixed use developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential contamination would be required to be cleaned up in accordance with the Washington Department of Ecology Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA). 	<p>policies that address visual identity, urban design principles and neighborhood character would be dependent on proposed building and site design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential contamination would be required to be cleaned up in accordance with the Washington Department of Ecology Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA).
Aesthetics			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No new significant impacts to neighborhood character, compatibility with adjoining properties and public scenic views are anticipated. The vacant area in the western portion of the site may be considered visually incompatible with the surrounding area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed building size and mass appear to be larger and out of scale, compared with surrounding development. Proposed building footprint is larger and lot coverage higher than much of the development in the surrounding area. Visual prominence of the proposed parking garage entrance is generally out of character with surrounding development. Proposed perimeter retaining walls are out of character with the surrounding area. Proposed landscape buffers would not be visible from adjacent properties. Impact would be greatest for properties to the east of the subject property. Proposed ground floor elevation would be below grade along Lake Street South and is out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because of vertical and horizontal modulation under all scenarios, the alternatives scenarios may be perceived to have reduced bulk, mass and height. Building footprint under Scenario 1 would be similar to Alternative 2. Under Scenarios 2 and 3, proposed building footprint and lot coverage would be reduced, compared to Alternative 2. In order to maintain minimum required distances to existing driveways and 10th Avenue South, all scenarios would be required to locate the driveway in a central location along the site frontage, similar to Alternative 2. Under Scenario 1, perimeter landscaping would be similar to Alternative 2. Under Scenarios 2 and 3, perimeter landscaping would be at grade with adjoining properties and smaller building footprints allow opportunity for larger landscape areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compared to Alternative 2, proposed building size and mass would likely be more similar in scale to surrounding development. Proposed building footprint would likely be more similar in size to surrounding development, compared to Alternative 2. In order to maintain minimum required distances to existing driveways and 10th Avenue South, the lower density alternative would be required to locate the driveway in a central location along the site frontage, similar to Alternative 2. Smaller building area may reduce the need for site excavation, reducing the need for perimeter retaining walls and increasing the overall visibility of on-site landscaping. Smaller building area may increase the ability to match the ground floor elevation to the elevation of the Lake Street

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed building colors may not be consistent with the general color palette in the neighborhood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under Scenarios 2 and 3, ground floor elevation would match the frontage along Lake Street South. Scenario 1 would have a ground floor elevation below the grade of the frontage of Lake Street South, similar to Alternative 2. Under all scenarios, proposed building colors are not known. 	<p>South frontage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compatibility of building materials and color with the surrounding area would be dependent on proposed building and site design.
Transportation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The No Action alternative would not increase vehicle trips generated by the site. However, due to background traffic growth expected regardless of the project site condition, four signalized intersections in the site vicinity are expected to operate at level of service (LOS) E or F during the PM peak hour by year 2014. Because the No Action alternative would not increase transit or non-motorized trips, no transit or non-motorized impacts are associated with this alternative. Because the No Action alternative would not increase parking demand, no parking impacts are associated with this alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed development would increase vehicle traffic, and would add 1 to 3 seconds of average delay per vehicle at signalized city intersections in the analysis study area during peak hours in 2014, including four intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F without the project. Project-related traffic would add between 7 and 12 seconds of average delay per vehicle for westbound turns at the unsignalized Lake Street S/10th Avenue S intersection. This would degrade operations for the westbound approach from LOS D to E during the AM and PM peak hours in 2014. Project traffic would add between 1 and 2 seconds of average delay per vehicle for eastbound turns at the unsignalized State Street S/10th Avenue S intersection. This would degrade operations for the eastbound approach from LOS D to LOS E during the PM peak hour in 2014. The Proportional Share of development-generated trips at the impacted intersections (described above) would be 1.0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compared to Alternative 2, total net new trips would be reduced, which would have small incremental effects on intersection delays, but no effect on levels of service. Potential pedestrian and bicycle conflicts would be incrementally reduced, but generally comparable to Alternative 2. Parking demand would be incrementally reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compared to Alternative 2, total trip generation, intersection delay, and level of service impacts would be reduced. Potential for pedestrian and bicycle conflicts would be reduced. Parking demand would be reduced.

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
	<p>to 4.2% of the intersection capacities, which is below the City's significance thresholds for level of service impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During peak traffic periods with limited gaps for vehicles turning left on to Lake Street S, it is likely that more drivers would choose "right-turn" routes to and from the site, potentially increasing traffic volumes on 10th Avenue S and NE 64th St by about 10 to 30 vehicles during the peak hours. • Increased vehicle trips on the surrounding street network could increase the potential for vehicle conflicts. High average delays at stop-controlled intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F could also result in drivers taking shorter gaps to cross or enter the major street, which could increase the potential for pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle conflicts. However, during more congested periods it is likely that more drivers would choose "right-turn" routes to and from the site that would have lower delays and be more predictable, so high future average delays at these intersections may not be realized. Overall, the project is not expected to result in a significant adverse impact to traffic safety. • Proposed development could generate some transit trips, which would be accommodated by transit routes along State Street. • Proposed development could 		

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
	<p>generate some pedestrian and bicycle trips, which would be accommodated by existing non-motorized facilities in the vicinity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased vehicle trips into and out of the site driveway increases the potential for conflict with pedestrians and bicyclists who cross the driveway. However, the project would be required to meet City design standards to maintain adequate sight distance at the driveway so that approaching pedestrians and bicycles would be seen by drivers. Proposed development would generate parking demand, parking is adequate and exceeds City's parking standards. 		
Construction Impacts			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because there would be no construction, there are no anticipated construction impacts associated with the No Action alternative. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise: Localized sound levels and vibration would likely temporarily increase in the vicinity of the project site. Level of impact would depend on type of equipment being used. Air quality: Potential temporary increase in dust from earthwork and hydrocarbons from gasoline or diesel-powered machinery. Light and glare: Potential impacts associated with job site lighting, trucks and equipment. Glare could reflect off of construction vehicles and equipment. Construction traffic and parking: Construction traffic would be related to construction workers and equipment, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction impacts would be similar to those described for Alternative 2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction impacts would be similar in nature to those described for Alternative 2. However, because the building would be smaller, potential site excavation and construction period may be less than described for Alternative 2.

Alternative 1 No Action	Alternative 2 Proposed Action	Alternative Design Scenarios	Lower Density Alternative
	<p>resulting in increased traffic and demand for parking. Most noticeable construction-related traffic impacts are likely to occur during demolition of existing uses, site excavation, and foundation work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site clean-up: Potential impacts would involve the excavation, handling, loading, and transport of contaminated soils; potential odors from volatile compounds in dry cleaning fluid and gasoline, run-off of contaminated sediment; worker safety; and the safety of pedestrians and neighbors. Construction activities are not expected to exacerbate the nature or extent of contamination in the ground or adversely affect groundwater conditions in the vicinity of the project. 		

1.6 MITIGATION MEASURES

The mitigating measures listed in Final EIS Section 1.6 include revised measures to allow ground floor retail and reduce off-street parking supply based on existing Comprehensive Plan policy guidance and revised measures to mitigate aesthetic impacts, transportation and construction phase impacts based on comments received on the Draft EIS. Deleted information is crossed out (XXX) and inserted information is underlined in red (XXXX).

1.6.1 Land Use

Applicable Regulations and Commitments

The proposed development would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the Kirkland Zoning Code and Shoreline Master Program. Adherence to these regulations will help ensure that the proposal is consistent with the surrounding land use pattern.

As required by Section 95.42 KZC, required landscape buffers shall provide effective screening for adjacent properties. The proposed site plan needs to be revised to meet the intent of the required landscape buffers. Modifications to the proposed site plan to meet this requirement could include shifting the retaining walls along the east, north and south property lines from the outer edge of the buffer to the inner edge and installing the landscape buffer between the retaining walls and property lines, widening the buffers to provide an adequate area along the retaining walls for a raised platform so that planted vegetation provides screening above the fence line at time of planting, or other measures as approved by the City.

In addition, to meet the requirement of 95.42.5 KZC, the proposed site plan needs to be revised to provide for a gradual transition in buffer widths along the east property line.

Other Mitigation Measures

In order to allow for future retail use of the site, landscape buffers would need to be modified to meet the standard for Buffering Standard 1, which requires a 15-foot width.

1.6.2 Plans and Policies

Applicable Regulations and Commitments

All new development on the subject property will be required to comply with the applicable standards of the Kirkland Zoning Code and, for the portion of the site within 200 feet of Lake Washington, the Shoreline Master Program.

Other Mitigation Measures

Revise the proposed site plan to allow ground floor retail uses. Please see Draft EIS Section 3.1 Land Use for a discussion of proposed mitigation to ensure that landscape buffers provide an effective transition between the subject property and adjoining land uses. In particular, Section 3.1 describes buffering standards for retail uses adjoining residential uses and identifies a mitigating measure recommending use of this standard to allow for future retail use. Under current regulations, office use would be allowed, but retail use would not be allowed unless a wider buffer is provided. ~~Consistent with this mitigating measure and in order to~~ To meet the

intent of a residential market to provide a variety of services that support the surrounding neighborhood, the 15-foot wide landscape buffer standard for retail uses adjoining residential uses would need to be provided.

Provide a minimum ground floor story height of 13-feet to accommodate retail and restaurant uses.

Incorporate mitigating measures described in ~~Please see Draft Final~~ EIS Section 3.53 ~~and 1.6.3~~ Aesthetics ~~for a discussion of proposed mitigation~~ to address potential impacts to community character and compatibility in scale and character.

Reduce off-street parking supply to the minimum required for the proposed use, pursuant to KZC Section 105.45 and/or 105.103.

If shared parking is proposed, require a Parking Management Plan be prepared that provides measures to ensure that shared parking supply will meet demand.

To assure follow-through of site clean-up, the applicant should ~~could~~ provide funds for a qualified consultant selected by and under the supervision of the City to oversee the site cleanup process. Oversight of the process would include regular progress reports to the City to document that the MTCA process is being followed and a process for review and resolution of issues should problems be encountered. In the case of a voluntary cleanup, the consultant would coordinate technical consultation with Ecology, documented by a letter stating that no further action is needed.

1.6.3 Aesthetics

Applicable Regulations and Commitments

The proposed development would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the Kirkland Zoning Code.

Other Mitigation

Building massing and size

To address building massing and size impacts, ~~consider~~ require the following measures:

- Set back the top floor along the west building façade an average of 10-feet from the façade on the floor below. ~~Stepped back upper floor as shown in Alternative Development Scenario 1 and 3.~~
- ~~Use of deep balconies or other features which provide horizontal modulation as shown in Scenarios 1-3.~~
- Reduce the perceived mass of the building by dividing it into two distinct building wings that are located on the north and south portions of the site with the wings separated by at least 40 feet where the building extends above the grade of adjacent properties. On the west side of the building where four floors are visible from off site, the separation should occur between all four floors. On the east where approximately two floors are below the adjacent grade, only the top two floors need be separated. The main building wings could be joined by a narrow connection if the connection is sufficiently recessed toward the interior portion of the site. This would be similar to Scenario 3, but with deeper recesses along either or both the west and east façades. A deeper recess along the west façade

would be preferred given its greater prominence and visibility. Alternatively, Development of separate buildings as shown in Alternative Development Scenario 2.

- ~~Reduced building footprint as shown in Alternative Development Scenarios 2 or 3.~~
- ~~Reduced number of building floors as shown in Alternative Development Scenarios 2 or 3.~~
- Along the north and south facades, provide exterior wall modulation for floors two through four that meets the intent of KZC Section 92.30 for vertical definition.
- Incorporate ~~ien~~ of measures to achieve architectural and human scale, as described in the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts and KZC 92.30.4 and 6.

Parking

To mitigate impacts related to the visual prominence of the driveway, consider the following design features:

- Enhanced landscaping around the driveway, such as densely planted landscape islands, foundation planting, trellis, screen or other features.
- Special pavement treatment to help identify the pedestrian area and enhance the visual appearance of the driveway.
- Use of lighting, seating areas, artwork or other features.
- Decorative grill, screening or similar architectural means which diminish the prominence of the parking entrance.

Landscaping

Improve the visibility of perimeter landscaping from adjoining properties through: ~~by providing for a more gradual transition in grade from adjoining sites,~~

- ~~s~~Setting the retaining walls back from the property line (with a reduced building footprint) and installing buffer plantings between the retaining walls and property lines; or
- ~~w~~Widening the buffers for space to install raised platforms along the inside of the retaining wall to install plantings so that the top of the landscaping exceeds the height of the fence at time of planting; or
- Other options that meet the intent of the City's landscape buffer requirements (KZC Chapter 95) as proposed by the Applicant and approved by the City.

Building Street Relationship

To improve the building/street relationship, ~~consider the following measures:~~

- ~~Match the first floor elevation to the elevation of the street frontage along Lake Street South as shown in Alternative Development Scenarios 2 and 3.~~
- ~~Consider~~ provide additional landscaping and/or pedestrian features incorporating elements described in the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts and KZC 92.10.6 and 7.

Building Materials and Color

To address impacts associated with building color and materials, require compliance with KZC 95.35. 2 through 95.35.6. In addition, consider measures identified in the Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts and KZC 92.35.1.

1.6.4 Transportation

Applicable Regulations and Commitments

Road Impact Fee

The City of Kirkland has adopted a Road Impact Fee Program that outlines the contribution that must be paid for new development, based on land use type, toward citywide roadway capacity improvement projects that have been planned to support concurrency. The estimated impact fee for the proposed project is \$378,275.

Frontage Improvements

As part of redevelopment, the project would provide frontage improvements as required by City development code. Frontage improvements would enhance the non-motorized facilities in the site vicinity.

Parking Garage

To ensure that adequate queuing is available between the street and the parking area and that commercial stalls are available at all times, the City Public Works Department shall review and approve the location of any security gate in the parking garage as part of building permit review.

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

Parking Management Strategies

~~The proposed parking supply meets the City's minimum requirements, and is expected to exceed the projected peak parking demand. Even so, it~~ It is possible that some parking demand generated by visitors to the office development or residential units could occur on public on-street spaces near the site. Since the on-site parking supply is expected to accommodate all parking demand generated by the project, the following parking management measures could be implemented to further encourage project-generated parking to occur on-site:

- Bundle parking with apartment leases (or condominium sales) to reduce the likelihood that residents will forego on-site parking and choose instead to park on the adjacent streets,
- Reserve parking spaces for the commercial uses and visitors in visible locations that are signed and easily accessible with no security gate,
- Provide signage that can be seen from the street indicating that visitor parking for commercial uses and residences are available inside the parking garage,
- Provide a kiosk in the common area that provides information on alternative transportation options; and
- Implement a parking management plan in which commercial parking is available to residents and their visitors on weekday evenings and weekends when not in use, and provide signage to clarify the availability of the additional spaces.

1.6.5 Construction Impacts

General Construction Mitigation Measures

Post the site with a readily visible sign and provide written notice to all residents within 300 feet of the site (and a copy to the City) with contact information to resolve concerns for

noise/vibration, air quality, light and glare, ~~transportation~~ truck traffic, construction employee parking, and other parking and access impacts. Provide the City with information about each concern and what measures are taken to resolved issues, if needed.

Noise/Vibration

Noise from construction activities would be subject to the limits in the Kirkland noise standards (KZC 115.95) and construction contractors would be required to comply with provisions of this code. The following contain both general and specific mitigation measures that could be undertaken to minimize noise and vibration-related impacts during construction.

General Noise Mitigation Measures

Because of the proximity of potentially sensitive land uses near the project site, the following project-specific mitigation is proposed.

- Limit construction-related activities to standard construction hours between 7 AM and 8 PM on weekdays and 9 AM - 6 PM on Saturdays.
- Limit the use of noise impact-type equipment, such as pavement breakers, pile drivers, jackhammers, sand blasting tools and other impulse noise sources, to work activity between 8 AM and 5 PM on weekdays.
- Whenever appropriate, substitute hydraulic impact tools with electric models to further reduce demolition and construction-related noise and vibration.
- Limit loud talking, music, or other miscellaneous noise-related activities.
- Provide properly sized and maintained mufflers, engine intake silencers, and where necessary engine enclosures on operating equipment.
- Turn-off idling equipment.

Specific Noise Mitigation Measures

Demolition, Earthwork and Shoring

- As necessary, deploy portable sound barriers around generators, compressors, tieback drill rigs, etc.
- As needed, construct temporary barriers of materials at least as dense as one-half-inch thick plywood with sound-dampening insulation.

Concrete Construction

- Where possible, pre-fabricate core-wall formwork at the contractor's off-site facility to minimize the use of electric saws and hammers on-site.
- Where possible, pre-fabricate reinforcing steel for the concrete core-wall curtains off-site to reduce the amount of noise associated with this work on-site.
- Where possible, locate the concrete pumping station and associated trucks to minimize impacts to residents in nearby buildings and other sensitive land uses proximate to the project site.

- Use hydraulic jacks to lift the core-wall formwork rather than disengaging, hoisting with crane, and re-attachment.

Interior Construction

- Pre-fabricate large duct risers and long interior runs and hoist them into place.
- Screen the building perimeter during steel fireproofing activities.

Air Quality

Site development would be required to adhere to Puget Sound Clean Air Agency’s regulations and the City’s construction best practices regarding demolition activity and dust emissions, including:

- As needed during demolition, excavation, and construction, sprinkle debris and exposed areas to control dust.
- As needed, cover or wet transported earth material.
- Provide quarry spall areas on-site prior to construction vehicles exiting the site.
- Wash truck tires and undercarriages prior to trucks traveling on City streets.
- Promptly sweep earth tracked or spilled onto City streets.
- Monitor truck loads and routes to minimize dust-related impacts.
- Use well-maintained construction equipment and vehicles to reduce emissions from such equipment and construction-related trucks.
- Avoid prolonged periods of vehicle idling.
- Schedule the delivery and removal of construction materials and heavy equipment to minimize congestion during peak travel times associated with adjacent streets.

Light and Glare

- Require construction-related lighting to be shielded and directed away from adjacent land uses.

Transportation, Parking and Access

- As part of building permit review, include a requirement that, should road repairs be required as a result of construction traffic, the applicant will pay for all repairs.

Prior to commencing construction on each block, require the prime contractor to prepare a Construction Management Plan. This plan would document the following:

- Truck haul-routes to and from the site.
- Peak hour restrictions for construction truck traffic and how those restrictions would be communicated and enforced.

- Truck staging areas (e.g., locations where empty or full dump trucks would wait or stage prior to and during loading or unloading.)
- Construction employee parking areas.
- Measures to reduce construction worker trips such as rideshare, shuttles, carpool, transit passes or related programs.
- Road, lane, sidewalk, or bike lane closures that may be needed during utility, street or building construction. A plan detailing temporary traffic control, channelization, and signage measures should be provided for affected facilities.
- Other elements or details may be required in the Construction Management Plan as required by the City of Kirkland. The project developer/owner and the contractor would be required to incorporate other City requirements into an overall plan, if applicable.

In addition, the City has identified more specific construction phase mitigating measures for parking and truck traffic, as listed below.

- A construction parking plan shall be submitted to the Public Works Department Transportation Division for approval prior to issuance of a building permit. The plan shall address the following elements:
 - Name of the designated parking coordinator who will be the City’s contact person and person responsible for implementation of the construction parking plan
 - Number of construction workers on site by shift
 - Approximate number of parking spaces needed
 - Identification of measures to encourage carpooling
 - Map showing the designated area(s) for construction parking as approved in advance by the City. If the parking area(s) will be off-site, identification of a shuttle service or other measures to transport workers to the site.
 - Map showing the location of “No Construction Parking” signs in the neighborhood. The no construction parking area shall include Lake Street South/Lake Washington Boulevard from 5th Avenue South to NE 62nd Street, 10th Avenue South from Lake Street South to State Street South and side streets connecting 10th Avenue South and 7th Avenue South; and NE 64th Street between Lake Washington Boulevard and Lakeview Drive.
- A Construction Truck Circulation Plan shall be submitted to the Public Works Department Transportation Division for approval prior to issuance of a building permit. The plan shall minimize impacts on local streets and existing traffic congestion.
- Construction truck circulation shall be limited to the hours of 9 am and 3 pm, Monday through Saturday. No construction truck circulation on Saturdays is permitted during

community events in the downtown or near Lake Street South. The Public Works Department will provide the construction manager with dates of the Saturday community events in which construction truck circulation will not be permitted.

- An on-site sign shall be installed facing and visible from Lake Street South containing the contact information of the parking coordinator to accept and respond to public concerns. The sign shall stay in place until completion of the project.

Site Clean-up

The project would be required to comply with all applicable Washington Department of Ecology MTCA rules for remediation of contaminated soil and groundwater, and removal of underground storage tanks.

The project could be required to fund a consultant selected and hired by the City to monitor site clean-up and ensure compliance with Ecology's MTCA rules.

Best management practices to include:

- Pre-construction testing to confirm presence, nature, and extent of possible contamination
- Qualified hazardous material transporters
- Certified UST Decommissioning Supervisors
- Contaminated Material Sampling and Handling Plans that provide for containment and decontamination of equipment and personnel
- Use of hazard reduction zones
- Hazard communication and Health and Safety plans
- Workers trained in hazardous materials cleanup work
- Air monitoring at the site boundary

1.7 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The significant unavoidable adverse impacts listed below include revised Plans and Policies impacts as listed in Final EIS Section 3.3. Deleted information is crossed out (XXXX) and inserted information is underlined in red (XXXX).

1.7.1 Land Use

The Proposal would result in a greater density of land use on the project site. This change to the land use pattern to include multifamily use is consistent with the surrounding land use pattern and the Kirkland Zoning Code. With recommended mitigation, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.

1.7.2 Plans and Policies

~~No significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.~~

Even with proposed mitigation, local citizens may not accept the project, resulting in continued inconsistency with this portion of Comprehensive Plan Policy LU-5.9. The size, scale, and character of a building in a commercial zone by its purpose and nature may not be totally consistent with the adjacent residential buildings.

1.7.3 Aesthetics

Development on the project site will change its existing character and the long-term relationship of the site to the surrounding area over the long term. However, with implementation of proposed mitigating measures, the proposal is expected to meet the City's vision for development in the BN zone and no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to aesthetics are anticipated.

1.7.4 Transportation

Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased traffic volumes and delay at intersections near the site. However, the operational effects of the additional vehicles do not exceed the City's adopted thresholds for significance and thus they would not be considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact.

1.7.5 Construction Impacts

While some construction-related impacts would be unavoidable, with the proposed mitigating measures and given the anticipated short-term duration, none of the impacts are likely to be significant.

1.8 SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Significant areas of controversy surrounding the Proposal include:

- Whether the density and scale of the Proposed Action is compatible with the surrounding development character.
- The extent to which the Proposed Action will result in significant transportation impacts.
- Concern over the clean-up process for potential on-site contamination.