

1.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes significant impacts, mitigation measures, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts evaluated in this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the Proposal and Alternatives described below and in Chapter 2. This summary is intentionally brief; the reader should consult individual sections in the DSEIS Chapter 3 for detailed information concerning the affected environment, impacts, and mitigation measures.

1.2 Proposal

The City of Kirkland (City) is considering alternative locations for accommodating additional commercial growth in or near Downtown Kirkland. The City previously studied additional employment growth and adopted ordinances approving the Touchstone (Parkplace) Private Amendment Request in 2008. The City has prepared this DSEIS to review alternatives to growth on the Parkplace site to comply with a Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board order and its interpretation of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules, which requires consideration of off-site alternatives for legislative actions and private rezones in some situations.¹

The City is reevaluating its previous approval of the Touchstone (Parkplace) Comprehensive Plan and Zoning and Municipal Code amendments using the additional information provided in this DSEIS. The City is also considering additional amendments to the Transportation and Capital elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and techniques that can be used to impose mitigation requirements on project applicants. Following consideration of this new information, the City may decide to reaffirm or modify its prior decision. Specifically, the Proposal studied in this DSEIS includes the following actions:

- Amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Kirkland Zoning and Municipal Codes to allow for 954,000 additional square feet of retail and office uses in Downtown.
- Amend the City of Kirkland Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan to include all necessary capital improvements and a multi-year financing plan based on the 10-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan, including those supporting Downtown growth.
- Approve a Planned Action Ordinance to facilitate future environmental review of selected properties in Downtown.

The City will also consider other implementing tools to ensure financing of transportation improvements. Such tools may take the form of a development agreement with one or more property owners consistent with RCW 36.70B.170, or a similar technique.

¹ See WAC 197-11-440 (5)(d), as well as Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board Case, *Davidson Serles v. City of Kirkland* (October 5, 2009), Case No. 09-3-0007c.

Once the City has considered additional alternatives, it may choose to re-adopt the 2008 ordinances, amend the 2008 ordinances, or approve a different alternative.

1.3 Description of Alternatives and Location

The DSEIS alternatives would vary the location of additional growth in or near Downtown. The location of the alternative would, in turn, determine the type of Comprehensive Plan Land Use, Zoning, and other plan and regulatory amendments that may be required.

1.3.1 Alternatives

Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS Alternatives – 2008

In 2008, the City's prior EIS studied placing new growth in Downtown on one particular property, Parkplace, an 11.5 acre site located at 457 Central Way. The site is currently developed with a mix of retail and office uses. The City completed the Downtown Area Planned Action Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Parkplace site in October 2008. The 2008 FEIS Alternatives included the following alternatives:

- **Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone Private Amendment Request (PAR)).** Approve a private amendment request by Touchstone to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code, and Zoning Map, allowing redevelopment of the Parkplace retail and office complex with approximately 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use. To achieve the redevelopment, increased building heights, reduced setbacks, parking requirement reductions, and other related code amendments were considered. The approximate net increase in growth between the No Action (below) and Proposed Action for the Parkplace site was 954,000 square feet.
- **FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved).** Develop the same 954,000 square feet of employment uses on the Parkplace retail and office complex as the Proposed Action but design future development with different height and setbacks in relation to Peter Kirk Park and Central Way, and apply new design guidelines. This alternative was approved by the City in 2008 through Comprehensive Plan, Zoning, and Planned Action ordinances.
- **No Action (2008 Parkplace site).** Continue growth under the applicable Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, in place prior to approval of the FEIS Review Alternative, on the Parkplace site and elsewhere in the City; this alternative would permit a total of 838,700 square feet of retail and office uses on the Parkplace site. This alternative results in a net increase in growth over the current site conditions of 600,250 square feet of office and retail space.

DSEIS Alternatives – 2010

Because the City is considering legislative amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, a broader review of appropriate locations for growth, including an off-site alternative, is being undertaken in this SEIS. Although no other specific proposals are before the City apart from Touchstone (Parkplace) described above, the City is considering alternative sites in or near Downtown where an additional 954,000 square feet of retail and office could locate. This DSEIS

analyzes additional alternatives to the Touchstone proposal not previously studied in the 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS.

The DSEIS on-site and off-site alternatives were identified with the aid of the Commercial Growth Alternatives Site Selection Study (Appendix A) conducted in May 2010. The study identifies the policy and land use concepts guiding commercial growth in the City, location of large properties, environmental constraints, location of transit and other infrastructure, development capacity, and the ability to meet planning objectives for a range of properties citywide and in the Downtown vicinity. As a result of the study, three alternatives were selected for detailed review in the DSEIS including the Superblock Alternative, Unified Ownership Alternative, and the Off-Site Alternative made up of three blocks in or near the Downtown. These alternatives can be compared to the DSEIS No Action Alternative as well as the prior 2008 FEIS Alternatives.

It should be noted that the new alternatives do not constitute specific development proposals. No applications have been submitted, and the new alternatives do not presume to reflect the intentions of individual property owners or the availability of specific properties. Rather, the new alternatives hypothesize how additional office and retail growth could possibly be located in and near Downtown.

The DSEIS alternatives are described as follows. The alternatives are further described in Chapter 2.

- **Superblock Alternative.** This reduced intensity alternative spreads the development throughout the “Superblock” located between Central Way, 6th Street, Kirkland Way, and Peter Kirk Park. This is considered an on-site alternative since development amount, intensity, height, and bulk would also be commensurately reduced on the Parkplace site compared to 2008 FEIS Alternatives. The growth on the Parkplace site alone would still increase above the No Action Alternative, but the increase would be less at approximately 482,000 square feet instead of 954,000. The remainder of the square footage increase, or 472,000 square feet, would be spread to the area on the Superblock south of Parkplace. This alternative would designate the block as a Planned Action.
- **Unified Ownership Alternative.** This alternative locates additional growth on the Parkplace and Post Office sites. For purposes of the SEIS, the Unified Ownership Alternative is considered an on-site alternative, which also includes some off-site development. The level of growth on Parkplace is similar to the Superblock Alternative and less than the 2008 FEIS Alternatives at about 482,000 square feet of office and retail uses above the No Action Alternative. Development amount, intensity, height, and bulk would also be reduced on the Parkplace site compared to 2008 FEIS Alternatives. The Post Office site would redevelop to contain 472,000 square feet of office and retail uses above the No Action Alternative. Each site is in single ownership, which would make it easier to coordinate master planning and amenities on the two sites. This alternative would designate the Parkplace portion of the alternative as a Planned Action.
- **Off-Site Alternative.** This alternative would allow Parkplace to develop consistent with the No Action Alternative and spread the 954,000 square feet increase to other blocks in and near the Central Business District including two blocks north of Parkplace across Central Way and one block west of Peter Kirk Park. This alternative would not designate the site(s) as a Planned Action.
- **No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks).** For purposes of comparison, the No Action Alternative assumes growth consistent with the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code for

the blocks under study to the year 2022. It is the same No Action Alternative considered in 2008, with the information provided by study block to match the action alternatives studied in the 2010 SEIS.

Comparison of Alternatives

Each of the alternatives considered in 2008 and those under consideration in 2010 are listed below with their size, configuration, growth, floor area ratio (FAR), and building heights listed.

Table 1-1. Alternatives Comparison

Alternative	Acres	Configuration	Total Building Square Feet	Net Square Feet Growth	Maximum Floor Area Ratio	Maximum Building Height
Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	11.5	Single site and owner	1,792,700	954,000	3.57 ¹	4-8
FEIS Review (2008 Approved)	11.5	Same	1,792,700	954,000	3.57 ¹	4-8
Superblock	17.54	One block, multiple owners	2,007,120	954,894	2.63	4-6
Unified Ownership	10.69	Three blocks, multiple owners	1,813,429	954,300	2.78	4-5
Off-Site	14.99	Two sites, two indiv. owners	1,135,164	954,483	2.44	3-6
No Action (2008)						
Parkplace site alone	11.5	Single site and owner	838,700	600,250	1.67	5
All Study Blocks	31.67	All blocks and sites above, multiple owners	1,253,336	670,392	0.91	3-5

¹ The 2008 FEIS identified a FAR of 3.25 for the three sites studied at the time—Parkplace, Altom, and Orni. However, the figure of 3.57 is based on total building volume and parcel area for Parkplace alone.

Source: ICF

1.3.2 Location

The **Superblock Alternative** is bounded by Central Way on the north, 6th Street on the east, Kirkland Way on the south, and Peter Kirk Park on the west.

The **Unified Ownership Alternative** consists of two separate properties south of Central Way, the Parkplace site at 457 Central Way and the Post Office site located at 721 4th Avenue.

The **Off-Site Alternative** would spread the additional commercial growth to multiple other sites in and near the CBD zone including the Substation Block, CBD-7 Block, and CBD-1B Core Block. These blocks are located as follows:

- The Substation Block is located northeast of the Superblock. The Substation Block is bounded by 7th Avenue on the north, 8th Street on the east, NE 85th Street on the south, and 6th Street on the west.
- The CBD-7 Block is located generally northwest of the Superblock. The CBD-7 Block is bounded by an alley between Central Way and 4th Avenue on the north, 5th Street on the east, Central Way on the south, and 3rd Street on the west.
- The CBD-1B Core Block is located west of Peter Kirk Park and the Superblock. The CBD-1B Block is bounded by Central Way to the north, 3rd Street to the east, the alley dividing the block between Park Lane and Kirkland Avenue on the south, and Main Street on the west.

1.4 Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Table 1-2 summarizes the environmental impacts for each DSEIS Alternative by environmental topic evaluated in Chapter 3. For a complete discussion refer to DSEIS Chapter 3. In addition, Table 1-1 summarizes “Potential Mitigation Measures” only. Applicable Regulations and Commitments are discussed in DSEIS Chapter 3. For comparison, the environmental impacts of the 2008 FEIS Alternatives are highlighted, but complete discussions are found in the 2008 FEIS.

The DSEIS analyzes three new alternatives allowing decision makers to reconsider the 2008 FEIS Alternatives in light of these other options for placing growth. The DSEIS Alternatives reduce impacts in some cases compared to 2008 FEIS Alternatives, but increase them in other cases.

- **Land Use Patterns:** The 2008 FEIS Alternatives place the full increase in employment growth 954,000 square feet on the Parkplace site. This provides a single intense focal point. The Superblock Alternative is similar to the 2008 FEIS Alternatives but distributes that focus from primarily Central Way to Kirkland Way. The Unified Ownership Alternative and Off-Site Alternative disperse the employment focus to the perimeter of Downtown taking what are Downtown buffer or transitional areas and instead making them a focus for growth, e.g. Post Office site, CBD-7, etc. The alternatives that disperse growth allow for more intense activity next to some residential areas in some cases, e.g., Off-Site Alternative CBD-7 block, Unified Ownership Alternative and the Post Office site.
- **Plans and Policies:** The 2008 FEIS Alternatives requires Comprehensive Plan and Zoning amendments for the Parkplace site, and increases allowable heights while at the same time requires greater protection for Peter Kirk Park and greater pedestrian amenities. With unified ownership it is anticipated that parking management, coordinated open space, green building design, and other features required in the amended plans and codes would be easier to achieve compared to the multiple site with multiple ownerships involved in the 2010 DSEIS Alternatives. The Unified Ownership Alternative is the closest to the 2008 FEIS Alternatives in terms of the ability to achieve a master planned approach to development. The Unified Ownership Alternative and Off-Site Alternative would require more Comprehensive Plan and Zoning amendments to address the change in status from perimeter blocks to Central Business District blocks allowing for office uses to allowing retail uses.

- **Aesthetics:** The 2010 DSEIS Alternatives decrease the amount of growth on the Parkplace site reducing the height and bulk allowed along Central Way and the attendant visual impacts, but transfer the potential impacts to other locations. The Off-Site Alternative would have the most impact on views westward along Central Way, framing both sides of the road with additional height and bulk and narrowing the view of Lake Washington. The Superblock Alternative would add impacts and narrow the view corridor along Kirkland Way. The Unified Ownership Alternative would have the least visual impacts of the 2010 DSEIS Alternatives and may slightly reduce visual impacts along Central Way in comparison to the 2008 FEIS Alternatives.
- **Transportation:** The 2008 FEIS Alternatives and 2010 DSEIS Alternatives would all generate additional traffic that is concentrated in Downtown, but also would increase traffic citywide and beyond. In Downtown, the location of impacts would shift slightly between alternatives, and tend to be more concentrated nearer access points to the different sites. Outside of Downtown, traffic impacts are expected to be similar between the alternatives. The alternatives are expected to have similar parking requirements, as defined by City code. Applicants under any of the alternatives could propose a Parking Management Plan and/or Transportation Demand Management to reduce traffic or parking impacts; which could in turn reduce the amount of additional capacity and parking improvements needed to support the additional development. Concentrated development under single ownership, such as what is reflected in the 2008 FEIS Alternatives, are more conducive to TDM and parking programs. If development is proposed by multiple applicants, it can be challenging to implement a cohesive program, and some strategies can only be implemented on a larger scale. It is also more challenging for the City to monitor the effectiveness of such programs if they are implemented by multiple smaller developments. All alternatives would increase density downtown, and therefore would be more supportive of transit and non-motorized transportation than No Action Alternative. All alternatives except one block under the Off-Site Alternative and the Post Office site under the Unified Ownership Alternative are located within a 0.25 mile distance of the Kirkland Transit Center. The alternatives located on a single site are slightly more supportive of pedestrian and bicycles because they would allow for more integrated non-motorized facilities.

1.5 Major Issues to Be Resolved

Adoption of a planned action ordinance and concurrent City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning/Municipal Code amendments to allow increased structure heights and reduced setbacks in and near Downtown would support development and redevelopment of the area to a more intensive mixed-use character and support employment growth in Downtown consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. The key environmental issues facing decision makers are the alternative distribution of traffic trips, adequate parking in the area, transit service and facilities to meet demand, potential land use conflicts, changes to visual character resulting from increased building heights, impact of increased building heights on public view corridors, and mitigating measures to address all such impacts.

1.6 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

This section summarizes the potential significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the DSEIS alternatives only. The results are similar to those identified for the 2008 FEIS Alternatives.

1.6.1 Land Use Patterns and Plans and Policies

The Superblock Alternative, Unified Ownership Alternative, and Off-Site Alternative would result in a greater intensity of land use and greater employment in the land use analysis area. Changes to land use have the potential to create land use conflicts in some locations, but impacts can be mitigated through the proposed mitigation measures. With mitigation measures, the changes to land use patterns would generally conform to the Comprehensive Plan vision for Downtown and the Norkirk neighborhood.

1.6.2 Aesthetics

The overall character, significance, or magnitude of visual impacts on the analysis area depends largely on the quality of the architectural and urban design features incorporated into the development, the degree to which the overall scale and form of the development incorporates features of the local setting, and the values and preferences of those viewing the change. However, even with mitigation incorporated, the amount of development anticipated occurring under the Superblock, Unified Ownership, and Off-Site alternatives would introduce building heights that would be inconsistent with height limits set forth in the City's Comprehensive Plan, as well as have a high potential to alter the visual character and shading conditions of the analysis area's pedestrian environment.

1.6.3 Transportation

Implementation of the No Action Alternative, Superblock Alternative, Off-Site Alternative, or Unified Ownership Alternative would result in increased traffic volumes and congestion in the City. Although the effects of additional vehicles on traffic congestion can be mitigated to varying degrees through the proposed transportation improvements, the actual increase in traffic volume may be considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact. A significant adverse impact could also result if one or more mitigation measures that have been identified to address expected impacts are not implemented. The combination of recommended roadway improvements that the City selects will reflect a balance between desired improvement in traffic operations, policy decisions, and available revenue.

Table 1-2. Summary of Potential Impacts of All Alternatives

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
Land Use Patterns and Plans and Policies					
<p>Impacts Common to All Alternatives (Land Use Patterns)</p> <p>Under all alternatives, the Parkplace property will redevelop into a more intense mix of office and commercial uses with more parking in structures rather than in the form of surface parking lots. In addition, the approved Parkplace North (Primeau) site on the Substation Block and a nearby parking lot are also anticipated to redevelop under both alternatives, in accordance with approved building permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall redevelopment in the study area surrounding the blocks being analyzed will continue to increase office, retail, and multifamily mix of uses found in Downtown and its perimeter area. The few existing single-family residential uses are expected to decrease in the land use pattern study area as single-family structures located in multifamily and commercial zones redevelop. • All Alternatives are expected to substantively increase office and to a lesser extent increase retail uses found in the Downtown vicinity. • Redevelopment would cause the temporary or permanent displacement of some existing uses. These uses could relocate within downtown Kirkland, to other areas of the City, or some might choose to relocate outside the City. 					
<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Under the No Action Alternative land use patterns would change on the Parkplace portion of the Superblock and on the Parkplace North (Primeau) and nearby parking lot on the Substation Block.</p> <p>The Parkplace site would redevelop to a more land-efficient office and commercial development complex than currently exists. Although surface parking is expected to remain, there would be more structured parking. Buildings are expected to be approximately 5 stories in height in place of the 1 to 6 stories in place currently.</p> <p>The Parkplace North (Primeau) site and adjoining parking lot on the Substation Block would redevelop to a more land-efficient 3-story office building development with associated parking consistent with approved permits.</p> <p>The remaining portions of Downtown are not expected to significantly change through the horizon year of 2022; however present land use and zoning designations do allow for additional mixed use growth.</p>	<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Under the Proposed Action, the Parkplace site would redevelop according to the private amendment requested by the property owner with taller buildings between 4 and 8 stories. Redevelopment would make more efficient use of existing buildable land, including the option of using structured parking over more land-consumptive surface parking.</p> <p>The Parkplace site’s redevelopment to more intensive office and commercial uses will increase the amount of area covered by buildings and plazas or other pedestrian-oriented gathering places and it will reduce the amount of surface parking. The level of redevelopment is greater than the No Action Alternative, with more area in buildings and less in surface parking. It will be a focal point of Downtown employment.</p> <p>The remaining portions of Downtown would redevelop consistent with the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Development under the FEIS Review Alternative would result a land use pattern that is very comparable to that anticipated under the Proposed Action. Specific changes that are now incorporated into the FEIS Review Alternative that could reduce impacts associated with intensification of land use patterns and promote a more pedestrian oriented environment include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced height limits and increased setback requirements along Central Way and within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park. • Increased setback requirements along the south portion of the Parkplace site, adjacent to the office and residential uses. • Include a requirement for a central open space as part of future development. • Require a minimum of 25% of future development area in retail use. 	<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Under this alternative, the entire Superblock would redevelop to a more uniform development pattern of commercial and office uses at between 4 and 6 stories. The level of intensity on the Parkplace portion of the Superblock would be greater than the No Action Alternative and less than the Proposed Action Alternative. Instead some of the growth considered under the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative for Parkplace would be spread to the southern portion of the Superblock.</p> <p>Redevelopment will increase the amount of area covered by buildings and plazas. Redevelopment will reduce the amount of surface parking more so than under the Proposed Action Alternative, as larger areas currently covered by surface parking would be converted to primary uses and structured parking. Open space and pedestrian connections would be made, and would require design guidelines to ensure a coordinated approach across the multiple properties.</p> <p>Similar to the Proposed Action Alternative, the amount and intensity of development on the Superblock will make it a focal point of Downtown employment, more so than under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Compared to the No Action alternative, land use patterns under the Superblock Alternative will intensify in the</p>	<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Growth would be similar to the other action alternatives but would occur on two sites rather than the single Superblock location or the three blocks of the Off-Site Alternative.</p> <p>The spread of the remainder of employment to the Post Office site on the perimeter of Downtown would provide less of a concentration of employment than the single contiguous area found under the Superblock Alternative. Growth would be more focused than the Off-Site Alternative.</p>	<p>Land Use Patterns</p> <p>Under this alternative, more office and retail growth would be allocated north of Central Way and west of Peter Kirk Park, with an increase on Parkplace occurring similar to the No Action Alternative. This would expand the CBD and reduce potential industrial uses planned to the east.</p> <p>Under the Off-Site Alternative, all properties on the CBD-7 and CBD-1B Core blocks and most of the properties on the Substation Block would be redeveloped with taller buildings than found under the No Action Alternative. However, maximum building heights in the land use study area would be lower (between 3 and 6 stories) than anticipated under the Proposed Action Alternative. Similar to the Proposed Action and Superblock Alternatives, redevelopment would make more efficient use of existing buildable land, including the option of using structured parking over more land-consumptive surface parking.</p> <p>Pedestrian connections and open space would be required, but given the dispersed growth and smaller sites, would occur in smaller pockets and in a less coordinated fashion.</p> <p>New employment being created as a result of this Alternative is spread along the Central Way corridor, and does not create a focal point for Downtown development that the Proposed Action Alternative and</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
			<p>Superblock as a whole. Although development would be spread across the Superblock, there is still more intense development found on the Parkplace site under the Superblock Alternative than found under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Outside of the Superblock, the remaining portions of Downtown would redevelop consistent with the No Action Alternative.</p>		<p>Superblock Alternative create.</p>
<p>Land Use Compatibility Redevelopment would occur in areas identified for commercial and office uses. Nearby properties are also designated for such uses. Building heights of redevelopment on the Parkplace site would be similar to existing development on the site, although there would be more buildings constructed to existing maximum height limit of the CBD-5 zone. Similarly, the Parkplace North (Primeau) site would redevelop to a multistory building of 2-3 stories, which would be taller than all but the 2-story Parkade office building on this block. A parking lot would also develop and have increased development scale compared to current conditions. In general the scale of the No Action Alternative would be compatible with surrounding blocks.</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility The redevelopment anticipated under the Proposed Action will change the Parkplace site from a primarily commercial and retail area with some office space, to a large office center with some retail and service uses, thereby switching the type of employment concentration in this area and increasing the employment magnitude.</p> <p>Building heights are expected to increase from a maximum height of 5 stories above average building elevation on the Parkplace site under existing conditions and the No Action alternative to 8 stories above adjacent streets under the Proposed Action. This height would be taller than any nearby building.</p> <p>Residential uses are expected to decrease in the land use pattern study area as single-family structures located in multifamily and commercial zones redevelop. The Proposed Action is expected to increase the office portion and to a lesser extent the commercial portion of the mixture of uses found in the land use pattern study area.</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility The FEIS Review alternative would generally result in similar or fewer land use compatibility impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action. Compared to the Proposed Action, maximum building heights on the Parkplace site would be decreased along Central Way, within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park and along the south edge of the site. This decrease allows for greater compatibility with the Park, nearby residential uses, and surrounding buildings of lower height and smaller scale than the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility The same types of land uses would occur on the Superblock as currently exist today.</p> <p>Redevelopment would have a more uniform intensity across the Superblock than the No Action, Unified Ownership, or Off-Site Alternatives which assume only Parkplace redevelops on the Superblock.</p> <p>Building heights are expected to increase from a maximum height of 5 stories to 4-6 stories. Due to lot size, shape, and building setbacks, building on the Emerald and Bungie properties would need to be 6 stories in height to accommodate the level of new development anticipated. Buildings on the remainder of the Superblock would range from 4 to 5 stories, within the limits of the existing CBD-5 zone, but taller than many of the existing buildings on the Superblock and those surrounding the blocks.</p> <p>Superblock redevelopment would have greater intensity and height compared to surrounding blocks. The increased intensity would occur within a largely commercial area to the north and east of the Superblock. However, there are lower intensity residential areas to the south and southeast, as well as at Peter Kirk Park. Thus there would be a change in scale and a potential for incompatibility from one block face to another. Adherence to setbacks and</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility The potential impacts of redevelopment on the Parkplace site are similar to Superblock Alternative. Building heights on the Parkplace site are expected to be similar to that found in the Superblock Alternative, but would be an increase in comparison to the Off-Site Alternative and No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The Post Office site would redevelop from a government facility to a mixture of office and retail uses. Although office uses surround the Post Office site on two sides, the introduction of commercial uses in this area would be new. Building heights would increase to 5 stories, or approximately 70 feet on the Post Office site, creating a taller building on the site than any of the buildings found east of 6th Street in this part of the City.</p>	<p>Land Use Compatibility The Off-Site Alternative is expected to result in increased building heights compared to existing conditions on each of the Off-site blocks as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substation Block. Increase from 3 to 5 stories. • CBD-7 Block. Increase from 3 to 6 stories. • CBD-1B Core Block. The CBD-1B Core Block would not require an increase in height above the 55 feet allowed to accommodate the anticipated 3 to 4 story buildings. Although upper story office uses are allowed in the CBD-1B zone, this alternative would substitute upper story office in place of the City's stated preference of upper story residential found within the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan. <p>Increases in building height and intensities of uses under the Off-Site Alternative have a higher likelihood of affecting residential uses located north of the CBD-7 Block east of 3rd Street, and north of the Substation Block, particularly on the western end of that block.</p> <p>Changing the mix of uses and intensity of uses on the Substation Block under the Off-Site Alternative could increase pressure to rezone and redevelop industrial/warehouse uses located to the north of the Substation Block to a similar mix of office and/or commercial uses in the future. This could affect the</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
			<p>design standards would help mitigate the differences in intensity to some degree.</p> <p>Greater activity levels could occur during non-commute hours if retail is added to other street frontages such as Kirkland Avenue. This change in activity levels could affect the lower intensity uses south of Kirkland Avenue and Kirkland Way.</p>		<p>viability of industrial and warehouse operations in this part of the City.</p>
<p>Employment and Housing Mix No additional housing is assumed under the No Action alternative.</p> <p>Under the No Action alternative, over 2,500 jobs (employees) would be added to the land use analysis area. This is less than half of the job growth compared to any other alternative. Most of the jobs would be on the Parkplace site and fewer would be located on the Parkplace North site on the Substation Block.</p> <p>This is in comparison to the estimated 4,000 employees that currently work in the Downtown (City of Kirkland 2007).</p>	<p>Employment and Housing Mix The Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in any new housing. Development under the Proposed Action would result in a substantial increase in employees over current conditions. The addition of approximately 1.1 million square feet of new office space and 449,600 square feet of new commercial space over existing conditions on the Parkplace site would result in over 5,300 new employees, creating a new employment focal point in Downtown.</p>	<p>Employment and Housing Mix There is no change to anticipated employment growth under the FEIS Review Alternative compared to the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Employment and Housing Mix Development under the Superblock Alternative would result in a substantial increase in employees on the Superblock compared to current conditions. The addition of jobs similar to the Proposed Action on the Superblock would create an employment focal point in Downtown in a slightly larger area than the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Employment and Housing Mix This alternative would result in a similar number of employees as other action alternatives but would split the focus to two sites – Parkplace and Post Office, and would be a less cohesive growth pattern than the Proposed Action, FEIS Review Alternative, or Superblock Alternative. It would have a greater concentration than the Off-site Alternative.</p>	<p>Employment and Housing Mix Development under the Off-Site Alternative would provide a similar amount of employment as the other action alternatives. These would be located in Downtown and its periphery on three separate sites. However, employment would be spread more widely under the Off-Site Alternative than any other alternative considered, creating less of a focal point than other alternatives.</p>
Potential Mitigation Measures (Land Use Patterns)					
<p>There are no mitigation measures identified for the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>A new zoning designation was proposed as part of the Proposed Action. However, the City's 2008 CBD 5 zone regulating the Parkplace site included some key features that could be retained in the new zoning designation (CBD-5A) in order to mitigate land use impacts on Peter Kirk Park and neighboring properties and rights-of-way. Among these features are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To retain the sense of open space for Peter Kirk Park, revised regulations could include one or more of the following requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retain or enhance setbacks from the park edge; ○ Step back taller portions of buildings away from the park, (as outlined in more detail in 	<p>The FEIS Review Alternative included elements that would eliminate or reduce the need for some of the mitigation measures identified in the 2008 DEIS. Specifically, measures addressing building heights, setbacks, and building step backs became inapplicable because these measures were incorporated into the FEIS Review Alternative. No new or additional mitigation measures would be required.</p>	<p>The new CBD-5A zoning designation if applied to the full Superblock Alternative should maintain features described in the FEIS Review Alternative related to land use patterns and relationship to Peter Kirk Park, but apply them to the entire Superblock. In addition, in order to minimize land use conflicts with existing multifamily residential buildings within the Superblock that may not choose to redevelop, the revised regulations could include enhanced upper story setbacks, setbacks and/or landscape buffering requirements for development abutting any existing multifamily development.</p> <p>To reduce potential changes in activity levels due to retail uses along Kirkland Way, the City could require a smaller</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for the Parkplace portion of the alternative would be similar to the Superblock Alternative. Regarding the Post Office site, the City could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply design standards for buildings over 2 stories in height to mitigate for impacts of taller buildings at 70 feet anticipated on the property. • Limit floor area ratios to reduce the scale and intensity of employment structures in proximity to existing residential development. • Limit potential types of commercial uses that could increase activity levels in proximity to residential uses such as: require a smaller amount of retail use than in other blocks (less 	<p>A new zoning designation proposed for the three Off-Site Alternative Blocks (CBD-5A) should retain aspects of existing zoning on the three Off-site blocks in order to mitigate land use impacts on neighboring properties and rights-of-way, and, where applicable, Peter Kirk Park. The new zoning designation should create districts that include the following features broken down by Off-Site Block:</p> <p><i>Substation Block</i> Because the Substation Block has poor visibility from nearby arterials, and to preserve it as a predominantly office buffer between Downtown and Norkirk, require a smaller amount of retail uses on the Substation Block (less than 25% retail applied elsewhere), or allow stand-alone office on Substation</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>Section 3.3, Aesthetics);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adopt height limits within a defined proximity of the park; ○ Modulate facades with defined widths and depths. ● In order to minimize land use conflicts with the multifamily residential buildings abutting the southeast corner of the area, the revised regulations could include enhanced setbacks and/or landscape buffering requirements in this area. 		<p>amount of retail use than in other block faces (less than 25%), allow a smaller range of retail uses that would not result in activity levels when residential dwellings are occupied, and/or allow only standalone office uses.</p>	<p>than 25%), allow a smaller range of retail uses that would not result in activity levels when residential dwellings are occupied, and/or allow only standalone office uses.</p>	<p>Block. Apply design standards for buildings over two stories in height to mitigate for impacts of taller buildings anticipated on Substation Block and to help soften transition with nearby single-family uses.</p> <p><i>CBD-7 Block</i> In order to retain the sense of open space for Peter Kirk Park and the boulevard effect along Central Way described in Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan, revised regulations could limit FAR, retain or enhance building setbacks from Central Way, and step back taller portions of buildings away from Central Way as described in Design District 7. In order to minimize land use conflicts with existing multifamily residential buildings proximate to CBD-7 Block, the revised CBD-5A regulations could include enhanced setbacks and/or landscape buffering for development abutting any existing residential development. Floor area ratio reductions, building modulation, upper storey setbacks, minimum parcel area requirements (lot consolidations), and/or other similar measures could be applied to reduce the scale and intensity of employment structures in proximity to existing residential development.</p> <p><i>CBD-1B Block</i> In order to maintain pedestrian-oriented streetscape, step back portions of buildings above 2nd story on 3rd Street and on Kirkland Avenue, and step back portions of buildings above the 3rd story along Central Way as described in Design District 1 in Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.</p>
<p>Impacts Common to All Alternatives (Plans and Policies) <i>Regional Policies</i> All alternatives considered are consistent with King County Countywide Planning Policies that provide the framework for planning in the City. Redevelopment under all alternatives would provide more concentrated development of office and commercial uses in the urban areas where public services are available; produce economic growth and development in an urban activity area; and allow development in an area well served by public transportation and nonmotorized transportation networks, allowing for multimodal transportation to the redeveloped employment area. Under all alternatives, the study area is anticipated to experience growth and redevelopment that will add a large number of new jobs in the City, particularly in the study area. Job growth due to redevelopment under all alternatives considered is</p>					

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
<p>expected to help the City exceed its 2001–2022 employment target of 8,800 jobs expressed in the 2008 King County Countywide Planning Policies. However, jurisdictions are only required to show that they can meet the employment targets in the countywide planning policies. The targets are not intended to act as a limitation on development potential.²</p>					
<p><i>Capital Facility and Transportation Elements Amendments</i> The Proposal described in Chapter 2 includes amendments to the City’s Capital Facility and Transportation Elements to provide for a 10-year list of projects and to identify potential financing for those projects. The City’s existing plans already account for a 6-year and 20-year projects necessary to meet roadway concurrency standards and that require use of public funds to construct. The proposed amendments would expand the list of improvements to include developer-financed improvements that have already been reviewed in the 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS, included in the planned action ordinance for Parkplace, and included in a developer agreement for the Totem Lake Mall redevelopment. The Capital Facility and Transportation Elements amendments do not identify new projects beyond those that have previously been analyzed and reviewed through the planning process and associated SEPA review. The amendments included in Appendix B focus on the FEIS Review Alternative. Should the City desire to approve the Superblock, Unified Ownership, Off-Site, or No Action Alternatives, the proposed amendments would need to reflect the transportation findings in Section 3.3 of this DSEIS. The Comprehensive Plan amendments are considered housekeeping in nature, and no impacts are anticipated.</p>					
<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> The No Action Alternative is consistent with the City’s vision of Downtown. The No Action Alternative provides additional economic development on the Parkplace portion of the Superblock and the Parkplace North (Primeau) site and an adjacent parking lot on the Substation Block. However, there is a lesser degree of economic growth expected under the No Action Alternative in comparison to all other alternatives. Based on the analysis contained in Section 3.4, <i>Transportation</i>, the No Action Alternative will add to the concentration of employees in proximity to the Kirkland Transit Center, thus helping facilitate a transportation system which allows the mobility of people and goods.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> The Proposed Action is generally consistent with the City’s vision for Downtown. However, the addition of some of the tallest buildings in Downtown (up to 8 stories) to the Parkplace site will make achieving a human scale environment more challenging. The Proposed Action is consistent with Land Use and Economic Development Goals and Policies for a complete community that allows for greater jobs and customers in Downtown. Based upon the analysis contained in the Transportation section of this DEIS, the Proposed Action would create a concentration of employment that would support transit and other modes of transportation. With mitigation measures identified in the Transportation section, including shared parking and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, the Proposed Action would support a transportation system which allows the mobility of people by providing a variety of transportation options.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> The relationship of the FEIS Review Alternative to applicable policies and regulations of the City of Kirkland is consistent with the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> Similar to the Proposed Action, the Superblock Alternative is generally consistent with the City’s vision for Downtown. The additional of taller buildings to the Superblock site would make achieving a pedestrian-friendly scale more challenging. However, maximum building heights are expected to be greater than the CBD-5 zone at 5 stories, and lower than the proposed CBD-5A zone maximums which allows up to 8 stories. Similar to the Proposed Action Alternative, the Superblock Alternative is also consistent with Land Use and Economic Development goals for a complete community that allow for greater jobs and customers in Downtown. The concentration of employment and shopping provided by the Superblock Alternative is also consistent with the City’s policy direction to add to the economic vitality of Downtown. Additional employment would also be consistent with City goals and policies related to providing employment in proximity to transit service. The Superblock redevelopment allows the City an opportunity to provide an intense employment center in an area with built-in transitions (parks and streets) thus providing fewer impacts</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> Land Use Map amendments would be needed for the Post office site to change from Office (O/MF) to Commercial (C) designations. The Unified Ownership Alternative is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies focusing employment in Downtown especially on the Parkplace site, though the alternative spreads the concentration further east (on the Post Office site) than City plans anticipate. The number of stories on the Post Office site is consistent with City policies but actual height achieved of 70 feet is greater than allowed by the Zoning Code. The addition of taller buildings and commercial uses in this perimeter area of Downtown, adjacent to lower-scale residential uses is inconsistent with City policies. The additional employees on the Post Office Site would be located further from the Transit Center on the perimeter of Downtown.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</i> Land use map amendments would be needed for the Substation block to change from Industrial (IND) to Commercial (C) designations. The Off-Site Alternative is generally consistent with the City’s vision for Downtown in that it would provide more commercial development to the Downtown. The Off-Site Alternative provides slightly more jobs overall, but in an expanded CBD boundary. Taller buildings needed to accommodate the additional development in the CBD-7 Block would make maintaining a pedestrian-friendly scale more challenging in that area. Similar to the Proposed Action and Superblock Alternatives, the Off-Site Alternative is consistent with City’s Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Economic Development goals and policies calling for the City create more of a complete community that provides more opportunities for Kirkland residents to work within the City. The taller building heights and more intensive development spread onto three smaller blocks rather than a single Superblock or portion of a Superblock make transitioning the new office and commercial development in</p>

² At the time that this DSEIS was written, cities within King County were in the process of ratifying updated growth targets to be included in updates to Policies LU-25c and LU-25d (Telephone communication with Harry Reinert, King County DDES, March 30, 2010). The amended growth targets would amend the planning period to 2006–2031. The City would have its growth targets amended to be 7,200 dwelling units (plus 1,370 dwelling units in the Potential Annexation Area), and 20,200 jobs (plus 650 jobs in the Potential Annexation Area) (Growth Management Planning Council Motion 09-2). If ratified by King County cities, the City would have until 2014 to amend its Comprehensive Plan for consistency.

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
			<p>upon nearby residential neighborhoods consistent with City land use policies.</p> <p>The Superblock Alternative is also consistent with City Transportation element policies on promoting pedestrian and bicycle transportation, providing a mix of employment and shopping in proximity to the Downtown Core, Kirkland Transit Center, Peter Kirk Park, and surrounding neighborhoods.</p>		<p>these areas to nearby residential neighborhoods more challenging. Creating transitions on smaller blocks, particularly in cases where the blocks are adjacent to or near residential uses would be difficult and less consistent with transition goal and policy language found in the Land Use element.</p> <p>The Off-Site Alternative is generally consistent with transportation goals and policies promoting nonmotorized access to employment and shopping; however, fewer of the jobs provided under this Alternative are provided in proximity to the Transit Center, making the Off-Site Alternative less consistent than the Proposed Action and Superblock Alternatives with that aspect of transportation goals and policies.</p>
<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> The No Action Alternative would be consistent with the vision and policies in the <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i>.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> In comparison to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan, redevelopment of the Parkplace site under the Proposed Action would be inconsistent with the Design District 5 policy statement that says building heights of 2 to 5 stories are appropriate in this design district. The Proposed Action contemplates building heights as tall as 8 stories in this design district. Therefore, the Proposed Action would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment to that policy in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> The relationship of the FEIS Review Alternative to applicable policies and regulations of the City of Kirkland is consistent with the Proposed Action. It should be noted that the City adopted Comprehensive Plan amendments in 2008 to approve the FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> The Superblock Alternative is consistent with the 2008 Comprehensive Plan’s Vision Statement since it attracts economic development that emphasizes diversity by combining a mixture of office and commercial space.</p> <p>The Superblock Alternative is also consistent with the East Core Frame policy and narrative because it provides large, intensively developed mixed-use projects that emphasize office redevelopment in the area of the East Core Frame between Central Way and Kirkland Way.</p> <p>Similar to the Proposed Action Alternative, redevelopment under the Superblock Alternative is inconsistent with the 2008 Design District 5 policy that states that building heights of 2 to 5 stories are appropriate in this design district since buildings of up to 6 stories are contemplated. Therefore, similar to the Proposed Action, the Superblock Alternative would require a</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> Redevelopment of the Parkplace Site under the Available Sites Alternative is consistent with employment, design, and related policies in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>Redevelopment anticipated on the Post Office site would be inconsistent with Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan Perimeter Area policy guidance because it would allow commercial uses in an area designated for office and multifamily residential.</p> <p>The addition of some of the tallest buildings in the Downtown on the Post Office site on the Perimeter Area of Downtown would make achieving compatibility with multifamily located to the south of the Post Office site difficult to achieve.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i> Similar to the other alternatives studied, the Off-Site Alternative is consistent with the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan’s Vision Statement since it attracts diverse economic development, combining a mixture of office and commercial space in the Downtown.</p> <p>The Off-Site Alternative is consistent with all 2008 Urban Design District 5 policies and narrative regarding building heights and other design features, since development in Design District 5 would occur within its 5 story height limits.</p> <p>The Off-Site Alternative provides additional commercial development that would include ground floor retail and other pedestrian-attracting uses on the CBD-1B Block in the Downtown Core consistent with Moss Bay policies that promote enhanced pedestrian activity and a critical mass of retail uses and services in the Downtown Core. The Off-Site Alternative would</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
			Comprehensive Plan amendment to that policy in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.		<p>also encourage a broad range of commercial uses in the Northeast Core Frame portion of the Downtown (CBD-7 Block) consistent with Northeast Core Frame land use policies.</p> <p>However, the Off-Site Alternative would be inconsistent with the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan because it would not provide for the majority of new development within the East Core Frame, described as the best opportunity for a vital employment base for the Downtown.</p> <p>In addition, the Off-Site Alternative would emphasize office on upper stories rather than residential dwellings envisioned in Design District 1B discussion.</p> <p>The Off-Site Alternative is also inconsistent with Design District 7's maximum height, maximum lot coverage, and front yard setback requirements that would implement the "Green Face" on Central Way described in this part of the Plan.</p>
<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The No Action Alternative is consistent with the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan. No amendments would be required.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The Proposed Action is consistent with the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan. No amendments would be required.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The FEIS Review Alternative is consistent with the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan. No amendments would be required.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The Superblock Alternative is consistent with the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan. No amendments would be required.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The Unified Ownership Alternative is consistent with the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan. No amendments would be required.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Norkirk Neighborhood Plan</i> The Off-Site Alternative is inconsistent with Norkirk Policy N-7.1 because it includes retail uses on the Substation block that are not envisioned for this part of the Norkirk Neighborhood and may draw traffic into this area which is meant as a transition to Downtown.</p> <p>In addition, the Off-Site Alternative would require building heights of 5 stories, which are taller than the 3 stories described in Policy N-7.1 of the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p>However, the additional employment capacity provided on the Substation Block provides an opportunity for additional service and office uses which are anticipated in the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan Vision Statement. Additional employment also provides</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
					an opportunity to create a predominantly office transition between the Norkirk Neighborhood (on the Substation Block) and Downtown envisioned in Policy N-7.1.
<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> No amendments to zoning or development standards would be required for the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> The Proposed Action would require amendments to the 2008 Zoning Code, including rezoning the Parkplace site from CBD-5 zone to a new CBD-5A zone to achieve the taller buildings required on the Parkplace site.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> The FEIS Review Alternative included detailed zoning amendments to the 2008 Zoning Code that modified building setbacks, parking requirements, percentage of retail required as part of an office development, open space connectivity, pedestrian connection, and sustainability measures. Additionally, amendments to design standards contained in the 2008 Kirkland Municipal Code were also included in the FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> The Superblock Alternative would require amendments to the 2008 Zoning Code, including replacing the CBD-5 zone with a new CBD-5A zone (or amending the CBD-5 zone) to achieve the taller buildings on the Superblock. Other zoning amendments would modify building setbacks, parking requirements, percentage of retail required as part of an office development, open space connectivity, pedestrian connection, and sustainability measures as described in the 2008 FEIS Review Alternative, only applied to the entire Superblock.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> The Unified Ownership Alternative would require amendments to the Zoning Code, including applying a new CBD-5A zone to the Parkplace and Post Office sites to help achieve the mixture of office and commercial uses. Other zoning amendments would modify building setbacks, parking requirements, percentage of retail required as part of an office development, open space connectivity, pedestrian connection, and general sustainability measures described in the 2008 FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Plans and Policies <i>Zoning and Development Standards</i> Zoning map amendments would be needed for the Substation Block to apply a modified version of the CBD-5A zone (with varying floor area ratio [FAR] requirements) to the three Off-Site Alternative blocks or to modify current zones that apply to achieve the proposed land uses, building height, and bulk that would accommodate proposed growth.</p> <p>Although the area could be rezoned, the poor visibility from nearby arterials makes retail uses less successful in the Substation Block.</p>
Potential Mitigation Measures (Plans and Policies)					
<p>There are no mitigation measures identified for the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p><i>Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments</i> Amend the 2008 Comprehensive Plan for employment capacity references, and the <i>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</i>.</p> <p>Amendments to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements addressing improvements studied in the FEIS for Parkplace are recommended. See Appendix B.</p> <p><i>Zoning Amendments</i> Under the Proposed Action, the Parkplace site would redevelop under a new zoning designation, called CBD-5A. However, there are regulations in the 2008 CBD 5 zone that could be retained or enhanced as mitigation measures under the new CBD-5A zoning regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit heights of buildings and/or setbacks for upper stories of buildings located adjacent to Peter Kirk Park. Locate pedestrian-oriented activities on façades facing Peter 	<p><i>Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments</i> The FEIS Review Alternative incorporates Proposed Action recommendations plus additional refinements.</p> <p>Amendments to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements addressing improvements studied in the FEIS for Parkplace are recommended. See Appendix B.</p> <p>Additionally, the City intends to adopt amendments to the Comprehensive Plan for employment capacity references, as recommended in 2008 though not yet completed.</p>	<p><i>Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments</i> The Superblock Alternative would include Comprehensive Plan amendments, similar to those identified in the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives. See Table 3.1-4 Policy and Zoning Mitigation in Section 3.1 of this DSEIS.</p> <p><i>Zoning Map Amendments</i> Amend the City's Zoning Map to apply the CBD-5A zone to the entire Superblock.</p> <p><i>Zoning Text Amendments</i> The Superblock Alternative would include zoning text amendments that would replace the 2008 CBD 5 zone with the CBD-5A zone proposal as described as part of the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives except expanded to the entire Superblock. See Table 3.1 4. Policy and Zoning Mitigation in Section 3.1 of this DSEIS.</p> <p><i>Kirkland Municipal Code Amendments</i></p>	<p><i>Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendments</i> The Unified Ownership Alternative would require the following Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map for the Substation Block from Industrial (O/MF) to Commercial (C). <p><i>Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments</i> The Unified Ownership Alternative would require the following amendments to the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Perimeter Areas language for Planned Area 5 to include allowance for commercial uses within this geographic area. Amend Perimeter Areas language for Planned Area 5's North C Subarea to allow commercial as part of the mix of uses allowed within this Subarea, and to indicate that the Post Office parcel is designated Commercial (C). 	<p><i>Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Amendments</i> The Off-Site Alternative would require the following Comprehensive Plan amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map for the Substation Block from Industrial (IND) to Commercial (C). <p><i>Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the text of the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan's Policy N-7.1 to allow a transition area between Downtown and the Norkirk Neighborhood at Substation Block that includes allowing office and commercial mixed uses, as well as buildings as increasing maximum building height from 3 stories to 5 stories, and makes corresponding amendments for consistency with the Norkirk Neighborhood Vision statement. Modify Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan's Northeast Core Frame language to allow taller buildings

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>Kirk Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply setbacks for upper stories of buildings facing Central Way. 		<p>Include amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code similar to those found in the FEIS Review Alternative. These amendments would add a document similar to that described in the FEIS Review Alternative that would regulate design of development on the Superblock.</p>	<p>The Unified Ownership Alternative would include additional Comprehensive Plan amendments, similar to those identified in the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives. See Table 3.1 4. Policy and Zoning Mitigation in Section 3.1 of this DSEIS.</p> <p><i>Zoning Map Amendments</i> Amend the City's Zoning Map to apply the CBD-5A zone to Post Office site as well as the Parkplace site.</p> <p><i>Zoning Text Amendments</i> The Unified Ownership Alternative would include zoning text amendments that would allow 70-foot-tall buildings on the Post Office site. The zoning would also include features described as part of the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives. See Table 3.1 4. Policy and Zoning Mitigation in Section 3.1 of this DSEIS.</p>	<p>(of 5-6 stories rather than 1-3 stories) abutting Central Way, allow for higher overall lot coverage, and to delete description of building setbacks that create a green face to Central Way, to accommodate building square footage and heights assumed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modify Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan's Design District 1 language to delete description of upper story residential, and/or reduce the number of stories where residential is required in order to obtain the additional fifth building story in order to accommodate the anticipated commercial square footage. Modify Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan's Design District 7 language to allow for building heights of 5-6 stories, reduction of or elimination of the 20 foot minimum front yard setback, and lot coverage of close to 100%. Tie any taller building heights allowed in Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan's Design Districts 1 and 7 to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures. The Off-Site Alternative would include additional Comprehensive Plan amendments, similar to those identified in the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives. See Table 3.1 4. Policy and Zoning Mitigation in Section 3.1 of this DSEIS. <p><i>Zoning Map Amendments</i> The Off-Site Alternative would include the following Zoning Map Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of a new CBD-5A or similar Zone to the CBD-1B, CBD-7, and Substation Blocks. The Zoning Map Amendments would create consistency with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
					<p>and the amendment noted above.</p> <p><i>Zoning Text Amendments</i> The Off-Site Alternative would apply a new zoning designation called CBD-5A that has the following basic zoning features and will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow the same or similar land uses as allowed under CBD 5A with a minimum commercial requirement of 25% of overall development applied to the CBD-1B and CBD-7 blocks. • Allow for distinct building height districts including building heights of a maximum of 4 stories in height on the CBD-1B block, 5-6 stories in height on the CBD-7 Block, and 5 stories in height for the Substation block. • Reduce or eliminate required street setbacks. • Increase lot coverage over the maximum amount allowed under the underlying zones. • Prohibit retail establishments from exceeding 70,000 square feet; at grade drive-through facilities; and outdoor storage, sale, service and/or rental of motor vehicles, sailboats, motor boats, and recreational trailers. This prohibition of uses is consistent with assumptions contained within the FEIS Review Alternative. • Require submittal of a study to justify parking less than required in the Zoning Code based on shared use and inclusion of a transportation management plan (TMP) and parking management plan (PMP) as part of the parking reduction study, consistent with provisions of the EIS Review Alternative. • Extend design guidelines to the Substation Block. <p>Under the Off-Site Alternative, the modified version of the CBD-5A zone described in the Proposed Action</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
					<p>Alternative (but with varying FARs) would be applied to the three Off-Site Alternative blocks. However, there are existing regulations applying to each of these blocks that could be retained or enhanced as mitigation measures under the new CBD-5A zoning regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain an enhanced level of landscaping for development adjacent to Planned Area 7B, as currently exists in the CBD-7 zone; • Allow zero feet front yard setback for ground floor retail and similar pedestrian-oriented uses, as currently exists in the CBD-7 zone. • Retain requirement for ground floor retail in the CBD-1B Block and CBD-7 Block. • Require upper story setbacks similar to those found in the CBD-1B zone, or other equivalent measures to retain a pedestrian character for the CBD-1B Block. • Allow reduced on-site parking and/or off-site parking requirements for the CBD-1B Block as described in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan for the CBD-1B Block.

Aesthetics

Impacts Common to All Alternatives
 All alternatives, including No Action, would result in increased building heights and lot coverage on the Parkplace property, which would make development more visually prominent. The increased visual mass could create a more intensive character along street frontages and property boundaries that may affect pedestrian comfort levels.

Views

Recreational Users
 Recreational users going to the park for a picnic or to relax on a park bench may be more visually sensitive to their surroundings than recreational users participating in sports and spectators.

Nearby Residents and Business Occupants
 Due to the highly developed nature of the analysis area, the view for nearby residents and business occupants is typically filtered by buildings and vegetation in the foreground. Additionally, Policy CC-4.5 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan indicates that private views are not protected.

Motorists along Local Roadways
 One of the largest viewer groups in the analysis area comprises motorists traveling along local roadways. Motorists who travel the roadway generally possess low visual sensitivity to their surroundings and their attention is typically not focused on the passing views. However, motorists are one of the viewer groups that is most affected by the changes to View Corridor 1 looking southwest toward Downtown and Lake Washington from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street. The larger visual mass of buildings under all alternatives would block views to portions of the sky visible to the southwest from this intersection.

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
<p><u>Temporary Visual Changes Resulting from Construction</u> Construction under all alternatives would create temporary changes in views of the analysis area. Construction activities would introduce heavy equipment into the surrounding public roadways, and residential and commercial properties. Safety and directional signage would also be visible. Viewer groups in the analysis area and vicinity may not be accustomed to seeing construction activities and equipment; their sensitivity to such impacts is expected to be moderate. However, since these activities are short term, temporary impacts on viewers are not expected to be significant.</p> <p><i>Light and Glare</i> Development under all alternatives has the potential to increase ambient light and glare throughout the analysis area, primarily through the increased presence of exterior building illumination and increased vehicular traffic. Impacts under each alternative differ in degree and are discussed in more detail below.</p> <p><i>Shading Conditions</i> All alternatives are likely to generate increased shading conditions on surrounding properties and streets due to increased building heights. During certain winter periods, the portion of Central Way adjacent to Parkplace could be in perpetual shadow under any of the alternatives.</p>					
<p>Visual Character No changes to height limits or setbacks would occur. Only lot coverage is expected to increase as a result of development under the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Visual Character The reduction in setbacks further increases the visual prominence of buildings under the Proposed Action and links them to the street and its associated pedestrian traffic. The increased building height, in excess of that allowed under the No Action alternative, would further intensify the visual prominence of buildings in the area and may affect the comfort of pedestrians, dependent upon application of design guidelines.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Action, height restrictions on buildings within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park would also be raised above the current limit of 3 stories. The park is a major visual landmark for this part of the City, and the increased visual bulk could adversely affect the park and reduce the impression of openness that currently exists.</p>	<p>Visual Character The FEIS Review Alternative includes both a building setback and upper-story setbacks along the Parkplace site's boundary with Peter Kirk Park, resulting in less height and bulk adjacent to this important community landmark. Upper-story setbacks along Central Way would also act to reduce the visual bulk of the property when viewed from the street and from properties across Central Way to the north. As such, impacts on visual character are expected to be less than under the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Visual Character The Superblock Alternative would add 954,000 square feet of office and commercial development to the Superblock, which would increase building heights and lot coverages over both existing conditions and the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The Superblock Alternative would result in building heights ranging from 4 to 6 stories. Development on the Parkplace site would be at a scale more consistent with the No Action Alternative at 4-5 stories, reducing bulk next to the park compared to the Proposed Action.</p> <p>The tallest buildings would be located at the Bungie and Emerald properties along Kirkland Way, and these properties would also experience the greatest increase in height over current conditions.</p> <p>While the Superblock Alternative would only represent a moderate increase in visual intensity for those properties at the corner of 6th Street and Kirkland Way, the Bungie, and Emerald properties would see a dramatic increase in building heights and coverages. Buildings on the Superblock would be located closer to the sidewalk than current development. The presence of these buildings so close to the street could influence the pedestrian experience on Kirkland Way and 6th Street.</p>	<p>Visual Character Both the Parkplace and Post Office sites would experience large increases in building heights and lot coverage compared to existing conditions with the addition of 954,000 square feet. Implementation of design guidelines would be necessary to reduce impacts to adjacent development and the pedestrian realm.</p> <p>As under the Superblock Alternative, development on the Parkplace site located so close to the street could negatively influence the pedestrian experience along 6th Street if design guidelines are not implemented.</p> <p>Though the building height of 5 stories on the Post Office site are consistent with City policies, the actual height required to achieve the development is 70 feet, greater than the maximum 60 feet in the applicable zone. A code amendment would be required as described in the Plans and Policies discussion above.</p>	<p>Visual Character The Off-Site Alternative would add the same amount of commercial square footage to the analysis area as the Proposed Action, FEIS Review Alternative, Superblock and Unified Ownership alternatives but distribute it between the CBD-1B Block, CBD-7 Block, and Substation Block. The addition of development to these sites would result in increased building heights and lot coverages over both existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. Under the Off-Site Alternative, the Parkplace site is assumed to develop under No Action Alternative conditions.</p> <p>Projected heights under the Off-Site Alternative represent at least a 2-story increase over existing conditions on every lot and would result in development inconsistent with design district height regulations on the CBD-7 Block, which is currently limited to 4 stories. The Substation block is located outside of the CBD, and is not located within a design district. The Substation Block is identified in the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan as being intended for office development up to 3 stories; future development on the Parkade site and at the location of the Tire Factory and Brown Bear Carwash has a high potential to be inconsistent with this standard.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
			Development on the southern portion of the Superblock would be inconsistent with the 5-story height limit of Design District 5 if buildings on the Bungie and Emerald properties develop to the projected 6 stories assumed under this Alternative.		
<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> New development under the No Action Alternative would be more expansive than existing conditions and would create a visual impact.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> Three territorial views identified in the Comprehensive Plan look directly to the analysis area: the gateway view to the southwest from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street (View Corridor 1), the gateway view to the southwest from the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way (View Corridor 2), and a view to the southwest along Kirkland Way (View Corridor 3).</p> <p><u>View Corridor 1 (westward view along NE 85th Street and Central Way)</u> Development under the No Action Alternative would be more expansive than existing development, and would create a more noticeable visual element on the south side of the view corridor. Existing buildings and vegetation screen views of the waterfront and Lake Washington along the south side of the view throughout the year, so the portion of the view with the highest visual quality would not be affected by new development. However, new development associated with the No Action Alternative would still encroach on the view corridor through increased building height and bulk and impact views from this vantage point.</p>	<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> New development under the Proposed Action will occur closer to the sidewalk and roadway than currently exists, thus encroaching on the visual environment of pedestrians and bicyclists, and creating visual impact.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> <u>View Corridor 1</u> The Proposed Action would allow for development to encroach further into the periphery of View Corridor 1, acting as a dominant visual element on the south side of the view corridor. Existing buildings and vegetation (even during winter months) screen views of the waterfront and Lake Washington along the south side of the view. The portion of the view with the highest visual quality, the view of Lake Washington, would not be affected due to new development. However, the encroachment of activities associated with the Proposed Action would still impact views by blocking view of the sky from this vantage point.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 2</u> Development associated with the Proposed Action would be a visible middle ground element from View Corridor 2. However, due to the elevation of the roadway at this vantage point, the top of the new development at 8 stories would be below the lake and mountains in the visual line of sight.</p> <p>Thus, the new development would tend to blend into the portion of the middle ground that acts as the footing to frame</p>	<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> New development would still encroach upon the visual environment; however, increased setbacks of upper floors along Central Way and Peter Kirk Park applied under the FEIS Review Alternative would lessen the dominance of this encroachment. Provision of a large central open space would also tend to reduce the overall mass and bulk of new development, lessening the visual encroachment of new development.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> <u>View Corridor 1</u> Under the FEIS Review Alternative the effect of an imposing visual element along the south side of the view corridor would be reduced by the increased setbacks of upper floors along Central Way.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 2</u> FEIS Review Alternative impacts on View Corridor 2 are expected to be similar to those under the Proposed Action.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3</u> No impacts are anticipated as development is not projected along Kirkland Way.</p>	<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> Impacts are similar to the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives except that there will be less intensity on Central Way and more intensity on Kirkland Way that could encroach on the visual environment of pedestrians and bicyclists, and creating visual impact.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> <u>View Corridor 1</u> The Superblock Alternative would allow for development on the Parkplace site to encroach further into the periphery of View Corridor 1, creating an imposing visual element on the south side of the view corridor, though to a lesser extent than the Proposed Action and the FEIS Review Alternative. Existing buildings and vegetation screen views of the waterfront and Lake Washington along the south side of this view, and the portion of the view with the highest visual quality would not be directly affected. However, new development under the Superblock Alternative could still potentially block views of portions of Lake Washington, the horizon, and the sky.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 2</u> Development associated with the Superblock Alternative would be a visible middle ground element from View Corridor 2, but would be below the line of sight to the lake and mountains and would not obstruct views to these elements. Also, the presence of existing vegetation between the vantage point and the</p>	<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> Development on the Parkplace site will be similar to the Superblock with the same consequences to the visual environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p>Development on the Post Office site, in particular, would greatly increase lot coverage over existing conditions, but building design would be more oriented toward the pedestrian than the car, as is currently the case. Though not presently required, if design standards are applied to the Post Office site, pedestrians and bicyclists would not be significantly affected under the Unified Ownership Alternative.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> <u>View Corridor 1</u> Under the Unified Ownership Alternative, development on the Parkplace site would develop to the same level as projected under the Superblock Alternative. This level of development would result in a visual encroachment on the south side of View Corridor 1, and associated impacts are anticipated to be the same as under the Superblock Alternative.</p> <p>The Post Office site is located east of the vantage point for View Corridor 1 and would not be visible to potential viewers. As such, no impacts associated with the Post Office property are anticipated to View Corridor 1.</p>	<p>Views <i>Pedestrians and Bicyclists</i> Under the Off-Site Alternative, new development would occur closer to the sidewalk and roadway than currently exists along Central Way, 3rd Street, and 6th Avenue/Central Avenue, thus encroaching on the visual environment of pedestrians and bicyclists and creating a visual impact. However, with the exception of the Substation Block, the analysis area is highly urbanized and local roadways and sidewalks are already flanked by large commercial, office, and residential buildings and vehicular traffic is a regular visual component of the analysis area.</p> <p>In the Substation Block, current development is much less urban in character; therefore, new development under the Off-Site Alternative would create a greater visual impact on pedestrian and bicyclists than in other parts of the analysis area. In addition, development on the Substation Block is not currently subject to design review. To minimize effects on pedestrians and bicyclists, it would be necessary to conduct design review and apply design guidelines to future development.</p> <p><i>Territorial Views</i> <u>View Corridor 1</u> Development under the Off-Site Alternative would result in increased encroachment on the visual landscape by taller buildings on both the north and south sides of Central Way. The Off-Site Alternative would introduce 4- to 6-story buildings on both sides of the view corridor, which would</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
<p><u>View Corridor 2 (intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way)</u> No Action Alternative development would be a visible middle ground element from View Corridor 2. However, due to the elevation of the roadway at this vantage point, the top of the new development would be below the lake and mountains in the visual line of sight.</p> <p>The new development under the No Action Alternative would tend to blend into the portion of the middle ground that acts as the footing to frame the high visual quality associated with the background view. During the winter, existing vegetation would tend to filter much of the new development, so that it would be only partially visible in the middle ground. Summer views of the new development would almost entirely be screened by existing deciduous vegetation.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3 (southwest on Kirkland Way)</u> No impacts are anticipated as development is not projected along Kirkland Way.</p>	<p>the high visual quality associated with the background view. During the winter, existing vegetation would tend to filter much of the new development, so that it would be only partially visible in the middle ground. Summer views of the new development would almost entirely be screened by existing deciduous vegetation.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3</u> No impacts are anticipated as development is not projected along Kirkland Way.</p>		<p>Superblock is likely to screen most new development from view. Therefore, no significant impacts on View Corridor 2 are anticipated under the Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3</u> Development under the Superblock Alternative would directly affect View Corridor 3, creating a large visual encroachment on the north side of Kirkland Way. Although the view corridor possesses low visual unity and only moderate visual quality, the introduction of 5 to 6-story office buildings directly adjacent to the street would be in stark contrast to the large amount of vegetation observed currently on the south side of Kirkland Way, narrowing the view corridor and reducing the sense of openness. However, as views from this location are already heavily obstructed, development under the Superblock Alternative is not anticipated to adversely affect View Corridor 3, provided that design review is applied to future projects along Kirkland Way to enhance pedestrian orientation in the building location, bulk, and interface with the streetscape.</p>	<p><u>View Corridor 2</u> The impacts of development on the Parkplace site would be similar to the Superblock Alternative. The 5-story development on the Post Office property would be closer to the viewer and at a slightly higher elevation than the Parkplace site, making it more visually prominent, though much of the site would be screened from view by the roadway embankment. Development on the Post Office property would partially block views to Lake Washington, though this view is already partially obstructed by existing vegetation along the south side of the road. The presence of this vegetation is likely to screen most new development from view, particularly during summer months. Therefore, no significant impacts on View Corridor 2 are anticipated under the Unified Ownership Alternative.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3</u> Development under the Unified Ownership Alternative would not be visible from View Corridor 3. As such, no impacts are anticipated.</p>	<p>partially obstruct views of Lake Washington, the horizon, and the sky. Development on the CBD-1B Core Block would also encroach on the view corridor, though most building in this location would be screened from view by development on the Parkplace site. Development in the Substation Block would have no effect on this view, as it is located behind the vantage point.</p> <p>While the portion of the view with the highest visual quality would not be directly affected, development along Central Way would encroach on the edges of the view corridor, narrowing it and reducing the feeling of openness and expansiveness.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 2</u> Development associated with the Off-Site Alternative would be a partially visible middle ground element from View Corridor 2. Most off-site development would be screened from view by vegetation, topography, or other development, though buildings in the CBD-7 Block would be visible from the vantage point. However, the projected building heights of 4 to 6 stories would be below the line of sight to the lake and mountains, and much of the development on the Park Place site would be screened from view by existing vegetation, particularly during summer months. Therefore, no significant impacts on View Corridor 2 are anticipated.</p> <p><u>View Corridor 3</u> No impacts are anticipated as development is not projected along Kirkland Way.</p>
<p>Light and Glare The increased square footage of office and retail space is anticipated to increase ambient light and glare along Central Way, 6th Street, and at Peter Kirk Park.</p>	<p>Light and Glare Increased development on the Parkplace site has the potential to increase ambient light and glare, primarily through the increased presence of exterior building illumination and increased vehicular</p>	<p>Light and Glare Impacts on light and glare under the FEIS Review Alternative are expected to be similar to those under the Proposed Action, with the exception of reduced impacts on Peter Kirk Park as a result of the Park setback included in</p>	<p>Light and Glare Increased development under the Superblock Alternative has the potential to increase ambient light and glare, primarily through the increase presence of exterior building illumination and increased vehicular</p>	<p>Light and Glare Impacts regarding the Parkplace portion of the Unified Ownership Alternative are similar to the Superblock Alternative The vicinity of the Post Office property,</p>	<p>Light and Glare Increased development under the Off-Site Alternative has the potential to increase ambient light and glare in the affected areas, especially along Central Way. The portion of Central Way between 4th Street and 5th Street</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>traffic on the area. While Central Way is already a significant source of ambient light and glare, 6th Street and the eastern portion of Peter Kirk Park are not, and could be affected by increased lighting levels.</p>	<p>the FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>traffic on and around the site. While development along Central Way is already a significant source of light and glare, 6th Street and Kirkland Way are not. These areas, as well as the eastern edge of Peter Kirk Park, could be affected by increased lighting levels. However, development on the southern portion of the Superblock is anticipated to consist mostly of office space, which will reduce impacts in this area associated with traffic to and from the site, as these buildings will primarily be occupied during daylight hours. Ground-level retail development has the potential to generate additional light and glare in both daytime and evening hours.</p>	<p>in particular, could be affected by increased lighting levels, as the site borders a multifamily residential development to the south. While development on the Post Office property would consist mostly of office space, which would primarily be occupied during daylight hours, a retail component is anticipated and has the potential to generate additional light and glare in both daytime and evening hours. The application of design guidelines and mitigation measures would be necessary to minimize impacts from increased exterior illumination.</p>	<p>would be exposed to additional light and glare generated by development in the CBD-7 Block, as well as the Parkplace site. The CBD-1B Block could also generate additional light and glare, which could have adverse effects on Peter Kirk Park located immediately to the east.</p> <p>The Substation Block would also have the potential to generate increased ambient light and glare resulting from increased exterior illumination and increased vehicular traffic. However, development on this block is anticipated to consist mostly of office uses, which would be occupied primarily during daylight hours. While the Substation Block would generate lower levels of light and glare than the blocks located in Downtown, retail uses on this block are likely to be open in the evenings, requiring a greater amount of exterior illumination than office uses.</p>
<p>Shading Conditions The No Action Alternative represents an increase in shading effects on surrounding development over existing conditions, but to a lesser degree than the Proposed Action or other alternatives being considered.</p>	<p>Shading Conditions The Proposed Action would result in an increase in shading conditions over the No Action alternative during winter months, as well as summer morning and afternoon hours. Development in the Parkplace area has the potential to cause significant winter shading impacts on properties to the north side of Central Way, such as an apartment complex on the northwest corner of the 6th Street and Central Way intersection, as well as lesser impacts on properties southeast and east of the area. The Proposed Action would also increase shading of the far eastern portion of Peter Kirk Park during morning hours over the No Action alternative.</p>	<p>Shading Conditions Impacts on shading conditions under the FEIS Review Alternative are anticipated to be less than those under the Proposed Action. Noticeably less shading of Central Way and Peter Kirk Park would occur on summer mornings, and parcels north of Central Way would receive slightly less shading in winter (morning and afternoon). Summer morning shading of Central Way and Peter Kirk Park would also be reduced.</p>	<p>Shading Conditions The Superblock Alternative would result in taller buildings than currently exist on the site; therefore, shading conditions are anticipated to increase, since taller buildings cast longer shadows and have a higher potential to shade adjacent buildings or neighboring properties though less than the Proposed Action or FEIS Review Alternatives.</p> <p>Shading impacts resulting from the Superblock Alternative are anticipated to be most pronounced in the interior of the site, between buildings. Simulated shading conditions indicate that the space between the new 5 and 6-story buildings south of the Parkplace site is the area likely to see the greatest increase in shadows, particularly during winter morning and evening hours. Development on the Parkplace site is also anticipated to shade 6th Street and Central Way.</p>	<p>Shading Conditions Shading conditions on the Parkplace site are similar to the Superblock Alternative.</p> <p>Shading impacts associated with development on the Post Office property would occur along 4th Avenue (morning) and 5th Avenue (afternoon). Increased building heights on the Post Office property also have the potential to shade the parking area of the office building across 4th Avenue, as well the office properties to the east.</p>	<p>Shading Conditions Shading conditions under the Off-Site Alternative are greatly increased over current conditions, since most buildings in the CBD-1B Block and CBD-7 Block are 1 story, and projected heights in the Substation Block are 2 to 3 stories higher than existing development. Simulated shading conditions indicate that few impacts are likely to be experienced during summer months. However, lower winter sun angles could result in the shading of adjacent properties in the CBD-7 Block, and the CBD-1B Block and Substation Block have a high potential to shade adjacent streets during winter morning and afternoon hours. Compared to the Superblock Alternative, shading impacts of the Off-Site Alternative are more outwardly directed, affecting adjacent properties and public areas such as streets and sidewalks, while the Superblock Alternative would affect mostly internal spaces.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
Potential Mitigation Measures					
<p>No mitigation measures are applied to the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>In addition to the City’s design guidelines, the following mitigation measures could be incorporated to reduce aesthetic impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require setbacks, step backs of upper stories of taller buildings, and/or limits to maximum building heights in areas of the site determined to be more aesthetically significant. Locate the tallest structures, to the greatest extent feasible, in the central or southeastern portions of the area, in order to reduce shading of and visual encroachment on Peter Kirk Park, Central Way, development on the north side of Central Way, and View Corridor 1. Incorporate a pedestrian plaza, public art installation, or distinctive landscaping feature to identify the intersection of 6th Street and Central Way as a significant gateway into Downtown and to provide view corridors and an aesthetically pleasing visual environment. Use vegetation to soften and screen built features. Shield light fixtures to minimize glare and up-lighting. Lights could be screened and directed away from residences to the highest degree possible. Lighting restrictions could be adopted to control façade illumination and excessive lighting. The number of nighttime lights installed could be minimized to the greatest degree possible. Light fixtures and poles could be painted; no reflective surfaces are proposed that will contribute to reflective daytime glare. Use low-sheen and non-reflective surface materials to the greatest extent possible to reduce potential for glare; the finish could be matte and roughened. 	<p>Many of the Proposed Action mitigation measures are incorporated into the FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>In addition to the City’s design guidelines, the following mitigation measures should be incorporated to reduce aesthetic impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require setbacks, step backs of upper stories of taller buildings, and/or limits to maximum building heights in specific areas of each lot determined to be more aesthetically significant. To the greatest extent feasible, locate the tallest structures in the central portions of the Superblock, so as to reduce shading of and visual encroachment on Peter Kirk Park, Central Way, development on the north side of Central Way, and View Corridors 1 and 3. Encourage coordinated design between properties on the Superblock to preserve solar access to the interior areas of the site and take advantage of opportunities for pedestrian connections between developments. Use vegetation to soften and screen-built features. Shield light fixtures to minimize glare and up-lighting. Lights should be screened and directed away from residences to the highest degree possible. Lighting restrictions should be adopted to control façade illumination and excessive lighting. The number of nighttime lights installed should be minimized to the greatest degree possible. Light fixtures and poles should be painted; reflective surfaces should be avoided to minimize reflective daytime glare. Low-sheen and non-reflective surface materials will be used to the greatest extent possible to reduce glare; the finish should be matte and roughened. <p>During construction the following measures should be taken to minimize temporary visual impacts:</p>	<p>Same as the Superblock Alternative.</p>	<p>In addition to the City’s design guidelines, the following mitigation measures should be incorporated to reduce aesthetic impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require setbacks, step backs of upper stories of taller buildings, and/or limits to maximum building heights in specific areas of each lot determined to be more aesthetically significant. Use vegetation to soften and screen-built features. Shield light fixtures to minimize glare and up-lighting. Lights should be screened and directed away from residences to the highest degree possible. Lighting restrictions should be adopted to control façade illumination and excessive lighting. The number of nighttime lights installed should be minimized to the greatest degree possible. Light fixtures and poles should be painted; reflective surfaces should be avoided to minimize reflective daytime glare. Low-sheen and non-reflective surface materials should be used to the greatest extent possible to reduce glare; the finish should be matte and roughened. The City’s <i>Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts</i>, adopted by the Kirkland City Council in 2004, could be applied to the Substation Block, particularly the portions closer to 6th Street that are more visible. <p>Measures regarding construction and Comprehensive Plan and code consistency are the same as for the Superblock.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p><i>Construction</i> During construction the following measures could be taken to minimize temporary visual impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screen storage and staging areas and locate them in areas that minimize visual prominence to the greatest extent possible in order to reduce the temporary visual effects during construction. • Address light and glare effects associated with possible nighttime construction activities by using downcast lighting sources and shielding roadway lighting. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screen storage and staging areas and locate in areas that minimize visual prominence to the greatest extent possible to reduce the temporary visual effects during construction. • Use downcast lighting sources and shield roadway lighting to minimize light and glare effects associated with possible nighttime construction activities. <p>See also Section 3.1.3 regarding mitigation measures necessary to ensure consistency of the alternative with the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code.</p>		
Transportation					
Impacts Common to All Alternatives					
See description of impacts identified under No Action Alternative for transportation impacts common to all alternatives.					
<u>Construction Traffic</u>					
During development of the alternatives, construction activities will disrupt vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Construction traffic will be particularly disruptive during earth excavation and concrete pours as these activities will generate the largest construction traffic volumes. This increase in traffic is mitigated by the demolition of existing buildings and the loss of existing vehicular trips to each area prior to commencement of construction. Street closures are unlikely; however, closure of traffic and/or parking lanes may be required.					
All building permits issued by the City are reviewed and conditioned to mitigate construction traffic impacts by the Public Works director. When a permit is issued, the applicant is required to develop and submit a traffic control plan and a contractor parking plan. The Public Works traffic engineer reviews each building permit and requires special construction traffic conditions depending on the scope and nature of the permit and the timing of the project in relation to other project permits. These permits may include the following measures:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide on-site or nearby parking for construction workers. • Restrict major removal and delivery of material to and from the site to the Central Avenue corridor east of 6th Street. • Provide flaggers to direct traffic when appropriate. • Provide on-site loading areas for removal and delivery of materials. • Prohibit truck movements to the site during the PM traffic peak hours. • Provide temporary sidewalks when existing sidewalks are blocked. • Adjust traffic signal phasing and timing to reduce traffic congestion. 					
<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> Based upon the City's Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines, an adverse LOS impact is identified at the following three intersections by 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Way/Parkplace Driveway • NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE • Central Way/4th Street 	<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> Based upon the City's Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines, an adverse operational impact is identified at the following 10 intersections by 2014:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Way/Parkplace Driveway • Central Way/6th Street • NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE • 6th Street/4th Avenue • Kirkland Way/6th Street • Central Way/5th Street 	<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> <i>FEIS Review Alternative</i> The FEIS Review Alternative would generally result in similar or lesser transportation impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> Adverse LOS impacts are identified at the following 13 intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Way/Parkplace Driveway • Kirkland Way / Parkplace Driveway • Central Way/6th Street • NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE • Kirkland Avenue/3rd Street • Kirkland Way/6th Street • Kirkland Avenue / 6th Street 	<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> Adverse LOS impacts are identified at the following 14 intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Way/Parkplace Driveway • Kirkland Way/Parkplace Driveway • Central Way/6th Street • NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE • 6th Street/4th Avenue • Kirkland Avenue/3rd Street • Kirkland Way/6th Street • Kirkland Avenue / 6th Street 	<p>Roadway Operations <u>Traffic Impact Analysis</u> Adverse LOS impacts are identified at the following 11 intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Way/Parkplace Driveway • Central Way/6th Street • NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE • Kirkland Avenue / 3rd Street • Kirkland Way/6th Street • Kirkland Avenue/6th Street • Central Way/5th Street • Central Way/4th Street

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Way/4th Street 6th Street/7th Avenue Market Street/15th Avenue NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Way/5th Street Central Way/4th Street 6th Street/7th Avenue Kirkland Way / Kirkland Avenue Market Street/15th Avenue NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE See Table 3.3-11 in the Transportation Section for more detail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Way/5th Street Central Way/4th Street 6th Street/7th Avenue Kirkland Way/Kirkland Avenue Market Street/15th Avenue NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NEE See Table 3.3-11 in the Transportation Section for more detail.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6th Street/7th Avenue Market Street/15th Avenue NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE See Table 3.3-11 in the Transportation Section for more detail.
<p><u>Concurrency V/C Impacts</u> Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022.</p> <p><i>2014</i> All concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under the No Action Alternative scenario for 2014.</p> <p><i>2022</i> Two intersections located in the southwest subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lake Washington Boulevard/NE 38th Place 114th Ave NE/NE 85th Street In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is expected to exceed its threshold of 0.92. <p>One intersection in the northwest subarea is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 116th Way NE/NE 132nd Street <p>The subarea average for the northwest subarea is expected to exceed its threshold of 1.01.</p> <p>Two intersections in the northeast subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 124th Avenue NE/NE 132nd Street Totem Lake Boulevard/NE 132nd Street However, the subarea average V/C is expected to remain under its threshold.	<p><u>Concurrency V/C Impacts</u> Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022.</p> <p><i>2014</i> One intersection located in the southwest region is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40 in 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 114th Ave NE/NE 85th Street In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is expected to exceed the threshold by 0.01. <p><i>2022</i> Three intersections located in the southwest region are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lake Washington Boulevard/NE 38th Place 6th Street/Central Way 114th Ave NE/NE 85th Street In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is expected to exceed its threshold of 0.92. <p>One intersection in the northwest subarea is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 116th Way NE/NE 132nd Street <p>The subarea average for the northwest subarea exceeds its threshold of 1.01.</p> <p>Two intersections in the northeast subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 124th Avenue NE/NE 132nd Street 	<p>The FEIS Review Alternative would generally result in similar or lesser transportation impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action.</p>	<p><u>Concurrency V/C Impacts</u> Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022.</p> <p><i>2014</i> One intersection located in the southwest region, (109) 114th Ave NE/NE 85th Street, is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40. In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is projected to exceed the threshold.</p> <p><i>2022</i> Deficiencies are projected at the same locations as the No Action Alternative, though some of the V/C values are slightly different. See No Action Alternative for a description of which intersections and subarea averages exceed concurrency thresholds.</p>	<p><u>Concurrency V/C Impacts</u> Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022.</p> <p><i>2014</i> 2014 deficiencies are the same as those identified for the Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><i>2022</i> Deficiencies are projected at the same locations as the No Action Alternative, though some of the V/C values are slightly different. See No Action Alternative for a description of which intersections and subarea averages exceed concurrency thresholds.</p>	<p><u>Concurrency V/C Impacts</u> Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022.</p> <p><i>2014</i> 2014 deficiencies are the same as those identified for the Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><i>2022</i> Deficiencies are projected at the same locations as the No Action Alternative, though some of the V/C values are slightly different. See No Action Alternative for a description of which intersections and subarea averages exceed concurrency thresholds.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totem Lake Boulevard/NE 132nd Street <p>However, the subarea average V/C is expected to remain under its threshold.</p>				
<p>Parking Parking demand would be less under the No Action Alternative than would be expected under the Proposed Action, because the intensity of land use would be less. As no specific development proposal is under evaluation under the No Action Alternative, it is not known if proposed parking would comply with current zoning requirements, or if alternative parking plans would also be proposed under this scenario.</p>	<p>Parking For development proposed on the Parkplace site, the spaces that would be required by the City’s Zoning Code are much higher—approximately 5,157— than the approximately 3,500 spaces that are being proposed. Note, the total that would be required under City code also includes parking that would be required for No Action. The amount of parking required over No Action is expected to be similar to the other SEIS alternatives.</p> <p>The differences in standard code parking requirements and the proposed parking supply are due to expected shared parking and proposed measures to reduce parking demand. A parking management program, which encourages use of alternative modes and efficient use of the available parking, will be needed to ensure that parking supply is adequate to meet demand. Otherwise, there is potential for parking to spill out into the surrounding neighborhoods, which would be considered a significant impact.</p>	<p>Parking Compared to the Proposed Action, the amount of required commercial parking for the FEIS Review Alternative would increase by 150 parking stalls. The increase will provide a buffer during peak commercial parking periods to reduce the amount of circulation by vehicles looking for parking.</p>	<p>Parking Since specific development proposals have not been made for the Superblock alternative, the summary represents a conservative estimate based upon requirements for general office and retail uses in City code, over the parking that would also be needed for No Action.</p> <p>Given a similar growth, the total parking stalls that could be required are the same for the Superblock and Offsite Alternatives, but would be distributed differently. It is estimated that the Superblock Alternative would require 2,726 parking spaces over No Action to accommodate the amount of office and commercial considered under this Alternative.</p>	<p>Parking Since specific development proposals have not been made for the Unified Ownership alternative, the summary represents a conservative estimate based upon requirements for general office and retail uses in City code, over the parking that would also be needed for No Action.</p> <p>Given a similar growth, the total parking stalls that could be required are the same for the Superblock and Offsite Alternatives, but would be distributed differently.</p> <p>The Unified Ownership Alternative is estimated to require the same amount of parking (2,726 parking spaces over No Action) as the Superblock Alternative</p>	<p>Parking Since specific development proposals have not been made for the Off-Site alternative, the summary represents a conservative estimate based upon requirements for general office and retail uses in City code, over the parking that would also be needed for No Action.</p> <p>Given a similar growth, the total parking stalls that could be required are the same for the Superblock and Offsite Alternatives, but would be distributed differently.</p> <p>The Off-Site Alternative is estimated to require the same amount of parking (2,726 parking spaces over No Action) as the Superblock Alternative.</p>
<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Lower square footages for retail and commercial uses and a potentially less efficient use of land could be less conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility and less supportive of the City’s non-motorized policies than the Proposed Action. However, there is a greater potential for improved pedestrian and bicycle mobility compared with current conditions.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility With the Proposed Action’s potential for a master planned redevelopment more site amenities are likely to be provided in terms of non-motorized connectivity, landscaping, and gathering spaces. With these features, the Proposed Action would be more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and would support the City’s non-motorized policies.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Same as those described for the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility The Superblock Alternative would concentrate new development on several sites on one large block in the downtown area, providing more opportunity for structured parking and efficient use of land, site amenities that provide non-motorized connectivity, landscaping, and gathering spaces. With these features, this alternative would be more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and would likely support the City’s non-motorized policies to a greater degree than the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility The Unified Ownership Alternative would distribute new development on two sites in the downtown area. Because the development would be more spread out, it would be less efficient use of land, with likely fewer site amenities that provide non-motorized connectivity, landscaping, and gathering spaces, compared to the single-site alternatives. However, since it would still result in a higher level density, this alternative would be more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and would likely support the</p>	<p>Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility The Off-Site Alternative would distribute new development on three sites in the downtown area. Because the development would be more spread out, it would be less efficient use of land, with likely fewer site amenities that provide non-motorized connectivity, landscaping, and gathering spaces, compared to the single-site alternatives. However, since it would still result in a higher level density, this alternative would be more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and would likely support the</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
<p>Transit Service Under the No Action Alternative, increased residential and employment growth is anticipated, although to a lesser degree than under the Proposed Action. Therefore, it is expected that the No Action Alternative would support increased transit service, although to a lesser degree than the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Transit Service Higher density under the Proposed Action would be more conducive to transit service and would support the City's transit policies</p>	<p>Transit Service Higher density under the Proposed Action would be more conducive to transit service and would support the City's transit policies, and in particular due to the TMP required in the FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Transit Service Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Transit Service Same as Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Transit Service Same as the Proposed Action, except that the Substation Block is located more than 0.25 mile away from the Transit Station and would be less supported by transit service.</p>
Mitigation Measures					
<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures See description of Transportation Mitigation Measures under the Proposed Action for a description of those mitigation measures that would be applicable under the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Three capacity improvements are identified by 2014; and four capacity improvements are identified by 2022.</p>	<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures <u>Capacity Improvements</u> Mitigation measures identified in the 2008 DEIS for the No Action Alternative represent mitigation necessary to resolve traffic impacts identified through the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and concurrency analyses. The mitigation measures identified under the Proposed Action are additional mitigation measures needed to resolve traffic impacts caused by the incremental increase in development above the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The Proposed Action would require seven capacity improvements over No Action (for a total of 10) by 2014; and one capacity improvement over No Action (for a total of 5) by 2022.</p> <p><u>TIA Results with Mitigation</u> The resulting LOS with mitigation for all intersections except one would be LOS E or better under all scenarios. The intersection that would remain at LOS F, NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE, would be improved to operate at better conditions (note, this intersection is operating at LOS F under existing conditions).</p> <p><u>Concurrency Results with Mitigation</u> <i>2014 Conditions</i> All concurrency intersections and</p>	<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures Similar to the Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures <u>Capacity Improvements</u> Table 3.4-15 in the DSEIS presents the capacity improvement projects that have been developed to address the LOS and concurrency impacts. The mitigation measures identified under the Superblock Alternative are additional mitigation measures needed to resolve traffic impacts caused by the incremental increase in development above the No Action.</p> <p>The table shows an additional 11 capacity improvements in addition to the three No Action improvements by 2014; and two capacity improvements in addition to the four No Action improvements by 2022.</p> <p><u>TIA Results with Mitigation</u> Analysis show that the resulting LOS for all intersections except one would be LOS E or better. The intersection that would remain at LOS F, NE 85th Street / 114th Avenue NE, would be improved to operate at better conditions (note, this intersection is operating at LOS F under existing conditions).</p> <p><u>Concurrency Results with Mitigation</u> <i>2014 Conditions</i> Analysis shows that all concurrency intersections and subarea averages are</p>	<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures <u>Capacity Improvements</u> Table 3.4-15 in the DSEIS presents the capacity improvement projects that have been developed to address the LOS and concurrency impacts. The mitigation measures identified under the Unified Ownership Alternative are additional mitigation measures needed to resolve traffic impacts caused by the incremental increase in development above the No Action.</p> <p>The table shows an additional 12 capacity improvements in addition to the three No Action improvements by 2014; and two capacity improvements in addition to the four No Action improvements by 2022.</p> <p><u>TIA Results with Mitigation</u> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><u>Concurrency Results with Mitigation</u> <i>2014 Conditions</i> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><i>2022 Conditions</i> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p>	<p>Transportation Mitigation Measures <u>Capacity Improvements</u> Table 3.4-15 in the DSEIS presents the capacity improvement projects that have been developed to address the LOS and concurrency impacts. The mitigation measures identified under the Off-Site Alternative are additional mitigation measures needed to resolve traffic impacts caused by the incremental increase in development above the No Action.</p> <p>The table shows an additional 10 capacity improvements in addition to the three No Action improvements by 2014; and two capacity improvements in addition to the four No Action improvements by 2022.</p> <p><u>TIA Results with Mitigation</u> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><u>Concurrency Results with Mitigation</u> <i>2014 Conditions</i> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p> <p><i>2022 Conditions</i> Same as Superblock Alternative.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under this scenario.</p> <p><i>2022 Conditions</i></p> <p>All concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under both scenarios.</p>		<p>expected to remain below thresholds under this scenario.</p> <p><i>2022 Conditions</i></p> <p>Analysis that all concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under this scenario.</p>		
<p>Potential Mitigation Measures No mitigation measures identified for the No Action Alternative.</p>	<p>Potential Mitigation Measures <u>Transportation Demand Management</u> The cumulative parking demand estimates for the office use require that some of the trips to and from Parkplace would occur by modes of travel other than SOV. To encourage use of other modes, the project proposes to implement a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for the office tenants. The following elements are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a transportation coordinator to manage and promote the program. • Provide transit pass subsidy. • Charge for daily parking. • Offer a part-time parking pass option. • Provide ride-match information. • Provide free parking for vanpools. • Provide reserved parking spaces for vanpools. • Provide shower and locker facilities. • Provide bike storage. • Provide parking for a car-sharing program (e.g., Zipcar). • Offer guaranteed ride home to employees who commute by alternative modes. • Install electronic kiosk(s) that provides up-to-date information about transportation services. • Monitor success of the TDM program. • Join transportation management association. 	<p>Potential Mitigation Measures <u>Transportation Demand Management</u> The Transportation Demand strategies described in the DEIS were refined for the FEIS Review Alternative and made a requirement of development within the Planned Action area. They are included in Appendix E of the FEIS. <u>Parking Management</u> The Parking Management mitigation measures described in the DEIS were refined for the FEIS Review Alternative and are included as Appendix F of the FEIS. These measures will also be a requirement of the City's Zoning Code parking requirements if a developer chooses to apply for a reduction in the required number of parking stalls. <u>Permitted Parking in Neighborhoods</u> See Proposed Action. <u>Construction Mitigation Measures</u> See Proposed Action. <u>Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> See Proposed Action. <u>Policy and Land Use Measures</u> See Proposed Action.</p>	<p>Potential Mitigation Measures Same as Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Potential Mitigation Measures Same as Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative.</p>	<p>Potential Mitigation Measures Same as Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative.</p>

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>A TDM program should be implemented with specific measures defined in the case mode split targets are not met.</p> <p><u>Parking Management</u> The following parking management measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge for all daytime parking. • Validate customer and visitor parking. • Use internal gates and controls to divide the garage into sections that are reserved for specific uses at different times of the day. • Reserve areas of the garage for short-term parking by customers and visitors. • Reserve parking for hotel. • Share office parking on weeknights and weekends. • Do not reserve individual spaces for office parking. No parking space in the garage would be reserved for an individual user. This allows all office parking to be shared by employees. • Monitor garage use and adjust allocation or implement additional management measures, if needed. • Monitor public parking. The City may require a parking management program be implemented as a condition of development approval, with specific measures defined in the case that tenants do not meet parking demand targets. <p><u>Permitted Parking in Neighborhoods</u> – If, over the long-term, monitoring indicates that even with the parking management measure described above in place, that parking supply is not adequate to meet typical demand, and overflow traffic is parking in neighborhoods, the City may consider establishing permitted parking in neighborhoods. This would allow</p>				

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	<p>residents to park long-term in their neighborhoods at no charge, but would restrict visitors to an established maximum.</p> <p><u>Construction Mitigation Measures</u> Construction mitigation may include the following measures tied to a permit application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide on-site or nearby parking for construction workers. • Restrict major removal and delivery of materials to and from the site to the Central Avenue corridor east of 6th Street. • Provide flaggers to direct traffic when appropriate. • Provide on-site loading areas for removal and delivery of materials. • Prohibit truck movements to the site during the PM traffic peak hours. • Provide temporary sidewalks when existing sidewalks are blocked. • Adjust traffic signal phasing and timing to reduce traffic congestion. <p><u>Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> - In addition to trip reduction measures such as transit, carpooling, and walking, there are several other ways that future developers in the analysis area could reduce GHG emissions. The 2008 EIS lists a variety of additional mitigation measures that could reduce GHG emissions caused by building construction, space heating, and vehicle usage.</p> <p><u>Policy and Land Use Measures</u> - In the case that revenue is not available to address all identified capacity needs, or if TDM measures do not produce adequate reduction to reduce needed capacity improvements, the Growth Management Act (GMA) allows the City to achieve the needed balance between land use and the transportation system through policy or land use measures.</p>				

No Action Alternative (2008 All Blocks)	Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)	FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)	Superblock Alternative	Unified Ownership Alternative	Off-Site Alternative
	Land use measures may include reducing the level of development at certain locations to reduce the number of trips in the transportation system. Policy measures can include refining LOS and concurrency standards to allow more congestion at certain locations.				