October 16, 2008

To Interested Agencies, Affected Tribes, and Members of the Public:

Attached is a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the City of Kirkland Downtown Area Planned Action Ordinance (PAO) prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The Proposed Action being considered includes three private amendment requests to amend the City’s Comprehensive Plan map and text and the City’s Zoning Code and map, and a City-initiated action to adopt a PAO for the three areas being covered by the private amendment requests.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) issued on April 4, 2008, addressed the Proposed Action and the No Action alternative. This FEIS responds to comments on the DEIS, and reviews a third alternative, the FEIS Review alternative, based on public input and the Planning Commission deliberations on the three planned action areas and the PAO that make up the Proposed Action. The FEIS also adds a brief analysis about how the FEIS Review alternative differs from the Proposed Action.

Copies of the FEIS are available for purchase at the cost of reproduction. The document will also be posted on the City’s website and will be available for review at the City Hall Planning counter and the Kirkland Public Library.

The City Council will consider adoption of the private amendment requests and the PAO in December 2008.

If you have any questions, please contact Angela Ruggeri at 425-587-3256, aruggeri@ci.kirkland.wa.us or me at 425-587-3226.

Sincerely,

Eric R. Shields, AICP
Planning Director
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City Hall
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Kirkland, WA  98033-6189
Contact: Angela Ruggeri
425/587-3256
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Seattle, WA  98004
Contact: Ron Loewen
206/801-2800
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Proposed Action Title
Downtown Area Planned Action Ordinance

Proposed Action and Alternatives

Proposed Action
The Proposed Action addresses two related actions:

Three private requests to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, all concerning properties located in the downtown area and near each other, described in more detail below:

- **Area A.** Touchstone Corporation (Parkplace) amendment request to allow redevelopment of the Parkplace retail/office complex located at 457 Central Way with as much as 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use, including increases in permissible building height up to a maximum of 8 stories, and reduced setbacks along nearby streets and Peter Kirk Park. Additional Zoning Code amendments associated with this request include revisions to lot coverage standards and parking requirements.

- **Area B.** Orni request to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map from High Density Residential (HDR) to Office/Multifamily (O/MF) and to rezone the area from Planned Area 5D (PLA 5D) zone to Planned Area 5C (PLA 5C) zone. The amendment would allow an increase in permissible building height from the lower of 4 stories or 40 feet up to the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet, and an accompanying Zoning Code amendment would allow a reduction of building setbacks where PLA 5C development abuts low-density uses in the PLA 5A zone.

- **Area C.** Altom request to rezone the area from Planned Area 5B (PLA 5B) zone to PLA 5C, while retaining O/MF land use Comprehensive Plan designation for one parcel of property containing a single-story office building at 220 6th Avenue. The City has expanded the area for consideration in this private amendment request to include the parcel to the north (605 4th Avenue) that contains two 2-story office buildings.
The amendment would also allow an increase in building heights from 30 feet to 60 feet and remove the minimum lot size requirement of 1 acre to attain this 60-foot maximum height in the PLA 5C zone.

A City of Kirkland (City)-sponsored proposal to adopt an ordinance establishing these three areas as a Planned Action for the purpose of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) compliance, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 43.21C.031(2)(a) and Washington Administrative Code 197-11-164.

**No Action Alternative**

The No Action alternative assumes that none of the three private amendment requests would be approved, and no Planned Action ordinance (PAO) would be adopted by the City of Kirkland. Comprehensive land use map designations and zoning for three areas would remain the same. The No Action alternative assumes an increased amount of development in Areas A and C that City staff estimated could occur on these parcels under the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning. In Area B, continuance of existing nonconforming office uses is assumed. However, for purposes of visual and school analyses, redevelopment of Area B into taller, multifamily buildings allowed under current zoning regulations is being reviewed in sections 3.3 *Aesthetics* and 3.5 *Public Services*. The No Action alternative would exceed the City’s employment growth targets for 2022 by approximately 600 jobs (see Section 2.3.5 for more detail).

**FEIS Review Alternative**

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Review alternative is described and addressed in this FEIS. The FEIS Review alternative is generally similar to or less intense than the Proposed Action, but differs in several specific design and use parameters. The FEIS Review alternative falls within the range of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives reviewed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The specifics of the FEIS Review alternative differ somewhat from the Proposed Action as noted below. If not specifically noted as a difference, the features of the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the features of the Proposed Action.

**City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendments**

The City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the amendments described for the Proposed Action, except as noted below:
Area B

- Retains the existing HDR land use designation similar to the No Action alternative.

City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative includes the following Comprehensive Plan text amendments that are consistent with the Proposed Action but were not specified as part of the Proposed Action in the DEIS:

Area A

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan consistent with mitigation measures identified in the DEIS to allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in CBD 5A, and tie the additional height allowed to provision a series of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets and sustainability measures in CBD 5A.

- Replace the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405.

- Include a description of how development in Area A is subject to design guidelines of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for the Kirkland Parkplace booklet.

- Update the City’s employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters.

Zoning Map Amendments

The City’s Zoning Map amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The FEIS Review alternative Zoning Map amendments are the same as outlined in the Proposed Action, except as noted below:

Area B

- Retain the existing PLA 5D zoning designation similar to the No Action alternative.

Zoning Code Amendments

The Zoning Code amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The Zoning
Code amendments in the FEIS Review alternative are the same as those identified in the Proposed Action of the DEIS, except as noted below:

**Area A**

- Create a new CBD 5A zone.
- Require that development in Area A comply with the Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines contained in Kirkland Municipal Code 3.30 (see Kirkland Municipal Code amendments below).
- Require that the amount of retail provided equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development, consistent with the mix of uses discussed in the Proposed Action.
- Establish other land uses, including hotel, athletic club, and movie theater as allowed uses subject to conditions. These uses are consistent with the mix of uses considered in the Proposed Action.
- 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 in the Proposed Action.
- Establish the following maximum building heights:
  - four height districts in CBD 5A with lower heights to the north and west and up to 115 feet maximum height (as noted in Figure 2–5), equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives,
  - maximum building height measurement points within the CBD 5A zone as shown in Figure 2–6, and
  - an exceedance in rooftop appurtenances height by 16 feet if covering less than 25% of the rooftop.
- 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 Proposed Action.
- Establish specific setback and stepback requirements based on location (see Figure 2–4) which are either consistent with or more restrictive than setbacks and stepbacks considered under the Proposed Action:
  - Central Way. No setbacks along Central Way and 6th Street,
- Peter Kirk Park. A 55-foot minimum setback adjacent to the Park, and
- South/southeast boundary. A 20-foot minimum setback along the south portion of the site adjacent to the existing office and residential uses.

- Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

**Area B**

- Add a mixed use category limited to Area B only that allows new office development so long as more than 50% of the building area is in residential use. Office-only development will not be permitted. This mix of uses is consistent with the variety of uses considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives in the DEIS.

- Maintain existing height limits of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less for sites that are at least 1 acre in size, consistent with the No Action alternative.

- Remove special regulation that requires additional building setbacks from single-family uses in the PLA 5A zone for buildings over 30 feet above average building elevation, consistent with setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Add a special building setback regulation requiring that office use be set back at least 15 feet from residential uses on adjoining properties, which is as restrictive or more than setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Add a special setback regulation that requires buildings containing office uses above 30 feet in height to set back portions of the building that are over 30 feet (an additional 10 feet from the property line) when residential uses are on adjoining properties, within the range of upper-story stepbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Require an administrative design review for mixed use development, but not for residential-only development. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

**Area C**

- Allow a maximum building height of 4 stories or 52 feet above average building elevation if the development site contains at least 0.8 acre. If the development site contains at least 0.4 acre, the maximum building height would be 3 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less. Heights allowed
under the FEIS Review alternative are less intense than those considered under the Proposed Action.

- Require administrative design review for buildings over 30 feet in height. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

Kirkland Municipal Code Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative includes amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code that add a document entitled “Kirkland Parkplace Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which regulates the design of development in Area A, including the following specific features.

- Establish a network of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces in Area A and connecting Area A to adjoining streets and developments.
- Provide a large central open space.
- Building(s) south of the central open space must be terraced to allow for sun to reach 50% of the open space at 2:00 p.m. on March 21 and September 21.
- Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

Features of the FEIS Review alternative’s Kirkland Municipal Code amendments were either included as mitigation measures for the Proposed Action or are consistent with assumptions of the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

Planned Action Ordinance

The FEIS Review alternative includes City adoption of a PAO designating the three private amendment requests outlined above (Areas A, B, and C) as a Planned Action for the purposes of SEPA compliance, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164. The PAO includes the following features:

- limits the amount of development in Areas A, B, and C;
- limits the amount of PM peak hour vehicle trips that may be generated by development in Areas A, B, and C;
- a requirement for implementing TMPs for development anticipated in Areas A, B, and C and associated monitoring (a TMP was considered as part of mitigations in the DEIS); and
a requirement for implementing a PMP and associated monitoring for development anticipated in Area A (a PMP was considered as part of the mitigations in the DEIS).

Location

The Planned Action area, or analysis area, roughly consists of the following three noncontiguous areas (shown as Areas A, B, and C for purposes of this FEIS):

- **Area A, Touchstone Corporation (Parkplace).** One 11.5-acre parcel with the address 457 Central Way located east of Peter Kirk Park, south of Central Way, and west of 6th Street;

- **Area B, Orni.** Three parcels addressed as 825, 903, and 911 5th Avenue generally located east of the U.S. Post Office, south of 5th Avenue, west of the Kirkland Park Place Condominium complex, and north of the pedestrian walkway that follows the alignment of 4th Avenue, if the street were extended;

- **Area C, Altom.** Two parcels addressed as 220 6th Street and 603 4th Avenue located east of 6th Street, south of 4th Avenue, north of the 620 Kirkland Way office building.

Proponent

The proponents of this FEIS are the City of Kirkland for the proposed Planned Action designation/ordinance and the following three private applicants for the proposed City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments:

- Area A – Touchstone Corporation
- Area B – Yarrow Bay Development (represented by Kathy Orni)
- Area C – Rhoda Altom (owner of property at 220 6th Street)

Lead Agency

The City of Kirkland

Responsible Official

Eric Shields, AICP, Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
City of Kirkland
123 Fifth Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
(425) 587-3226
**Contact Person**

Angela Ruggeri, AICP, Senior Planner  
Department of Planning and Community Development  
City of Kirkland  
123 Fifth Avenue  
Kirkland, WA 98033  
(425) 587-3256

**Potential Required Approvals**

Recommendations by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council of the following:

- adoption of a Planned Action Designation and Ordinance,
- adoption of the amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan (including amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map) and adoption of amendments to the City of Kirkland Zoning Code, Kirkland Municipal Code, and zoning map amendments for the three private amendments, and
- additions to the design guidelines in the Kirkland Municipal Code.

**Environmental Impact Statement Authors and Principal Contributors**

The DEIS and FEIS have been prepared under the direction of the City of Kirkland.

**Principal Authors:**

ICF Jones & Stokes  
710 Second Avenue Suite 550  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 801-2800

**Contributing Authors:**

Fehr & Peers  
11410 NE 122nd Way Suite 320  
Kirkland, WA 98034-6927  
(425) 820-0100  
(Transportation model)

LMN Architects  
801 Second Avenue, Suite 501  
Seattle, WA 98104
Heffron Transportation, Inc.
6544 NE 61st Street
Seattle, WA 98115
(206) 523-3939
(Level of service and parking)

RH2
12100 NE 195th Street, Suite 100
Bothell, WA 98011
(425) 951-5400
(Water Utility)

Roth Hill Engineering Partners, LLC
2600 116th Avenue NE, Suite 100
Bellevue, WA 98004
(425) 869-9448
(Sewer Utility)

Weinman Consulting, LLC
9350 SE 68th Street
Mercer Island, WA 98040
(206) 295-0783

City of Kirkland Planning and Community Development Department
(Multiple sections)

City of Kirkland Public Works Department
(Transportation and Utilities)

City of Kirkland Finance Department
(Public Services)

City of Kirkland Police Department
(Public Services)

City of Kirkland Fire Department
(Public Services)

City of Kirkland Parks and Recreation Department
(Public Services)
**Date of Draft Environmental Impact Statement Issuance**

The DEIS was issued on April 4, 2008.

**Review Opportunities**

A 45-day comment period was held for the DEIS between April 4 and May 19, 2008. Comments during that period, including the April 24, 2008 Planning Commission public hearing, are provided in this FEIS.

The FEIS is being considered together with the final Comprehensive Plan map and text, Zoning map and text, Kirkland Municipal Code amendments, and the PAO by the City Council. No review period applies.

**Date of FEIS Issuance**

October 16, 2008

**Date of Implementation**

The date of anticipated implementation of this FEIS is December 2008, with phased development following necessary permit approvals.

**Comprehensive Plan SEPA Review**

A prior EIS was conducted for the City of Kirkland 2004 Comprehensive Plan. For subsequent amendments, SEPA environmental addenda and checklists were completed for these non-project actions and determinations of nonsignificance were prepared. A full list of previous environmental documents is provided below.

**Previous Environmental Documents**

DEIS for Proposed City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan, issued July 1, 2004.


Process IV Zoning Code Amendments, Chapter 115, for Sight Distance Triangle, issued on March 8, 2004, File ZON05-00012 (TS)

Process IV Zoning Code Amendments, Chapter 110 for sidewalk improvements, issued on July 7, 2005, File ZON05-00013 (AR)

Process IV Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments; Highlands Neighborhood Plan, issued on October 6, 2005, File IV-03-27 (JLB)

Process IV Zoning Code, Zoning Map and Municipal Code amendments to implement the NE 85th Street Subarea Plan, File IV-02-05, in progress (JLS)

Process IV 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments and associated Zoning Map changes, issued on October 3, 2005, File ZON05-00026 (TS)

Surface Water Master Plan Update, issued on October 31, 2005 (SAC)

Zoning Code, Zoning Map and Municipal Code Amendments, EIS Addendum, for TL 4-TL 11 Zones (not including TL 9), issued on October 24, 2004, File ZON04-00020 (DC)

Process IV Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map and Zoning Code Amendments; Norkirk Neighborhood Plan, issued on September 7, 2006, File IV-03-27 (JLB)

Process IV Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map Amendments; Market Neighborhood Plan and Market Street Corridor Subarea Plan; issued on September 6, 2006, File IV-03-27 (AR)


Process IV Zoning Code and Municipal Code Amendments to implement the Market and Norkirk Neighborhood historic preservation and small lot single family goals and policies; issued on April 12, 2007, File MIS06-00053 (JLB)

Process IV Miscellaneous Zoning Code Amendments related to reformatting of Chapter 92 Design Regulations issued on April 19, 2007, File ZON07-00002 (JLS)


Process IV 2007 Private Amendment Request Nakhjiri/Kirkland Congregational Church, issued on January 11, 2008, File ZoN07-00010 (JLB)

Hart Private Amendment Request issued on January 17, 2008, File ZON06-00019 (JGR)

TL 9 Zoning Implementation issued on January 17, 2008, File ZON07-00023 (JGR)

Process IV Zoning Code Amendments for Cottage, Carriage and Two/Three-Unit Homes, issued on October 11, 2007, File No. ZON07-00005 (DC)

Location of Background Information

City of Kirkland, Planning and Community Development Department. See Lead Agency and Responsible Official Address listed above.

FEIS Purchase Price

The purchase price of a copy of the FEIS will be based on reproduction costs of printed documents or CDs. The document also will be posted on the City’s Web site.
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Chapter 1. Environmental Summary

1.1. Introduction

This chapter summarizes significant impacts, mitigation measures, and significant avoidable adverse impacts evaluated in this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the FEIS Review, Proposed Action and No Action alternatives described below and in Chapter 2. This summary is intentionally brief; the reader should consult individual sections in this FEIS and DEIS Chapter 3 for detailed information concerning the affected environment, impacts, and mitigation measures.

1.2. Proposed Action and Location

1.2.1. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action addresses two related actions:

Three private requests to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, all concerning properties located in the Downtown area and near each other, as described in more detail below:

- Area A, Touchstone Corporation (Parkplace). This amendment request would allow redevelopment of the Parkplace retail/office complex located at 457 Central Way with as much as 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use, including increases in permissible building height up to 8 stories, and reduced setbacks along nearby streets. Additional Zoning Code amendments associated with this request may include revisions to lot coverage standards, parking requirements, and site plan requirements.
- Area B, (Orni). This amendment request would amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map from High Density Residential (HDR) to Office/Multifamily (O/MF) and would rezone the area from Planned Area 5D (PLA 5D) zone to Planned Area 5C (PLA 5C) zone. The amendment would allow an increase in permissible building height up to 60 feet, and an accompanying Zoning Code amendment would allow a reduction of building setbacks where PLA 5C development abuts single-family uses in the PLA 5A zone.

- Area C, (Altom). This amendment request would rezone the area from Planned Area 5B (PLA 5B) zone to PLA 5C, while retaining O/MF comprehensive land use map designation for one parcel of property containing a single-story office building at 220 6th Avenue. The City has expanded the area for consideration in this private amendment request to include the parcel to the north (605 4th Avenue) that contains two 2-story office buildings. The amendment would also allow an increase in building heights to 60 feet and remove the minimum lot size requirement of 1 acre to achieve the 60 foot maximum height in the PLA 5C zone.

A City-sponsored proposal to adopt an ordinance establishing these three areas as a Planned Action for the purpose of State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) compliance, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164.

### 1.2.2. Location

The Proposed Action analysis area consists of the three noncontiguous planned action areas outlined as Areas A, B, and C. This area is roughly bounded by Central Way (NE 85th Street) in the north, Kirkland Way on the east and south, and 3rd Street on the west. This area includes all of PLA 5 and a portion of the East Core Frame of Downtown, as defined in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

### 1.3. Alternatives

#### 1.3.1. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action alternative would amend Comprehensive Plan land use designations and zoning on the three planned action areas (A, B, and C), make Zoning Code amendments (see Chapter 2), and adopt a Planned Action ordinance (PAO) for the three areas covered by the private amendment requests. These amendments would collectively allow approximately 2 million square feet of office and commercial development in Downtown, an increase of approximately 1.8 million square feet over existing conditions as a result of the allowed higher building heights and greater permissible lot coverage. The amendments are also expected to result in an increase of approximately 6,138 jobs in the City compared to existing conditions.
1.3.2. No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative assumes that none of the three private amendment requests would be approved and no PAO would be adopted by the City. Comprehensive Plan land use designations and zoning for the three planned action areas would remain the same. The No Action alternative assumes an increased level of office and retail development for Areas A and C that city staff estimated could occur under the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning. In Area B, continuance of existing nonconforming office uses is assumed. This redevelopment would result in an increase of approximately 681,200 square feet of office and commercial development. For visual and school services analysis purposes, redevelopment of Area B into taller, multifamily buildings allowed under current zoning regulations is being reviewed in section 3.3 Aesthetics and 3.5 Public Services. As a result of the assumptions contained in the No Action alternative, the City would exceed its employment growth targets by approximately 600 jobs (see Section 2.5.3 for more detail). The No Action alternative would result in an increase of 2,340 jobs in the City compared to existing conditions.

1.3.3. FEIS Review Alternative

The FEIS Review alternative consists of amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan map, zoning map, Comprehensive Plan text, zoning code text, and the Municipal Code. The FEIS Review alternative falls within the range of the No Action alternative and Proposed Action reviewed in the DEIS. The specifics of the FEIS Review alternative differs somewhat from the Proposed Action as noted below. If not specifically noted as a difference, the features of the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the features of the Proposed Action.

Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan land use map are the same as described in the Proposed Action with the following exception:

- There would be no amendment to the Comprehensive Plan map for Area B. It would retain the HDR land use designation, consistent with the No Action alternative.

Zoning Map Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative amendments to the City’s zoning map are the same as described in the Proposed Action with the following exception:

- There would be no amendment to the City zoning map for Area B. It will retain the PLA 5D zone, consistent with the No Action alternative.
Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative includes the following Comprehensive Plan text amendments that are consistent with the Proposed Action but were not specified as part of the Proposed Action in the DEIS:

Area A

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan consistent with mitigation measures identified in the DEIS to allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in CBD 5A and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures in CBD 5A.

- Replace the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405.

- Include a description of how development in Area A is subject to design guidelines of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for the Kirkland Parkplace booklet.

- Update the City’s employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters.

Zoning Code Amendments

The Zoning Code amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The Zoning Code amendments in the FEIS Review alternative are the same as those identified in the Proposed Action of the DEIS, except as noted below:

Area A

- Create a new CBD 5A zone.

- Require that development in Area A comply with the Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines contained in Kirkland Municipal Code 3.30 (see Kirkland Municipal Code amendments below).

- Require that the amount of retail provided equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development consistent with the mix of uses discussed in the Proposed Action.

- Establish other land uses including hotel, athletic club, and movie theater as allowed uses subject to conditions. These uses are consistent with the mix of uses considered in the Proposed Action.

- 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 Proposed Action.

- Establish the following related to maximum building heights:
  - four height districts in CBD 5A with lower heights to the north and west and up to 115 feet maximum height (as noted in Figure 2-5), equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action,
  - maximum building height measurement points within the CBD 5A zone as shown on Figure 2-4, and
  - an exceedance in rooftop appurtenances height by 16 feet if covering less than 25% of the rooftop.

- 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 Proposed Action.

- Establish specific setback and upper-story setback requirements based on location (see Figure 2-4), which are either consistent with or more restrictive than setbacks and upper-story setbacks considered under the Proposed Action:
  - Central Way. No setbacks along Central Way and 6th Street
  - Peter Kirk Park. A 55-foot minimum setback adjacent to the park
  - South/southeast boundary. A 20-foot minimum setback along the south portion of the area adjacent to the existing office and residential uses.

- Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

**Area**

- Add a mixed use category limited to Area B that allows new office development so long as more than 50% of the building area is in residential use. Office-only development will not be permitted. This mix of uses is consistent with the variety of uses considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternative in the DEIS.

- Maintain existing height limits of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less for sites that are at least 1 acre in size, consistent with the No Action alternative.

- Remove special regulation that requires additional building setback from single-family uses in the PLA 5A zone for buildings over 30 feet above average building elevation, consistent with setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.
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- Add a special building setback regulation requiring that office use be set back at least 15 feet from residential uses on adjoining properties, which is as restrictive or more than setbacks considered in under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Add a special setback regulation that requires buildings containing office uses above 30 feet in height to set back portions of the building that are over 30 feet an additional 10 feet from the property line when residential uses are on adjoining properties, within the range of upper story setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Require an administrative design review for mixed-use development, but not for residential-only development. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

Area C

- Allow a maximum building height of 4 stories or 52 feet above average building elevation if the development site contains at least 0.8 acre. If the development site contains at least 0.4 acre, the maximum building height would be 3 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less. Heights allowed under the FEIS Review alternative are less intense than those considered under the Proposed Action.

- Require administrative design review for buildings over 30 feet in height. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

Kirkland Municipal Code Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative includes amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code that add a document entitled “Kirkland Parkplace Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which regulates the design of development in Area A, including the following specific features.

- Establish a network of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces in Area A and connecting Area A to adjoining streets and developments.

- Provide a large central open space.

- Building(s) south of the central open space must be terraced to allow for sun to reach 50% of the open space at 2:00 p.m. on March 21 and September 21.

- Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

Features of the FEIS Review alternative’s Kirkland Municipal Code amendments were either included as mitigation measures for the Proposed Action or are consistent with assumptions of the Proposed Action in the DEIS.
**Planned Action Ordinance (PAO)**

The FEIS Review alternative includes City adoption of a PAO designating the three private amendment requests outlined above (Areas A, B, and C) as a Planned Action for the purposes of SEPA compliance, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164. The Planned Action includes the following features:

- limits the amount of development in Areas A, B, and C,
- limits the amount of PM peak hour vehicle trips that may be generated by development in Areas A, B, and C,
- requires implementation of TMPs for development anticipated in Areas A, B, and C and associated monitoring; a TMP was considered as part of mitigations in the DEIS, and
- requires implementation of a PMP for development anticipated in Area A and associated monitoring, a PMP was considered as part of the mitigations in the DEIS.

These amendments for Areas A, B, and C would collectively allow slightly less office and commercial development than would the Proposed Action, falling within the range of land uses reviewed in the DEIS. They would still allow approximately 2 million square feet of office and commercial development in Downtown, an increase of approximately 1.8 million square feet over existing conditions as a result of the allowed higher building heights and greater lot coverage. In addition, the FEIS Review alternative would allow approximately 69 dwelling units in Areas B and C, within the range of residential units reviewed for aesthetics and public schools impacts in the DEIS. The amendments are expected to result in an increase of approximately 6,025 jobs and 69 dwelling units in the City, compared to existing conditions, within the range of jobs and housing studied for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

### 1.4. Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### 1.4.1. Introduction

Table 1-1 at the end of this chapter summarizes the environmental impacts for each element of the environment evaluated in Chapter 3 of the DEIS and Chapter 3 of the FEIS. For a complete discussion of the elements of the environment considered in the DEIS, please refer to DEIS Chapter 3.

#### 1.5. Issues to be Resolved

Adoption of a PAO and the concurrent adoption of three private amendment requests, including adoption of Comprehensive Plan text amendments, Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map...
amendments, Zoning text and map amendments to allow increased structure heights, reduced or eliminated setbacks, increased lot coverage, and reduction in on-site parking requirements in the analysis area would support redevelopment of the area to a more intensive commercial character that would generally support the City’s Vision for this part of Downtown as a focal point of Kirkland’s vital employment base. The key environmental issues facing decision-makers are:

- the impact of additional traffic on area roadways,
- the visual and aesthetic impact of taller buildings with reduced setbacks in this area of downtown,
- the greater intensity of land use and employment in downtown,
- policy and code amendments necessary to allow the Proposed Action,
- the increased demand on public services, and
- mitigating measures to address these impacts.

### 1.6. Significant Navoidable Adverse Impacts

#### 1.6.1. Land Use Atterns

Similar to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative will result in a greater intensity of land use and greater employment in the analysis area than the No Action alternative. The changes to land use patterns under both the FEIS Review and the Proposed Action alternatives would generally conform to the City’s Comprehensive Plan vision for Downtown. Changes to the analysis area have the potential to impact land use compatibility, but impacts can be mitigated with mitigation measures. The FEIS Review alternative includes Zoning Code and Kirkland Municipal Code amendments that provide for setbacks, upper story setbacks, and updated design guidelines that mitigate impacts to land use patterns.

#### 1.6.2. Plans and Policies

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts to plans and policies are anticipated if mitigation is implemented. Conflicts with adopted plans and policies require amendments. The FEIS Review alternative includes a package of amendments to Comprehensive Plan text and implementing Zoning Code that address shifts in policies identified as mitigation measures in the DEIS for the Proposed Action. The City is planning to reevaluate its land use policy framework citywide as part of a state mandated Comprehensive Plan update that will occur by 2011.
1.6.3. 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. With proposed mitigation—particularly through implementation of design guidelines addressing height and bulk for the three planned action areas under the Proposed Action—the development of Areas A, B, and C are generally expected to meet the City’s vision and standards for the Downtown area, a place targeted for additional development.

The FEIS Review alternative includes amendments to design guidelines for Area A that are expected to help mitigate impacts of taller buildings and their rooftop appurtenances in that area. In addition, the FEIS Review alternative includes the provision of administrative design review under circumstances where redevelopment occurs with mixed-use office for Area B or taller buildings for Area C, adding mitigations to aesthetics impacts in those two areas. It is acknowledged that along View Corridor 1, views will change under all alternatives but particularly under the Proposed Action. Views along View Corridor 1 will change in a similar manner to the Proposed Action under the FEIS Review alternative. Among amendments to the Comprehensive Plan under the FEIS Review alternative is an amendment replacing View Corridor 1 in the Comprehensive Plan Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405.

1.6.4. Transportation

Implementation of the FEIS Review, Proposed Action, or No Action alternatives will 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. Significant impacts will occur in 2014 at the intersection of NE 85th Street and 124th Avenue NE. This impact will be mitigated through the implementation of 85th Street corridor transportation improvements of equal value.

1.6.5. Public Services

With mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are expected with the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives for police protection, fire and emergency medical services (EMS) services, parks and recreation, and schools. Although the FEIS Review alternative now includes residential as a component of Area B development, the amount of residential is lower than that reviewed in the DEIS.
1.6.6. Utilities

With the mitigation measures noted in the DEIS, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated for utilities. The FEIS Review alternative falls within the range of impacts that were studied for the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives in the DEIS.
# Summary of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures of Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts Common to All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impacts Common to All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impacts Common to All Alternatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of the three areas in the analysis area (A and C) are anticipated to experience growth, including potential redevelopment of Area A into a more intense mix of office and commercial uses with more parking in structures rather than in the form of surface parking lots. Area C is anticipated to redevelop into more intense offices uses that make more efficient use of land. Area B is expected to only redevelop under the Proposed Action or the FEIS Review alternative. The same level of background redevelopment is expected to occur in the broader study area under the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most intense redevelopment of land use patterns is expected to occur in the analysis area (Areas A, B, and C). All three planned action areas would redevelop according to the private amendments requested by property owners in Areas A, B, and C. All three planned action areas will redevelop with taller buildings and redevelopment would make more efficient use of existing buildable land, including the option of using structured parking over more land-consumptive surface parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area A’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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area B will redevelop into new land-efficient office spaces, with more area covered by office buildings with structured parking in them and less area dedicated to surface parking lots. Setbacks from abutting properties would be similar to existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area C would redevelop into more of an intensive land use pattern that covers more area with office buildings containing structured parking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FEIS Review alternative would result in a land use pattern that is comparable to that anticipated under the Proposed Action. In general, changes since the DEIS would reduce potential land use impacts. Specific changes that are now incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area A would redevelop to a more land-efficient office and commercial development than currently exists. Although surface parking is expected to remain, there would be less surface parking and more structured parking in redevelopment rather than present in existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area B would not redevelop under the No Action alternative since the existing use is a nonconforming office use within a multifamily zone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area C is assumed to redevelop as office buildings that achieve closer to their maximum zoning potential than under existing conditions. In particular, the southern parcel with its single-story office building is expected to redevelop into a 3-story office building with associated surface parking. Therefore, there would be a slightly larger area of building coverage in Area C under the No Action alternative than exists under existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development under the FEIS Review alternative would result in a land use pattern that is comparable to that anticipated under the Proposed Action. In general, changes since the DEIS would reduce potential land use impacts. Specific changes that are now incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area A. Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would have somewhat reduced height limits on portions of the area and increased setback requirements along Central Way and within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park. Increased setback requirements would also be required along the south portion of Area A, adjacent to the office and residential uses. The FEIS Review alternative would include a requirement for a central open space as part of future development. Future development would also be required to include a minimum of 25% of development area in retail use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area B. In contrast to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would not allow office-only development. For mixed use development, more than 50% of the building area must be in residential use. The FEIS Review alternative would maintain the existing building height limit of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, rather than increasing it, as contemplated under the Proposed Action. The FEIS Review alternative would require administrative design review of mixed use development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area C. The FEIS Review alternative would allow an increased height of 4 stories or 52 feet above average building elevation whichever is less only if both sites are combined. If a single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Land Use Compatibility**

Under the Proposed Action the same types of land uses will occur on all three planned action areas as currently exist today. However, a substantial increase in office development will occur in the three planned action areas, and an increase in commercial development will also occur in Area A. Building heights are also anticipated to increase in all three planned action areas under the Proposed Action in comparison to both the No Action and existing conditions.

Specifically, the Proposed Action will have the following land use compatibility characteristics:

- **Redevelopment of Area A** will substantially increase the amount of office space in the Downtown area. The Proposed Action will increase the concentration of office employees in this area over existing conditions making Area A a key employment focal point of Downtown Kirkland. The redevelopment anticipated under the Proposed Action will change Area A 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.

- **Redevelopment of Areas B and C** under the Proposed Action will provide a larger amount of the same type of office uses as currently exist on these planned action areas, which will result in a larger concentration of the same type of employment use as exists on the two areas, only at a much smaller magnitude of increase as found in Area A.

- The Proposed Action is expected to result in increased building heights on all three planned action areas.

- Building heights are expected to increase from a maximum height of 5 stories above average building elevation in Area A 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Compatibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land Use Compatibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Land Use Compatibility</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Given that zoning allows more development than presently exists, under the No Action alternative Areas A and C would redevelop into more intense uses city staff estimated could occur under existing land use regulations. Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action alternative would change Area A from a primarily retail development with a lesser amount of office, into a primarily office development with a lesser amount of retail. However, the amount of new office under the No Action alternative is approximately half of what would be expected under the Proposed Action, making less of an impact on overall office development in Downtown. Redevelopment of Area C would also add a small increment of additional office space to the Downtown perimeter area, though much less than could be expected under the Proposed Action. Building heights of redevelopment in Area A would be similar to existing development in the area, although there would be more buildings constructed to existing maximum height limit of the Central Business District (CBD) 5 zone. Similarly, Area C would redevelop to its maximum height limit of 30 feet, similar to other buildings in the PLA 5B zone (located east and south of Area C). | Given that zoning allows more development than presently exists, under the No Action alternative Areas A and C would redevelop into more intense uses city staff estimated could occur under existing land use regulations. Similar to the Proposed Action, the No Action alternative would change Area A from a primarily retail development with a lesser amount of office, into a primarily office development with a lesser amount of retail. However, the amount of new office under the No Action alternative is approximately half of what would be expected under the Proposed Action, making less of an impact on overall office development in Downtown. Redevelopment of Area C would also add a small increment of additional office space to the Downtown perimeter area, though much less than could be expected under the Proposed Action. Building heights of redevelopment in Area A would be similar to existing development in the area, although there would be more buildings constructed to existing maximum height limit of the Central Business District (CBD) 5 zone. Similarly, Area C would redevelop to its maximum height limit of 30 feet, similar to other buildings in the PLA 5B zone (located east and south of Area C). | The FEIS Review alternative would generally result in similar or fewer land use compatibility impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action in the DEIS. Changes that have been incorporated since the DEIS that will decrease potential land use compatibility impacts include the following:

- **Area A.** Compared to the Proposed Action, maximum building heights would be decreased along Central Way, within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park and along the south edge of the area. 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.

- **Area B.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the inclusion of a requirement for multi-family residential uses in Area B would increase the potential of land use compatibility with adjacent residential uses. Similarly, building height limits and administrative design review of non-residential uses would also help maintain future land use compatibility.

- **Area C.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative reduces the allowable maximum building height. This reduction increases the potential that new development will be more compatible in height and scale to adjacent areas.
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**Proposed Action**

- Similarly, building heights are expected to increase up to the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet above average building elevation under the Proposed Action in Areas B and C, an increase over both the existing conditions and No Action building heights on these two planned action areas. Increased building heights in Areas B and C would be taller than other existing buildings within the PLA 5C zone.
- Redevelopment of Area B will increase the number of office workers in proximity to the existing low-density single-family use located immediately south of Area B. It is anticipated that redeveloped office buildings in Area B will retain a similar distance from the existing single-family residential structure, although they will be taller buildings.
- A proposed Zoning Code amendment under the Proposed Action would allow buildings taller than 30 feet above average building elevation on parcels less than 1 acre in size, particularly in Area C. Taller buildings on smaller building sites would provide less of a ground-floor buffer with adjacent land uses and could increase land use compatibility conflicts in some limited areas of the PLA 5C zone where taller office buildings would abut lower scale office and residential uses.

#### Employment and Housing

- **No Action Alternative**
  - No additional housing is assumed under the No Action alternative.
  - Under the No Action alternative, 2,341 jobs (employees) would be added to the planned action area. Most of the jobs would be in Area A where an additional 2,137 office jobs and 132 commercial jobs would be located. The remaining 72 office jobs would be located in Area C.

- **FEIS Review Alternative**
  - Area C would redevelop with approximately 18,000 square feet of additional office space in buildings that are a maximum of 30 feet high measured above average building elevation. Building heights would be similar to those for other office and residential buildings located in the PLA 5B zone, which tend to be 2 to 3 stories tall. Building heights will be lower than those existing to the north (PLA 5C zone) and west (CBD 5 zone).
  - Under the No Action alternative, Zoning Code amendments would not be made to the PLA 5C zone. Therefore, sites would need to be at least 1 acre in size in order to allow buildings taller than 30 feet to be built on them. The requirement of larger sites for taller buildings allows an increased opportunity for stepping back upper stories and allowing more light and air to the ground at adjacent sites than under the Proposed Action. However, the two existing properties in the PLA 5C zone under the No Action alternative have at least 1 acre of property.

- **Proposed Action**
  - 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 6,138 jobs in the three planned action areas (5,318 in Area A; 445 in Area B; and 375 in Area C) would result in approximately 1.3 million square feet of new office space and 449,800 square feet of new commercial space over existing conditions, creating a new employment focal point in Downtown. This is in comparison to the estimated 4,000 employees that currently work in the Downtown (City of Kirkland 2007).

### Measures for Proposal

#### Environmental Summary

- **Proposed Action**
- **No Action Alternative**
- **FEIS Review Alternative**

#### Environmental Summary

- **Proposed Action**
- **No Action Alternative**
- **FEIS Review Alternative**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed new zoning designation for Area A will encourage pedestrian-oriented retail and entertainment uses. New development in Area A would continue to be required to meet the City’s pedestrian-oriented design guidelines and/or any site-specific design guidelines enacted with the PAO.</td>
<td>Similar incorporated plan feature mitigation measures for the Proposed Action apply to the FEIS Review alternative. The FEIS Review alternative includes a Zoning Code amendment that requires a mix of office and commercial uses in Area A. Other amendments that are part of the FEIS Review alternative address pedestrian-oriented design guidelines, including implementation of the Kirkland Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines and requirements for administrative design review for redevelopment of mixed use including office in Area B or taller buildings in Area C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

The Proposed Action development of Area A would be required to comply with applicable City design standards which will help to enhance the pedestrian environment and treat scale and massing issues for the taller buildings. Adhering to these design standards would be a key component for redevelopment of the area given that more parking would be placed in structures, building heights would increase, and building setbacks would be reduced or, in some cases, eliminated. Please see Section 3.3, Aesthetics, for more detail on compliance with design standards.

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

The FEIS Review alternative includes elements that eliminate or reduce the need for some of the mitigating measures identified in the DEIS. Specifically, measures addressing building heights, setbacks, and building setbacks are no longer directly applicable because these measures have been incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative. No new or additional mitigation measures would be required.
Environmental Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other potential mitigation measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other potential mitigation measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other potential mitigation measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The FEIS Review alternative includes elements that would eliminate or reduce the need for some of the mitigation measures identified in the DEIS. Specifically, measures addressing building heights, setbacks, and building stepbacks are no longer directly applicable because these measures have been incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new zoning designation is being proposed for Area A as part of the Proposed Action. However, the City's existing CBD 5 zone regulating this area contains 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In order to retain the sense of open space for Peter Kirk Park, revised regulations could include one or more of the following requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Retain or enhance setbacks from the park edge;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Step back taller portions of buildings away from the park, (as outlined in more detail in Section 3.3, Aesthetics);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adopt height limits within a defined proximity of the park;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Modulate facades with defined widths and depths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas B and C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to minimize land use conflicts with adjoining residential developments, as part of the Zoning Code amendment requested by the Area C applicant, the City could include requirements such as enhanced setbacks for any building over 30 feet in height on less than 1 acre of land in the PLA 5C zone. This mitigation measure primarily affects Areas B and C—since other parcels in the PLA 5C zone are larger than 1 acre in size—and would account for the effect that taller buildings would have on smaller building sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts Common to All Alternatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment under all alternatives would provide more concentrated development of office and commercial uses in the urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives, the analysis area is anticipated to experience growth and redevelopment that will add a large number of new jobs in the City, particularly in the analysis area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Action is generally consistent with the City's vision for Downtown. However, the addition of some of the tallest buildings in Downtown will make achieving a human scale environment more challenging, particularly for Area A, where buildings of up to 8 stories are anticipated. The Proposed Action is consistent with Land Use and Economic</td>
<td>The No Action alternative is consistent with the City's vision of Downtown. The No Action alternative provides additional economic development in two of the three planned action areas. However, there is a lesser degree of economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship of the FEIS Review alternative to applicable policies and regulations of the City is consistent with the DEIS analysis for the Proposed Action. As noted for the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative is also consistent with the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Goals and Policies for a complete community that allows for greater jobs and customers in Downtown.

The Proposed Action addresses the City’s Framework Goals related to parks, recreation, and open space; capital facilities; public services; and transportation in the following ways:

- With mitigation measures identified in Section 3.5, Public Services, the City would be able to maintain Peter Kirk Park and expand amenities such as benches and pathways and recreation programs used by the new employees in the planned action area who use the park. Therefore, the Proposed Action is consistent with Framework Goal FG-11.

- Based on the analysis contained in Section 3.5, Public Services and Section 3.6, Utilities of the DEIS, the additional employees and customers anticipated in the three planned action areas of the Proposed Action will increase demands on city facilities and services in the area. However, with mitigations outlined in the Section 3.5, Public Services and Section 3.6, Utilities, the City will be able to maintain existing adopted levels of service consistent with Framework Goal FG-13.

- Based upon the analysis contained in Section 3.4, Transportation of the DEIS, the Proposed Action would create a concentration of employment that would support transit and other modes of transportation. With mitigation measures identified, 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.

Expected under the No Action alternative in comparison to the Proposed Action. Area B is not expected to provide any additional economic development of growth opportunities since it will not redevelop under the No Action alternative.

The No Action alternative meets the City’s Framework Goals related to transportation; parks, recreation, and open space; capital facilities; and public services in the following ways:

- Additional employees and customers in the planned action areas, particularly in Area A, will increase demand for facilities and services at Peter Kirk Park. However, with recreation service fees and property taxes collected through redevelopment in Areas A and C, the City would be able to maintain Peter Kirk Park and recreation programs. Therefore, the No Action alternative is consistent with Framework Goal FG-11.

- Based on the analysis contained in Section 3.5, Public Services and Section 3.6, Utilities, of the DEIS, the additional employees and customers anticipated in the No Action alternative in two of the three planned action areas will increase demands on city facilities and services in the area. However, with mitigations outlined in the Public Services and Utilities sections, the City will be able to maintain existing adopted levels of service consistent with Framework Goal FG-13.

- Based on the analysis contained in Section 3.4, Transportation, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A</strong></td>
<td>The No Action alternative would be consistent with the vision and policies in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan. However, the existing land use of office in Area B is not consistent with the land uses allowed in the HDR Comprehensive Plan designation or the PLA 5D zoning designation. The existing land use is a legally existing nonconforming use, and as such, is not expected to redevelop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Action would have some inconsistencies with the vision and policies in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan. Area A redevelopment under the Proposed Action is 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 for Area A 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would increase consistency with the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan by retaining the existing High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation for Area B. The FEIS Review alternative also includes amendments to the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan text relating to building heights, view corridors, and design that maintain consistency with the vision and policies of the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The redevelopment of Area B as an office development is inconsistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan land use designation of HDR applied to the PLA 5D Subarea of the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan. The Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan states that future development in this subarea should be multifamily residential at a density of up to 24 dwelling units per acre. The Proposed Action would place Area B in the PLA 5C Subarea. This change would require a Comprehensive Plan land use map amendment to be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The additional height requested for Area C is inconsistent with the description of PLA 5B Subarea contained in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan, which states that structure heights should be limited to 3 stories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measures for Proposal**

- **Incorporated Land Features**
  - The Proposed Action would include Comprehensive Plan amendments that would do the following:
    - Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan’s text for Design District 5 to allow building heights of 2 to 8 stories rather than 2 to 5 stories. This would allow the taller buildings being considered for Area A redevelopment under the Proposed Action.
The Proposed Action would include Zoning amendments that would do the following:
- Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map for Area B from HDR to O/MF.
- These Comprehensive Plan amendments would create Comprehensive Plan land use map and text consistency.
- The Proposed Action would include Zoning Map amendments that would do the following:
  - Create a new zoning designation called CBD 5A for purposes of the DEIS and apply that new designation to Area A.
  - Amend the Zoning Map from PLA 5D to PLA 5C for Area B.
  - Amend the Zoning Map from PLA 5B to PLA 5C for Area C.
- These Zoning Map amendments would create consistency between the City’s Comprehensive Plan and zoning.
- The Proposed Action would include Zoning Code text amendments that would do the following:
  - Create a new zoning designation called CBD 5A that has the following basic zoning features and will:
    - Allow the same or similar land uses as allowed under CBD 5.
    - Allow for building heights of a maximum of 8 stories in height.
    - Reduce or eliminate setbacks from Central Way, 6th Street, and Peter Kirk Park.
    - Increase lot coverage over the maximum amount allowed under the CBD 5 zone.
  - Amend the PLA 5C Zoning Code text to:
    - Eliminate the minimum lot-size requirement for buildings to reach the maximum height of the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet above average building elevation; and
    - Eliminate the PLA 5C general regulation #2 which limits the height or horizontal length of any façade of a structure within 100 feet of an adjoining, low-density use in the PLA 5A zone.
  - Area A of the Proposed Action would continue to need to comply with the City’s design guidelines.

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**
Redevelopment considered for Area A would need to comply with City design guidelines, the design guidance contained in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan’s Design District 5, and/or new design guidelines established by the PAO.

The Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan also includes the following additional plan features that could be considered in development of Area A:
- The development of Area A occurs adjacent to a public view from the eastern gateway to Downtown at Central Way and 6th Street identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-16). If the City decides that this is an

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**
The FEIS Review alternative includes amendments to the Zoning Code and Municipal Code that apply design guidelines similar to those found in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan’s Design District 5 to Areas A and administrative design guidelines to certain developments in Areas B and C.

The public view shown in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan and studied as View Corridor 1 in the DEIS is proposed for removal as
### Environmental Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important public view, a policy and/or regulation amendment would be necessary to protect this public view.</td>
<td>Development of Area A could enhance the eastern gateway with an entry sign or some other distinctive structure or landscape feature (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-17).</td>
<td>Part of the Comprehensive Plan amendments in the FEIS Review alternative, which will make mitigation measures associated with that view corridor in the Proposed Action inapplicable to the FEIS Review alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the City decides that the public view shown in the Everest Neighborhood Plan is important then redevelopment of Areas A, B, and C could be designed to not obstruct the major territorial view at the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way shown in the Everest Neighborhood Plan (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-23).</td>
<td>The PLA 5C Subarea has provisions for greater height limitation and larger setbacks and limitation of horizontal dimensions where potential development is adjacent to single-family dwellings in the neighboring PLA 5A. These restrictions would apply specifically to Area B where it is adjacent to existing single-family uses.</td>
<td>The larger setbacks required when adjacent to a single-family dwelling in the neighboring PLA 5A zone in the PLA 5C zone discussed in the Proposed Action will no longer require mitigation since that feature is being removed from the FEIS Review alternative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Potential Mitigation Measures

- Under the Proposed Action, Area A would redevelop under a new zoning designation, called CBD 5A for purposes of the DEIS. However, there are existing regulations in the CBD 5 zone that could be retained or enhanced as mitigation measures under the new CBD 5A zoning regulations:
  - Consider limiting heights of buildings and/or setbacks for upper stories of buildings located adjacent to Peter Kirk Park.
  - Consider locating pedestrian-oriented activities on façades facing Peter Kirk Park.
  - Consider setbacks for upper stories of buildings facing Central Way.

- Under the Proposed Action, amendment to the PLA 5C Zoning Code is contemplated to allow for buildings to be closer to existing single-family dwelling units in adjoining multifamily zones and to allow for taller buildings on smaller lots. Therefore, some key features of existing PLA 5C zoning could be retained or enhanced in some form to mitigate effects of redevelopment in Areas B and C. This would require that the following regulations be retained or enhanced in the PLA 5C zone:
  - Setbacks for upper stories for buildings to mitigate for taller buildings allowed on smaller lots.
  - Setback for upper stories for buildings whose façades face an existing single-family use.
  - Landscape buffers in the PLA 5C zone when adjoining low-density uses in the PLA 5A zone.

### Aesthetics

**Impacts Common to All Alternatives**

**Visual Character**

October 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives total office and commercial square footage in the analysis area would significantly increase, and all alternatives are likely to result in development of larger buildings than currently exist in each area, as well as greater area coverage. This increased coverage will make buildings more visually prominent in all three of the planned action areas. This increased visual mass could create a more intensive character along street frontages and may affect pedestrian comfort levels.</td>
<td>views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impacts to uphill territorial views along Market Street, Kirkland Way, and the waterfront, as well as local views along 3rd Street, Kirkland Avenue, and State Street are expected under the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives.</td>
<td>For recreational users of Peter Kirk Park, all three alternatives would change the existing visual foreground through the addition of larger buildings. Although views are expected to change, they are not expected to be significantly affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view of the analysis area by nearby residents and business occupants is typically filtered by buildings and vegetation in the foreground, as the area is highly developed and there are numerous existing large commercial/office buildings adjacent to the analysis area. Additionally, Policy CC-4.5 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan indicates that private views are not protected.</td>
<td>The view of the analysis area by nearby residents and business occupants is typically filtered by buildings and vegetation in the foreground, as the area is highly developed and there are numerous existing large commercial/office buildings adjacent to the analysis area. Additionally, Policy CC-4.5 of the City’s Comprehensive Plan indicates that private views are not protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the largest viewer groups in the analysis area comprises motorists traveling along local roadways. The overall visual character of the roadway and surrounding area will be consistent with the visual character under existing conditions from the perspective of motorists, as urban development flanking the roadway is already the dominant feature. However, motorists are one of the most impacted viewer groups affected by the changes to views looking southwest towards Downtown and Lake Washington from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street. The larger visual mass of buildings under all alternatives is expected to block views to portions of the sky visible to the southwest from this intersection.</td>
<td>One of the largest viewer groups in the analysis area comprises motorists traveling along local roadways. The overall visual character of the roadway and surrounding area will be consistent with the visual character under existing conditions from the perspective of motorists, as urban development flanking the roadway is already the dominant feature. However, motorists are one of the most impacted viewer groups affected by the changes to views looking southwest towards Downtown and Lake Washington from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street. The larger visual mass of buildings under all alternatives is expected to block views to portions of the sky visible to the southwest from this intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction under all alternatives will create temporary changes in views of the analysis area. Construction activities will introduce heavy equipment into the surrounding public roadways, and residential and commercial properties. Safety and directional signage will also be a visible element. Viewer groups in the analysis area and vicinity may not be accustomed to seeing construction activities and equipment; their sensitivity to such impacts will be expected to be moderate. Since these activities are short term, temporary impacts to viewers are not expected to be significant.</td>
<td>Construction under all alternatives will create temporary changes in views of the analysis area. Construction activities will introduce heavy equipment into the surrounding public roadways, and residential and commercial properties. Safety and directional signage will also be a visible element. Viewer groups in the analysis area and vicinity may not be accustomed to seeing construction activities and equipment; their sensitivity to such impacts will be expected to be moderate. Since these activities are short term, temporary impacts to viewers are not expected to be significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light and Glare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment under all three alternatives has the potential to increase ambient light and glare in each of the three planned action areas, primarily through the increased presence of exterior building illumination and increased vehicular traffic.</td>
<td>Shading Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shading Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All alternatives allow for an increase in building heights over existing conditions. As such, all alternatives are likely to generate increased shading conditions on surrounding properties and streets. This increased shading will be most pronounced during winter, when days are shortest, the sun is lowest in the sky, and there are fewer sunny days. During certain winter periods, the portion of Central Way adjacent to Area A could potentially be in perpetual shadow under each alternative.</td>
<td>All alternatives allow for an increase in building heights over existing conditions. As such, all alternatives are likely to generate increased shading conditions on surrounding properties and streets. This increased shading will be most pronounced during winter, when days are shortest, the sun is lowest in the sky, and there are fewer sunny days. During certain winter periods, the portion of Central Way adjacent to Area A could potentially be in perpetual shadow under each alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shading is also anticipated on properties to the north side of Central Way and the eastern portion of Peter Kirk Park. Similarly, the buildings in Areas B and C will shade streets immediately to the north during winter months under all alternatives.</td>
<td>Shading is also anticipated on properties to the north side of Central Way and the eastern portion of Peter Kirk Park. Similarly, the buildings in Areas B and C will shade streets immediately to the north during winter months under all alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Action

**Visual Character**

**Area A**

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.

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.

**Area B**

The Proposed Action has the potential to impact low-density uses to the southwest through the removal of the PLA 5A setback.

**Area C**

The increased height and footprint allowed in the area would greatly increase the area's visual prominence from 6th Street and could potentially adversely affect the pedestrian environment if conflicts of scale are not addressed in building design.

**Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

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.

**Southwest Territorial Views**

New development under the Proposed Action would be more expansive than existing conditions and would create a visual impact.

**Southwest Territorial Views**

Two territorial views identified in the Comprehensive Plan

### No Action Alternative

**Visual Character**

**Area A**

No changes to height limits or setbacks would occur, so lot coverage is expected to increase as a result of development under the No Action alternative.

**Area B**

The No Action visual analysis assumes that the existing office uses would redevelop as multifamily residential. This conversion would improve visual character in Area B by making the area more visually compatible with the residential uses located to the east and south. However, building height could increase from 2-story office buildings to the lesser of 4-story or 40 feet. Also, changing from office to residential would reduce visual compatibility with the office uses located to the west.

**Area C**

Under the No Action alternative, building heights and area coverage would increase over existing conditions. Lot coverage would also increase, though setbacks from 6th Street would remain unchanged. Similar to the Proposed Action, the increased visual prominence could potentially degrade the pedestrian environment.

**Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

New development under the No Action alternative would be more expansive than existing conditions and would create a visual impact.

**Southwest Territorial Views**

Two territorial views identified in the Comprehensive Plan

### FEIS Review Alternative

**Visual Character**

**Area A**

The FEIS Review alternative includes both a building setback and upper-story setbacks along the area's boundary with Peter Kirk Park, resulting in less height and bulk adjacent to this important community landmark than considered in the Proposed Action. Upper-story setbacks along Central Way would also act to reduce the visual bulk of the property compared to the Proposed Action 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.

**Area B**

The FEIS Review alternative would closely resemble the No Action alternative in height, lot coverage, and building type (i.e., residential, or mixed-use with residential) allowed. As such, impacts on visual character are expected to be less than under the Proposed Action in which buildings would be taller and the type of building would differ from those located to the south and east.

**Area C**

The FEIS Review alternative is essentially the same as the Proposed Action, save for the reduction of maximum height from 60 feet to 52 feet. The lower height limit would reduce visual bulk on the property, and reduce impacts on visual character, as compared with the Proposed Action.

**Pedestrians and Bicyclists**

Impacts on views for pedestrians and bicyclists are expected to be similar under the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action. New development would still encroach upon the visual environment; however, increased setbacks of upper floors along Central Way and Peter Kirk Park 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...
**Territorial Views**

**View Corridor 1**

Impacts on View Corridor 1 (southwest view from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street) are expected to be similar to those under the Proposed Action. New development would encroach into the periphery of the view corridor; however, the effect of an imposing visual element along the south side of the view corridor would be reduced from the Proposed Action by the increased setbacks of upper floors along Central Way.

**View Corridor 2**

Impacts on View Corridor 2 (southwest view from the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way) are expected to be similar to those under the Proposed Action.

**Rooftop Appurtenances**

There will be rooftop appurtenances in Area A that exceed the maximum building height in the FEIS Review alternative by up to 16 feet not to exceed 25% of the total building rooftop (see Appendix B). Depending on location and actual height of rooftop appurtenances, they may be visible from View Corridor 1. However, existing vegetation already partially obscures middle ground views of the lake in View Corridor 2. Additionally, the FEIS Review alternative’s design guidelines (Appendix C) state that rooftop equipment shall be located or screened so as not to be visible from public streets or other public spaces. Thus, the appurtenances would tend to blend into existing vegetation or be partially obscured during the winter and either blend into or be totally obscured in the summer. With this mitigation measure and the amount of existing vegetation, there will be no significant impact from rooftop appurtenances on view corridors.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two 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) and the gateway view to the southwest from the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way (View Corridor 2).</td>
<td>Look directly to the analysis area: the gateway view to the southwest from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street (View Corridor 1) and the gateway view to the southwest from the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way (View Corridor 2).</td>
<td>Development, lessening the visual encroachment of new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Corridor 1</td>
<td>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 (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.</td>
<td>No Action 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 at eight stories would be below the lake and mountains in the visual line of sight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View Corridor 2</td>
<td>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 eight stories would be below the lake and mountains in the visual line of sight.</td>
<td>No Action 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thus, the new development would tend to blend into the middle ground view below the viewer’s line of sight to the water, which is the high quality view from View Corridor 2. During the winter, existing vegetation would tend to filter much of the new development, so that it was only partially visible in the middle ground. Summer views of the new development would almost entirely be screened by existing deciduous vegetation.</td>
<td>The new development under the No Action alternative would tend to blend into the middle ground view below the viewer’s line of sight to the water, which is the high quality view from View Corridor 2. During the winter, existing vegetation would tend to filter much of the new development, so that it was only partially visible in the middle ground. Summer views of the new development would almost entirely be screened by existing deciduous vegetation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li ht and lare</td>
<td>Li ht and lare</td>
<td>Li ht and lare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>Area A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased development in Area A has the potential to increase</td>
<td>The increased square footage of office and retail space in</td>
<td>Impacts on light and glare under the FEIS Review alternative in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ambient Light and Glare

**Proposed Action**
- Ambient light and glare, primarily through the increased presence of exterior building illumination and increased vehicular 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.

**Area B**
- Under the Proposed Action, light and glare in Area B are likely to increase over existing conditions and the No Action alternative. The additional office space is likely to result in an increased need for on-site exterior lighting during evening hours. Increased light and glare from the area could potentially impact the primarily residential properties to the south and east.

**Area C**
- The increased square footage of office space in Area C could potentially increase ambient light and glare on 6th Street through increased exterior building illumination and vehicular traffic. However, as the property will be devoted to office uses, vehicular traffic is expected to occur primarily during daylight hours and the anticipated impacts from increased light and glare are minimal.

### Shading Conditions

**Area A**
- In Area A, the Proposed Action would result in an increase in shading conditions over the No Action alternative during winter months, when there are a larger number of shady days, as well as summer morning and afternoon hours. As illustrated in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, 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.

**Area B**
- Redevelopment of Area B for residential uses could potentially increase ambient light and glare by increasing vehicular traffic to the area during evening hours, which could impact other surrounding residential uses. Given the extensive vegetation of surrounding areas and the requirement for design review by the City, light and glare impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

**Area C**
- Similar to the Proposed Action, the increased square footage of office space in Area C could potentially increase ambient light and glare on 6th Street through increased exterior building illumination and vehicular traffic.

### Proposed Action Alternative

**Area A**
- Area A is anticipated to increase ambient light and glare along Central Way, 6th Street, and at Peter Kirk Park.

**Area B**
- Redevelopment of Area B for residential uses could potentially increase ambient light and glare by increasing vehicular traffic to the area during evening hours, which could impact other surrounding residential uses. Given the extensive vegetation of surrounding areas and the requirement for design review by the City, light and glare impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

**Area C**
- Similar to the Proposed Action, the increased square footage of office space in Area C could potentially increase ambient light and glare on 6th Street through increased exterior building illumination and vehicular traffic.

### FEIS Review Alternative

**Area A**
- Area A 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 included setback.

**Area B**
- Light and glare impacts in Area B are anticipated to be similar to those under the No Action alternative.

**Area C**
- Similar to the Proposed Action, the increased square footage of office space in Area C could potentially increase ambient light and glare on 6th Street through increased exterior building illumination and vehicular traffic.

**Shading Conditions**

**Area A**
- The No Action represents an increase in shading effects on surrounding development over existing conditions, but to a lesser degree than the Proposed Action.

**Area B**
- The No Action assumes that Area B will redevelop as a multifamily residential use. While not as tall as development allowed under the Proposed Action, area coverage under the No Action could potentially be greater, and buildings sited closer to the edges of the property would increase off-site shading effects. As shown in Section 3.3, Aesthetics, afternoon shading of the residential buildings to the east of the area is potentially greater under No Action than under the

**Shading Conditions**

**Area A**
- The FEIS Review alternative includes rooftop appurtenances that exceed the maximum height studied in the DEIS by up to 16 feet covering less than 25% of the rooftop and reductions in building size through building setback requirements. The shading analysis shows impacts on shading conditions under the FEIS Review alternative are anticipated to be less than 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.
**Proposed Action**

**Area B**

While building height would increase in Area B under the Proposed Action, the highest point of development would be located in the interior of the area, and shading impacts on surrounding properties would be minimal. Some shading of 5th Avenue and the apartment buildings to the east would occur in winter, but given the level of vegetation in the area, the surrounding residential areas are likely to be well shaded in any case.

**Area C**

The increased height of buildings allowed in Area C under the Proposed Action represents a moderate increase in shading conditions over existing development, but when compared to the No Action alternative, the increase in shading effects is minimal. Shading effects are most profound during winter mornings and afternoons. The Proposed Action could result in some increased shading of Area A (across 6th Street), the office building immediately north of Area C, and a portion of 4th Avenue.

**Proposed Action Alternative**

**Area C**

Shading conditions in Area C under No Action are similar to those present under the Proposed Action. While slightly less shading is anticipated on neighboring properties due to lower building heights, this still represents an increase over existing shading conditions. The building heights allowed under No Action are similar to those of surrounding development, so shading impacts are anticipated to be minimal.

**FEIS Review Alternative**

**Area B**

Shading impacts in Area B are expected to be similar to those under the No Action alternative. Afternoon shading impacts, both winter and summer, are anticipated to duplicate those seen under the No Action alternative. Shading impacts on the property immediately to the west of the area could potentially experience a small increase over the No Action alternative due to the removal of the special single-family setback. With the removal of this setback, the southwest corner of the area would be open to development that could shade the adjacent property. However, shading on the property immediately west of the area under the FEIS Review alternative would be less than found under the Proposed Action, which included removal of the special single-family setback and showed placement of a 6-story office building in the southwest corner of the Area B.

**Area C**

Shading impacts in Area C under the FEIS Review alternative are anticipated to be less than those under the Proposed Action. The reduction in maximum building height would reduce winter morning shading of Area A and winter afternoon shading.

### Incorporated Plan Features

**Proposed Action**

As detailed plans for redevelopment have not yet been developed, no incorporated plan mitigation features are included at this time.

**FEIS Review Alternative**

Similar to the Proposed Action, there are no incorporated plan mitigation features for the FEIS Review alternative.
### Proposed Action and No Action Alternative

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

Development in Area A under both the Proposed Action and No Action will be required to comply with all applicable urban design principles set forth in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan, *Design Guidelines for Pedestrian-Oriented Business Districts*, adopted by the Kirkland City Council in 2004, and/or any new design guidelines established by the PAO.

In addition, the following area-specific design guidelines would apply.

**Area A**

The Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan states that, in Design District 5, massing should be lower near the area perimeter, with taller structures placed in the interior. Building facades over 2 stories should employ stepbacks, and special attention should be paid to the connection to Peter Kirk Park. Development should not place service entrances along the interface with the park, and landscaping and pedestrian linkages should be provided.

Development of Area A under the Proposed Action could also incorporate the following additional Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan features also outlined from Section 3.2, *Plans and Policies*:

- The development of Area A occurs adjacent to a public view from the eastern gateway to Downtown at Central Way and 6th Street identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-16). If the City decides that this is an important public view, a policy or regulation amendment would be necessary to protect this public view.
- Development of Area A could enhance the eastern gateway with an entry sign or some other distinctive structure or landscape feature (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-17).
- Development of Area A could maintain, enhance, and improve the definition of the major east–west pedestrian pathway between Area A and the rest of the Downtown shopping district, as well as provide pedestrian connections through Area A to 4th Avenue and 2nd Avenue (City of Kirkland 2004, pp XV.D-7 and XV.D-17).
- Development of Area A could strengthen the visual prominence of Peter Kirk Park and improve pedestrian connections between Area A and the park (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-18).
- Enhancements to the pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and parking as outlined in the Circulation section of the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan (City of Kirkland 2004, p XV.D-20) could be considered as part of the redevelopment of Area A.

The nearby intersection of Central Way and 6th Street is a designated gateway area, and the following design tools from the City’s design guidelines could be employed to reduce impacts on visual character.

- Vertical and horizontal facade modulation (p. 23-24). These are useful tools for breaking the visual monotony of a building and reducing its visual mass. Vertical modulation consists of varying the height of a building, which often gives the impression of a collection of smaller structures, rather than a single mass. Horizontal modulation includes the use of pedestrian elements (awning, balconies, window details, etc.), as well as upper-story setbacks and varied roof forms. Upper-story setbacks are particularly important for reducing shading effects created by the increased height of development in the area.
- Gateway feature (p. 15). The intersection of Central Way and 6th Street has been identified as a gateway into Downtown, and the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan states that development in this location should promote a positive image of the City. Street corners are centers of increased vehicular and pedestrian activity, and this portion of the area provides heightened visibility. Further discussion of appropriate design elements can be found in the City’s design guidelines, in the section titled, *Public Improvements and Site Features*.

**FEIS Review Alternative**

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

Development in Area A would be required to comply with the applicable urban design principles set forth in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan as amended by the FEIS Review alternative, and with the design guidelines included as part of the FEIS Review alternative (Appendix C), consistent with those mitigations anticipated in the Proposed Action.

The FEIS Review alternative includes similar mitigation measures as those outlined under the Proposed Action for Applicable Regulations and Commitments with the following exception:

- The public view identified at the eastern gateway to Downtown is being replaced with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405 in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan as part of the FEIS Review alternative. Therefore, mitigation associated with that view corridor is removed from the FEIS Review alternative.

In addition, the requirement that rooftop appurtenances be screened or made invisible from public places contained in the zoning code amendments (Appendix B and KZC 115.120) and design guidelines (Appendix C) will mitigate the effect of rooftop appurtenances that exceed the maximum height by up to 16 feet in Area A.
Proposed Action | Action Alternative | FEIS Review Alternative
---|---|---
Other potential mitigation measures | | Other potential mitigation measures

**Area A**

In addition to the City’s design guidelines, the following mitigation measures could be incorporated to reduce aesthetic impacts in Area A.

- Require setbacks, step backs of upper stories of taller buildings, and/or limits to maximum building heights in areas of the area 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 in order 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.

During construction the following measures could be taken to minimize temporary visual impacts:

- 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.

**Areas B and C**

Include Areas B and C within a City design district that allows the City to employ design guidelines similar to those described under Applicable Regulations and Commitments.

As part of the Zoning Code amendment requested by the Area C applicant, the City could require greater setbacks for any building proposed for over 30 feet in height above average building elevation on less than 1 acre of land in the PLA 5C zone. This mitigation measure primarily affects Areas B and C—since other parcels in the PLA 5C zone are larger than 1 acre in size—and would account for the effect that taller buildings would have on smaller building sites.

The following design considerations are also recommended:

- All building entries could be well lit. Building facades in pedestrian areas could provide lighting to walkways and sidewalks.
### Environmental Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>through building-mounted lights, canopy or awning-mounted lights, and display window lights. Design could encourage variety in the use of light fixtures to give visual variety from one building facade to the next. Back-lit or internally-lit translucent awnings could be prohibited (City of Kirkland 2004).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· External building lights could be constructed in such a way as to shield nearby development from excess light and glare, particularly when adjacent to residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Blank walls could be avoided near sidewalks, parks, and pedestrian areas. Where unavoidable, blank walls could be treated with landscaping, art, or other architectural treatments (City of Kirkland 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Impact Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon the City’s Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines, an adverse operational impact is identified at the following 10 intersections by 2014:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/6th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 6th Street/4th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Kirkland Way/6th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/5th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Market Street/15th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concurrency V/C Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022. 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intersection located in the southwest region is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40 in 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· 114th Ave NE/NE 85th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic Impact Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon the City’s Transportation Impact Analysis guidelines, an adverse operational impact is identified at the following three intersections by 2014:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concurrency V/C Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon the City’s concurrency guidelines the following adverse operational impacts are identified by 2014 and 2022. 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under the No Action scenario for 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FEIS Review alternative would generally result in similar or lesser transportation impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action in the DEIS. The changes in building sizes and uses in Area B and C resulted in a reduction of 11 PM peak hour tips for the FEIS Review alternative as shown in DEIS Table 3.4-10 which is reproduced in Section 3.4 of the FEIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>Action Alternative</td>
<td>FEIS Review Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceeds the threshold by 0.01.</td>
<td>Two intersections located in the southwest subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>- Lake Washington Boulevard/NE 38th Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three intersections located in the southwest region are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40.</td>
<td>- 114th Ave/NE 85th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6th Street/Central Way</td>
<td>In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is expected to exceed its threshold of 0.92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 114th Ave/NE 85th Street</td>
<td>One intersection in the northwest subarea is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, the subarea average for the southwest subarea is expected to exceed its threshold of 0.92.</td>
<td>- 116th Way NE/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One intersection in the northwest subarea is expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</td>
<td>The subarea average for the northwest subarea exceeds its threshold of 1.01.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 116th Way NE/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td>Two intersections in the northeast subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subarea average for the northwest subarea exceeds its threshold of 1.01.</td>
<td>- 124th Avenue NE/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two intersections in the northeast subarea are expected to exceed the concurrency threshold of 1.40:</td>
<td>- Totem Lake Boulevard/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 124th Avenue NE/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td>However, the subarea average V/C is expected to remain under its threshold.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Totem Lake Boulevard/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Area A, 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. 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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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. Additional parking stall and aisle design efficiencies could raise this value another 100 spaces to 3,750.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since proposals for Areas B and C do not include any provisions for reduced parking supply, it is assumed that future development in these areas would follow provisions of the City’s zoning code.

### 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.

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.

The FEIS Review alternative is similar to the Proposed Action for Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility.

### Transit Service

Higher density under the Proposed Action would be more conducive to transit service and would support the City’s transit policies.

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.

The FEIS Review alternative is similar to the Proposed Action for Transit Service.

### Greenhouse Gasses

Greenhouse gas emissions are expected to increase with increased vehicle traffic. However, trip reduction measures would also have the effect of reducing greenhouse gases. The Proposed Action generates greater GHG emissions, but when accounting for regional growth the Proposed Action would generate less GHG emissions than the No Action Alternative.

Greenhouse gas emissions are expected to increase with increased vehicle traffic. However, trip reduction measures would also have the effect of reducing greenhouse gases.

The FEIS Review alternative is similar to the Proposed Action for Greenhouse Gasses.

### Mitigation Measures For Proposed Action

- **Incorporated Plan Features**
  - There are no Incorporated Plan Features mitigations.

- **Other Potential Mitigation Measures**
  - Under the Proposed Action, Area A includes a total of 3,500 parking spaces, which is lower than the approximate 5,100 spaces that would be required under current zoning.
  - The parking demand estimate for the Area A mixed-use project was determined by considering the following factors:
The Area A development would include a transportation demand management plan developed for the office tenants to increase transit, carpooling, walking, and bicycling to work. Increased use of these modes would reduce the parking demand associated with the office use. In addition, some of the retail and restaurant customers are expected to walk to the area from nearby residential uses.

**Internal and multi-stop trips.** Many of the daytime customers to the area’s retail and restaurant uses are expected to come from offices at the area. Likewise, hotel guests could also shop or dine in the area. No additional parking would be needed for these customers. Many of the area’s customers will visit more than one use. For example, a restaurant patron may also shop at the supermarket or retail store, or visit the theater.

**Peak demand by time of day or day of week.** The peak parking demand for each use occurs at different times of the day or on different days of the week. This allows some of the parking to be shared among uses.

### Capacity Improvements

Capacity improvement projects have been developed to address the intersection operational impacts identified for the Proposed Action and No Action scenarios.

The No Action scenario assumes a level of development in the planned action areas that could be allowed under current zoning. This assumption reflects a higher intensity of land use at these three areas than what was analyzed for the Comprehensive Plan. This is due to the fact that the City’s available land use capacity is greater than the land use needed to support future population and employment targets. Thus, the No Action assumes a level of development in the planned action areas that has not previously been analyzed through the development review process. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS for the No Action alternative represent required mitigation 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.

### TIA Results with Mitigation

The resulting LOS with mitigation for all intersections except one would be LOS E or better under both scenarios. The intersection that would remain at LOS F, NE 85th Street / 114th Avenue NE, would be improved to operate at better conditions than existing conditions (note, this intersection is operating at LOS F under existing conditions).

### Concurrency Results with Mitigation

#### 2014 Conditions

All concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to meet LOS standards under this scenario.

#### 2022 Conditions

All concurrency intersections and subarea averages are expected to remain below thresholds under both scenarios.

### Transportation Demand Management

The cumulative parking demand estimates for the office use require that some of the trips to and from Area A would occur by modes of travel other than SOV. To encourage use of other modes, the project proposes to implement a TMP for the office

---

**Action alternative.** The FEIS Review alternative improvement projects differ from the Proposed Action alternative in the following ways:

- Improvements at 6th Street and 7th Avenue (intersection number 169) have been modified. Only a northbound left-turn pocket is proposed at this intersection. Installing the southbound left turn pocket would require the removal of existing median and curb bulbs. The LOS failure at this intersection was the result of the northbound left turn volumes. A southbound left turn is not required to mitigate the impacts.

- The traffic signal proposed for Market and 15th Avenue (intersection number 211) could be installed at 7th Avenue instead, as long as adequate gaps are created at 15th Avenue to resolve the LOS failure.

- Improvements proposed at NE 85th Street and 124th Avenue NE (intersection number 402) would only reduce the average vehicle delay at the intersection by 3 seconds and primarily benefit the minor street traffic. Based on TIA mitigation guidelines alternative improvements, to be identified, along the 85th Street corridor of equal value will be substituted for improvements at this location.

### TIA Results with Mitigation

Under all three alternatives, the resulting LOS for all intersections except two would be LOS E or better. One of the intersections, 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).

### Concurrency Results with Mitigation

#### 2014 Conditions

Both the 2014 and 2022 concurrency analysis results for the FEIS Review alternative with mitigation in place and the Proposed Action are the same.

### Cost Estimates for Capacity Improvements

Table 3.4-23 in Section 3.4 of the FEIS summarizes planning level cost estimates for the capacity improvement projects that have been presented as mitigation measures. Capacity improvements
Environmental Summary
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Proposed Action

The following elements are proposed:

- 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.
- Implement a TDM program as a condition of development approval, with specific measures defined in the case it does not meet mode split targets.

Parking Management

The following parking management measures are proposed:

- 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 outside of Areas A, B, and C. 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.

FEIS Review Alternative

Presents in Table 3.4-23 would be funded by a variety of sources. Only the improvements that would allow restriping of the intersection of 85th Street NE and 114th Avenue NE are included as a funded project in the current 6-year capital improvement project. Funding for all other improvements could potentially include city funds, transportation grants, revision of the current citywide transportation impact fee, or developer improvements or contributions. Additional analysis and policy discussion would determine the amount of funds that would be derived from these sources.

Transportation Management Plan (TMP)

A TMP is required for each of the three planned action areas. A detailed program has been identified for Area A and is included as a mitigation requirement. This program includes specific measures to reduce vehicular trips including retaining a site transportation coordinator, carpooling, vanpooling and transit passes (see Appendix E).

Parking

The parking mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS have been refined and included as mitigation measures for Area A in the FEIS Review alternative. The mitigation measures provide specific requirements for operating the parking garage, reducing trips to and from the site, monitoring, and remedies to reduce parking spillover (see Appendix E). The City will require compliance with these measures with development under the PAO and when modifying existing parking standards, in conformance with Kirkland Zoning Code Section 105.103.3.c.

This FEIS and the PAO assume the maximum amount of development in Area A at 1.8 million square feet with a minimum of 3,650 parking stalls. If a smaller amount of building space is built, the amount of parking spaces could be scaled back proportionally based on the mix of office and non-office uses. A parking study would need to be prepared by the applicant similar to the one included in the DEIS to substantiate the reduction in parking spaces. However, even with a reduction in parking spaces, the mitigation measures included in Appendix E would still be required.
### Proposed Action

#### Permitted Parking in Neighborhoods
- If, over the long-term, monitoring indicates that even with the parking management measure described above in place, the 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 residents to park long-term in their neighborhoods at no charge, but would restrict visitors to an established maximum.

#### Measures to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- 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. Appendix D lists a variety of additional mitigation measures that could reduce GHG emissions caused by building construction, space heating, and vehicle usage.

#### Policy and Land Use Measures
- 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. 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.

### Public Services

#### Impacts Common to All
- Growth in employees and customers in the area as a result of the Proposed Action and FEIS Review alternatives will increase the demand for public facilities and services. Under all alternatives, there will be more intensive use of public structures and more intensive need for services. Under all alternatives, city staff would increase as growth in the community at large and the analysis area itself occurs. There would be greater growth anticipated under the Proposed Action and FEIS Review alternatives compared to the No Action alternative resulting from the larger amount of growth anticipated under the Proposed Action.

#### Police Protection
- During construction phases of development under the Proposed Action, No Action, and FEIS Review alternatives, construction activity may affect the response time of emergency vehicles.

#### Fire and Emergency Medical Services
- Under all alternatives, construction activity may affect the response time of emergency vehicles during the construction period. Under all alternatives, future development and the commensurate increase in jobs and customers may result in an ongoing increase in the Fire Department’s call load (including calls for emergency service and medical response). Future traffic growth may also impact the response time of emergency vehicles. The number of small fires and automatic fire alarm calls is expected to increase under both alternatives.

#### Parks and Recreation
- None.
- Schools
  - None.
**Environmental Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Proposed Action, growth in retail and commercial establishments may result in increased shoplifting and fraud crimes at a rate similar to other City retail businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater increases in vehicular and pedestrian traffic under the Proposed Action may result in a need for additional traffic enforcement over No Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the current proportion of incidents to employees at Parkplace were projected forward (0.75 incident per employee) there would potentially be 4,600 new calls for service (6,138 jobs multiplied by 0.75 calls for service).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon the Police Department’s methodology, the Proposed Action would result in the need for 3.1 additional officers (4,600 new calls for service divided by 1,500).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the use of Peter Kirk Park and other areas surrounding the analysis area increases, there may be an increase in calls for service over No Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire and Emergency Medical Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fire and Emergency Medical Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fire and Emergency Medical Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased numbers of customers and employees resulting from redevelopment in Areas A, B, and C under the Proposed Action would result in a greater increase in calls and a greater need for firefighters in the companies responding to these areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the Fire Department’s methodology of accounting for additional staffing needs, the overall increase in firefighting and EMS staff for the Proposed Action would be as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Firefighter - 8 FTEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EMS firefighter - 4 FTEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The higher building heights that are part of the Proposed Action would result in a need to change the way the Fire Department responds to fires.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No increase in firefighter or EMS staff is anticipated under the No Action alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and Proposed Action, fire and emergency medical calls for service are expected to be comparable to those described for the Proposed Action in the DEIS. No new significant impacts are anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Recreation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arts and Recreation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arts and Recreation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Proposed Action, Peter Kirk Park, which is adjacent to the analysis area, may be impacted by increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the No Action alternative, Peter Kirk Park would remain unchanged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and Proposed Action, no new significant impacts are anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Action**

To Area A, will experience increased demand on its facilities. Greater numbers of employees using the park and park facilities (during their lunch hour and before and after work) will create additional demand for park furniture and equipment. There will be more pedestrians traveling across the park to Downtown and more pedestrians travelling from Downtown across the park to Area A, which may result in the need for improved and/or additional pedestrian connections. Use of existing neighborhood park facilities may also intensify.

Increased use of Peter Kirk Park under the Proposed Action will result in a greater need for maintenance and a greater demand for public amenities such as restrooms than under the No Action alternative; there may be a need for additional staff to provide such maintenance. Increased use of Peter Kirk Park under the Proposed Action will result in a greater need for maintenance and a greater demand for public amenities such as restrooms; there may be a need for additional staff to provide such maintenance.

The increased demand for adult lap swims at Peter Kirk Pool may increase due to the increase in daytime population in the neighborhood. Other recreational programs may see increased enrollment as well as the greater number of employees in the Moss Bay neighborhood participate in programs. The revenue from fees for enrollment may help offset costs of providing these recreational services.

Development of Areas B and C would likely have a lesser impact on Peter Kirk Park than Area A because of the reduced size and distance from the park. Because residential development is not a key element under either alternative, it is not expected that level of service standards would be exceeded.

**Action Alternative**

Experience increased demand on its facilities. Increased use of Peter Kirk Park under the Proposed Action will result in a greater need for maintenance and a greater demand for public amenities such as restrooms than under the No Action alternative; there may be a need for additional staff to provide such maintenance.

Increased use of Peter Kirk Park under the Proposed Action will result in a greater need for maintenance and a greater demand for public amenities such as restrooms; there may be a need for additional staff to provide such maintenance.

The increased demand for adult lap swims at Peter Kirk Pool may increase due to the increase in daytime population in the neighborhood. Other recreational programs may see increased enrollment as well as the greater number of employees in the Moss Bay neighborhood participate in programs. The revenue from fees for enrollment may help offset costs of providing these recreational services.

Development of Areas B and C would likely have a lesser impact on Peter Kirk Park than Area A because of the reduced size and distance from the park. Because residential development is not a key element under either alternative, it is not expected that level of service standards would be exceeded.

**FEIS Review Alternative**

Comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and Proposed Action, impacts on park and recreational services would be comparable to those under the Proposed Action. It should be noted that the FEIS Review alternative includes residential development that is not found in the Proposed Action. The FEIS Review alternative would allow an estimated 49 units in Area B and the possibility of 20 additional units in Area C (69 units total). Even though the DEIS did not assess effects of residential development on the parks and recreation facilities, the reduction in office employees that occurs when residential development is added into the mix of uses in Areas B and C offsets the addition of residential parks and recreation patrons in the analysis area. By allowing up to 69 dwelling units in Areas B and C, the FEIS Review alternative would also reduce the estimated number of employees allowed in the same area by 184 employees.

**Incorporated Land Features**

**Police Protection, Fire and Emergency Medical Services, and Recreation**

There are no incorporated plan features proposed at this time.

**Schools**

No residential development is proposed as part of the Proposed Action at this time; there would be no growth in the Lake Washington School District population under either alternative.

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

Under the FEIS Review alternative, no new or additional mitigation measures would be required for police services or fire and emergency medical services.
### Police Protection

There are no applicable regulations and commitments proposed for police protection services.

### Fire and Emergency Medical Services

Sprinkler systems would be required for all new buildings developed as a result of the Proposed Action. In addition, redevelopment would be required to install sprinkler systems when new square footage exceeded 25% of the original building square footage or when more than 5,000 square feet was added. All revenue from permit fees for Areas A, B, and C could be dedicated to providing the necessary plan review and fire inspection services to those areas.

### Parks and Recreation

Because residential development is not a key element of either alternative, it is not expected that level of service standards would be exceeded. However, if residential development were proposed per zoning allowances, such development would be subject to park impact fees.

Non-residents who work in Kirkland are offered resident rates when using City facilities. This approach by the City may result in increased numbers of new employees in Areas A, B, and C enrolling in programs and using City facilities. Costs of the additional use of facilities may be offset by increased revenue from program fees.

Several of the City’s Comprehensive Plan policies give guidance on possible mitigation measures, including:

- Based on Policy PS-3.4, the City could increase efforts to create opportunities for joint use of facilities that address the needs of the additional daytime population.
- Based on Policy PR-1.2, the City could work with the developers of Areas A, B, and C to incorporate design of pedestrian and bicycle routes that tie the areas together as well as tie them to Downtown.

As a condition of development approval, the City could require that development be physically integrated both in site and building design and that area designs include installation of pedestrian linkages consistent with major pedestrian routes shown in the Downtown Plan chapter of the Comprehensive Plan consistent with CBD 5 zone requirements.

### Schools

No residential development is proposed as part of either alternative. If the City was to adopt the Lake Washington School District’s Capital Facilities Plan and a school impact fee policy and ordinance, any residential units that may be built would be required to pay fees to the district, thereby mitigating costs to some extent. However, the Lake Washington School District would need to ask the City to adopt an impact fee ordinance in order to assess impact fees in the City. Without impact fees, the school district assesses mitigation pursuant to SEPA.

### Other Potential Mitigation Measures

#### Police Protection

The revenues from increased retail activity and increased property values could help offset some of the additional expenditures.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td>The FEIS Review alternative includes the same or similar mitigations as shown under the Proposed Action. The presence of residential development in Area B, and possibly in Area C in the FEIS Review alternative is not expected to increase or change mitigations related to parks and recreation or schools since it will be accompanied by a concurrent reduction in office space and employees in the analysis area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>Sprinkler systems would be required for all new buildings developed as a result of the Proposed Action. In addition, redevelopment would be required to install sprinkler systems when new square footage exceeded 25% of the original building square footage or when more than 5,000 square feet was added. All revenue from permit fees for Areas A, B, and C could be dedicated to providing the necessary plan review and fire inspection services to those areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Because residential development is not a key element of either alternative, it is not expected that level of service standards would be exceeded. However, if residential development were proposed per zoning allowances, such development would be subject to park impact fees. Non-residents who work in Kirkland are offered resident rates when using City facilities. This approach by the City may result in increased numbers of new employees in Areas A, B, and C enrolling in programs and using City facilities. Costs of the additional use of facilities may be offset by increased revenue from program fees.</td>
<td>Several of the City’s Comprehensive Plan policies give guidance on possible mitigation measures, including: Based on Policy PS-3.4, the City could increase efforts to create opportunities for joint use of facilities that address the needs of the additional daytime population. Based on Policy PR-1.2, the City could work with the developers of Areas A, B, and C to incorporate design of pedestrian and bicycle routes that tie the areas together as well as tie them to Downtown. As a condition of development approval, the City could require that development be physically integrated both in site and building design and that area designs include installation of pedestrian linkages consistent with major pedestrian routes shown in the Downtown Plan chapter of the Comprehensive Plan consistent with CBD 5 zone requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>No residential development is proposed as part of either alternative. If the City was to adopt the Lake Washington School District’s Capital Facilities Plan and a school impact fee policy and ordinance, any residential units that may be built would be required to pay fees to the district, thereby mitigating costs to some extent. However, the Lake Washington School District would need to ask the City to adopt an impact fee ordinance in order to assess impact fees in the City. Without impact fees, the school district assesses mitigation pursuant to SEPA.</td>
<td>Other potential mitigation measures The FEIS Review alternative contains the same mitigation measures as discussed under the Proposed Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Action</td>
<td>No Action Alternative</td>
<td>FEIS Review Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of on-site security services including video surveillance systems, to Area A in particular, may reduce the increased need for police response to that area. This reduction is largely dependent on the nature of the incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security-sensitive design of buildings and the landscaping environment, such as installing only moderate height and density border shrubs, could reduce certain types of crimes, such as auto and store-front break-ins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions as part of development approval for Area A could ensure that the needed additional firefighters are provided. Development in Area A could include a staffed medical aid station serving employees and customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development in Areas B and C would require one additional EMS employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased tax revenues from increased retail activity and increases in property values could address some of the additional costs to the Fire Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owners in Areas, A, B, and C will pay property taxes each year, based on the assessed value of their property, which will go toward ongoing park maintenance and other park and recreational services. In addition, new or expanding retail businesses will produce ongoing sales tax revenue, a portion of which will go to the City's general fund to pay for park facility maintenance and services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development conditions in Area A could emphasize connections between Peter Kirk Park and Area A in design of the buildings and landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the Lake Washington School District grows, there will be additional pressure on schools, particularly in the eastern portion of the District. To meet the needs arising from that growth in the event that residential uses develop in the areas of the Proposed Action, the District has the option of moving relocatable classrooms, making boundary changes for school attendance, engaging in new construction, modernizing its facilities, and modifying the education programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lake Washington School District also has the option of collecting impact fees under Washington State's Growth Management Act, and voluntary mitigation fees paid pursuant to the state’s Environmental Policy Act as well as the option of securing state funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts Common to All Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the No Action flow rates for Year 2022 were routed through the Central Way trunk sewer, surcharging (pressure flow) was observed in four runs of 24-inch pipe under 3rd Street between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Way and the King County Pump Station. Additional flows from redevelopment under the Proposed Action or FEIS Review alternatives would exacerbate this surcharging condition. In addition, data indicated that the Kirkland Pump Station and force main do not have adequate capacity to accommodate Year 2022 (No Action) projected flows. Increased flows under the Proposed Action or FEIS Review alternatives would heighten the effects of this deficiency.

**Water**

Based on the estimated amount of additional commercial and office square footage, fire flow requirements for Area A will increase from 3,500 gallons per minute (gpm) for 3 hours to 4,000 gpm for 4 hours. Using an estimated breakdown of land uses proposed for Area A, average daily demand (ADD) will increase from an estimated existing combined demand of 39 gpm to approximately 249 gpm. The estimates shown in this analysis are considered conservative (overestimated) to ensure that the water system is adequately sized for most office or retail uses being considered for Area A.

ADD in Area B would increase by 15 gpm.
ADD in Area C would increase by 12.7 gpm.

The computer model of the City’s existing water system was analyzed under existing conditions and with the additional projected demands from Areas A, B, and C. The analysis was performed to determine the available fire flow and dynamic pressure in and around Areas A, B, and C. The results of the analysis indicated that while available fire flows were often inadequate, service pressures were well above the Washington State Department of Health's minimum allowable pressure of 30 pounds per square inch (psi).

**Sewer**

Based on the estimated amount of additional commercial and office square footage, fire flow requirements for Area A will increase from 3,500 gallons per minute (gpm) for 3 hours to 4,000 gpm for 4 hours. Using an estimated breakdown of land uses proposed for Area A, average daily demand (ADD) will increase from an estimated existing combined demand of 39 gpm to approximately 125 gpm under the No Action alternative. The estimates shown in this analysis are considered conservative (overestimated) to ensure that the water system is adequately sized for most office or retail uses being considered for Area A.

ADD in Area B would remain unchanged at 5 gpm.
ADD in Area C would increase by 2.7 gpm.

The No Action alternative conditions were estimated from 2024 water system calculations provided in the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Water System Plan (2007). The analysis was performed to determine the available fire flow and dynamic pressure in and around Areas A, B, and C. The results of the analysis indicated that while available fire flows were often inadequate, service pressures were well above the Washington State Department of Health's minimum allowable pressure of 30 pounds per square inch (psi).

### Table: Proposed Action vs Action Alternative vs FEIS Review Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No incorporated mitigation measures are proposed.</td>
<td>No incorporated mitigation measures are proposed.</td>
<td>No new or additional mitigation measures are required for water supply or sewer services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicable Regulations and Commitments**

**Water**

Utility improvement costs are the responsibility of the applicant; however, the amount is dependent on a number of variables, including timing and funding of planned capital improvements, and participation of other developers.
The CIP provides a number of improvements as follows:

**Segment A.** This segment includes improvements identified as part of improvement number CIP 144. Replace an existing 8-inch diameter water main in Area A with a new 12-inch diameter water main. Replace the existing connections on the north side of Area A, crossing Central Way west of 5th Street and on the east side of the Area, crossing 6th Street south of 4th Avenue with 12-inch diameter water mains. Construct a new 12-inch diameter connection at the south side of Area A so that a looped connection is created to connect the proposed on-site 12-inch main to the existing 8-inch and 12-inch diameter water mains under Kirkland Avenue.

**Segment B.** Replace the existing 8-inch water main along 6th Street with a new 12-inch water main between the east side of the Parkplace water main loop to approximately the intersection of 6th Street and Kirkland Circle.

**Segment C.** Replace the existing 8-inch water main along Kirkland Circle from 6th Street to 4th Avenue with a new 12-inch main.

**Segment D.** Replace the existing 8-inch water main along 4th Avenue, 5th Avenue, and 10th Street from Kirkland Circle to 3rd Avenue with a new 12-inch main.

In addition to the above segments, one of the following segments must also be constructed in order to accommodate development under either the No Action or Proposed Action alternatives.

**Segment E.** Install a new 12-inch water main along the unimproved right-of-way between 2nd Avenue and 5th Avenue from approximately 4th Avenue to 10th Street. This improvement is not identified in the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Water System Plan.

**Segment F.** Replace the existing 8-inch water main along 2nd Avenue and 10th Street from 6th Street to 3rd Avenue with a new 12-inch main.

**Sewer**

Utility improvement costs are the responsibility of the applicant, however, the amount is dependent on a number of variables, including timing and funding of planned capital improvements, and participation of other developers.

King County Wastewater Treatment Division is in the process of designing upgrades to the sewer system that would provide sufficient capacity for projected Year 2022 flows. Upsizing of the 3rd Street sewer from 24 inches to 48 inches would eliminate the observed surcharging. While the planned upgrades to the pump station and force main are not being specifically designed to accommodate the Proposed Action, engineering analysis indicates that the increase in flows between the No Action and Proposed Action is minor and would not significantly impact the system.

**Other potential mitigation measures**

**Water**

There are no other potential mitigation measures for Water Utility.

**Other potential mitigation measures**

No new or additional mitigation measures are required for water supply or sewer services.
Proposed Action

In addition to the improvements required under No Action, the Proposed Action will require that the new 12-inch water main in Segment C be enlarged to a 16-inch main.

Sewer

While King County’s upgrades to the Kirkland Pump Station and force main, as well as the upsizing of the 3rd Street sewer, would provide sufficient capacity for No Action flows, the City will coordinate with the King County Wastewater Division regarding final design details of these improvements to ensure that Proposed Action flows can be accommodated. The City will coordinate with King County on the projected flows that would be generated by redevelopment in these areas so that the county can inform its facility planning department and incorporate projected flows into planning efforts. If final design does not include the necessary improvements to convey projected flows, a detailed backwater analysis could be performed to evaluate the severity of surcharging in the 3rd Street sewer and identify corrective measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the improvements required under No Action, the Proposed Action will require that the new 12-inch water main in Segment C be enlarged to a 16-inch main.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While King County’s upgrades to the Kirkland Pump Station and force main, as well as the upsizing of the 3rd Street sewer, would provide sufficient capacity for No Action flows, the City will coordinate with the King County Wastewater Division regarding final design details of these improvements to ensure that Proposed Action flows can be accommodated. The City will coordinate with King County on the projected flows that would be generated by redevelopment in these areas so that the county can inform its facility planning department and incorporate projected flows into planning efforts. If final design does not include the necessary improvements to convey projected flows, a detailed backwater analysis could be performed to evaluate the severity of surcharging in the 3rd Street sewer and identify corrective measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2. Description of the Alternatives

2.1. Introduction

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) issued on April 4, 2008 presented a description of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives and an evaluation of several environmental elements. This Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) completes the environmental review process by describing the FEIS Review alternative, addressing environmental analysis for the FEIS Review alternative, revising or clarifying portions of the DEIS analysis, and responding to comments on the DEIS.

This section of the FEIS focuses on changes in the alternatives since issuance of the DEIS and does not repeat information that is unchanged from the DEIS. Specifically, the reader should refer to Chapter 2 of the DEIS for a description of background issues, including the overall planning and planned action processes and prior environmental review. This section of the FEIS summarizes public involvement since issuance of the DEIS and provides a description of the proposal and alternatives, including the FEIS Review alternative.

2.1.1. Overview of the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action consists of two related actions: (1) three private requests to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, all concerning properties located in the Downtown area and near each other, and (2) a City of Kirkland (City)-sponsored proposal to adopt an ordinance establishing these three areas as a Planned Action for the purpose of Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) compliance, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington
(RCW) 43.21C.031(2)(a) and Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-164. Both actions are summarized below and described more fully in Section 2.5.

The Proposed Action consists of the following private amendment requests submitted by three separate applicants, and the associated City-sponsored action of adopting a Planned Action ordinance (PAO) for the three geographically proximate areas:

1. **Private Amendment Requests.** Three applicants have proposed amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code for the areas described below and shown in Figure 2–1.

   The private amendment requests are listed below as Touchstone Corporation, Orni, and Altom (Areas A, B, and C, respectively) using the City’s naming conventions.

   - **Area A, Touchstone Corporation (Parkplace).** This amendment request would allow redevelopment of the Parkplace retail and office complex located at 457 Central Way with as much as 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use. This development would represent an increase of approximately 1.5 million square feet of office and commercial uses in this area over existing conditions. This request would also increase permissible building heights throughout the site from 5 stories to 8 stories, allow increases in height within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park, and reduce setbacks along Central Way, 6th Street, and Peter Kirk Park.

     Additional Zoning Code amendments associated with this request include revisions to lot coverage standards, parking requirements, and site planning requirements. Implementation of this request would result in a new zoning designation for this 11.5-acre area.

   - **Area B, Orni.** This request would amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map from High Density Residential (HDR) to Office/Multifamily (O/MF) and rezone the area from Planned Area 5D (PLA 5D) zone to Planned Area 5C (PLA 5C) zone for approximately 2 acres of property located at 825, 903, and 911 Fifth Avenue, an area generally located east of the U.S. Post Office (Figure 2–1). Under existing PLA 5D zoning, properties with at least 1 acre, may construct multifamily buildings that reach a maximum height of the lower of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation. This amendment would allow office and office/residential mixed use as a permitted use and increase maximum building height allowed in this area to 6 stories or 60 feet above average building elevation.
Figure 2-1
Vicinity Map

Legend
- Planned Action Areas
  A = Touchstone (Park Place)
  B = Omi
  C = Altom

Source: City of Kirkland 2008
The Zoning Map proposal is accompanied by a Zoning Code amendment that would allow a reduction in the required setback in the PLA 5C zone when any portion of a structure is adjoining to a low-density use in the PLA 5A zone. Although it is likely that this amendment would only affect Area B where it abuts an existing single family use, the amendment would apply to the entire PLA 5C zone.

Based on the City’s review of development plans provided by the applicant, the Proposal would allow as much as 145,000 square feet of office space on this property, an increase of 111,300 square feet of office space over existing conditions in the area.

- **Area C, Altom.** This amendment request would rezone the area from Planned Area 5B (PLA 5B) zone to PLA 5C, while retaining O/MF comprehensive land use map designation for one parcel containing a single-story office building at 220 6th Avenue. The City has expanded the area for consideration in this private amendment request to include the parcel to the north (605 4th Avenue) that contains two 2-story office buildings. The overall area for this proposed amendment request consists of approximately 0.9 acre located generally southeast of the corner of 4th Avenue and 6th Street.

  This rezone request would increase the maximum permitted building height from 30 feet above average building elevation to 6 stories or 60 feet above average building elevation. It would also remove the 1-acre minimum lot size standard currently required for a building height of the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet in the PLA 5C zone.

  Based on the estimated allowable development in the PLA 5C zone, the Proposal would allow for as much as 103,500 square feet of office space on the two parcels, an increase of 93,800 square feet of office space over existing conditions.

2. **Planned Action Ordinance (PAO).** The City is considering adoption of a PAO designating the three private amendment requests outlined above (Areas A, B, and C), and shown in Figure 2–1, as a Planned Action for the purposes of SEPA compliance, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164. A Planned Action designation allows for future streamlined environmental review of specific development proposals, based on a prior EIS that addresses potential impacts and mitigation of such development during the early planning stage. The DEIS analyzed specific environmental impacts and measures to mitigate impacts based on the proposed Comprehensive Plan and zoning amendments.
The environmental analysis conducted in the DEIS assumed that all parts of the Proposal, as described above, will be implemented. Following issuance of the FEIS, action by the City may include some or all of the elements of the Proposal. The City may adopt a PAO that includes all of areas A, B, and C, or one or two of the areas. The City may also adopt all, some or none of the proposed Zoning Code amendments and Zoning Map designations.

2.2. Environmental Review

The analysis area for purposes of this FEIS consists of the three noncontiguous areas (Areas A, B, and C) as shown in Figure 2–1. The DEIS provided an analysis of probable impacts to the natural and built environment and measures to mitigate identified impacts. This information was made available to City decision makers, other agencies, and the public for a 45-day comment period, from April 4 to May 19, 2008. This FEIS includes responses to comments received during this comment period, includes clarifications and corrections to the analysis, and provides a description and brief analysis of the FEIS Review alternative.

2.2.1. DEIS Public Comment

The City held a public comment period as part of the scoping process prior to preparation of the DEIS. As part of the scoping process, the City of Kirkland conducted an open house at City Hall on November 1, 2007 to take public comment on the Proposed Action and to provide information on public input regarding the environmental review process. Five people attended the open house and made comments on subjects such as building heights and views. No written comments were submitted at the public open house. Building heights and views were addressed in the Aesthetics section of Chapter 3 of the DEIS. During the scoping period two written comments were received via email encompassing issues related to surface water, parking, and transportation.

Once the DEIS was issued on April 4, 2008, the City held a 45-day DEIS public comment period. During this time, the City held a number of public meetings at which the DEIS was discussed. These included the following advisory committee meetings.

2.2.2. Advisory Committee Meetings

Planning Commission

The Planning Commission held public meetings that included public comment opportunities during the DEIS 45-day public comment period on the following dates:

- April 10, 2008
April 24, 2008: Public Hearing on private amendment requests and DEIS
May 8, 2008

In addition, the Planning Commission included the three private amendment requests with associated public comment periods on its agenda on the following dates outside of the 45-day public comment period:

- March 27, 2008
- May 22, 2008
- May 29, 2008
- June 12, 2008: Public Hearing on private amendment requests
- June 26, 2008: Public Hearing on private amendment requests
- July 10, 2008
- July 31, 2008
- August 14, 2008
- August 28, 2008

**Design Review Board**

The City’s Design Review Board conducted a review of the Touchstone (Parkplace) private amendment request proposal over the past year. Design Review Board meetings with this subject on the agenda were held on:

- May 14, 2007
- December 3, 2007
- January 7, 2008
- February 4, 2008
- March 11, 2008
- April 21, 2008

Each Design Review Board meeting allowed for a public comment period during which members of the public could make their opinions known. Design Review Board comments are addressed separately from the DEIS since the Proposed Action in the DEIS described a potential development in terms of overall bulk, scale, use mix, etc., rather than a specific design proposal. A future development application will need to comply with the City’s design review in accordance with the resulting amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and development code that will be reviewed and addressed in this FEIS.
Transportation Commission

The Transportation Commission reviewed and discussed the three private amendment requests that make up the Proposed Action on the following meeting dates:

- April 23, 2008
- July 23, 2008

Each Transportation Commission meeting allows a public comment period during which members of the public can make their opinions known. The Transportation Commission prepared a comment letter that was submitted as part of the public comment on the DEIS. Responses to the Transportation Commission letter are shown in Chapter 5 of this FEIS.

Parking Advisory Board

The Parking Advisory Board reviewed and discussed the three private amendment requests that make up the Proposed Action on the following meeting dates:

- April 10, 2008
- May 1, 2008
- August 7, 2008

Each Parking Advisory Board meeting allows a public comment period during which members of the public can make their opinions known. The Parking Advisory Board prepared a comment letter that was submitted as part of the public comment on the DEIS. Responses to the Parking Advisory Board letter are shown in Chapter 5 of this FEIS.

2.3. Description of the Alternatives

The DEIS studied a Proposed Action alternative (to approve a PAO, City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map and Zoning Map amendments, and amendments to zoning regulations for three noncontiguous private amendment requests) and a No Action alternative (to maintain current Comprehensive Plan designations, zoning designations, and development regulations). This FEIS addresses comments on the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives, as well as providing additional analysis of the FEIS Review alternative.

2.3.1. Analysis Area

As shown in Figure 2–1, the DEIS analysis area consists of three noncontiguous areas.
Area A, Touchstone Corporation (Parkplace). One 11.5-acre parcel with the address 457 Central Way located east of Peter Kirk Park, south of Central Way, and west of 6th Street. Area A currently contains approximately 238,400 square feet of office and retail uses with surface and garage parking on the site.

Area B, Orni. Three parcels addressed as 825, 903, and 911 5th Avenue generally located east of the U.S. Post Office, south of 5th Avenue, west of the Kirkland Parkplace Condominium complex, and north of the pedestrian walkway that follows the alignment of 4th Avenue, if the street were extended. Area B currently includes three 2-story office buildings totaling approximately 33,600 square feet.

Area C, Altom. Two parcels addressed as 220 6th Street and 603 4th Avenue located south of 4th Avenue, east of 6th Street, north of the 620 Kirkland Way office building. Area C currently includes one single-story office building and two 2-story office buildings, totaling approximately 9,600 square feet of office.

2.3.2. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action consists of three private amendment requests to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning Code regulations for three noncontiguous areas of land (Areas A, B, and C) located in or adjacent to Downtown in an area identified as the Moss Bay neighborhood; and the City-initiated adoption of a PAO for the three areas covered by the private amendment requests.

City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendments

The Proposed Action would amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map as follows:

Area A. Retain the Commercial (C) comprehensive land use map designation, but change the CBD 5 zoning to the new zoning CBD 5A designation noted below on this property.

Area B. Change the comprehensive land use map designation from HDR and PLA 5D to O/MF and PLA 5C.

Area C. Retain the existing O/MF comprehensive land use map designation, while changing its designation from PLA 5B to PLA 5C.

Zoning Map Amendments

The Proposed Action would amend the City’s Zoning Map to the following:
Area A. Rezone from CBD 5 to new zoning designation: (called CBD 5A for purposes of this FEIS) that is detailed under the zoning code amendments below.

Area B. Rezone from PLA 5D to PLA 5C to allow for office uses and mixed-use office/residential uses in taller buildings.

Area C. Rezone from PLA 5B to PLA 5C to allow for taller buildings.

Zoning Code Amendments
The Proposed Action would amend the Zoning Code in the following ways:

Area A. Create a new zoning designation called CBD 5A that would allow the same mix of uses and development standards as CBD 5, with the following exceptions (other changes may also occur in addition to this list).

- Allow maximum building heights to increase from 3 to 5 stories to 4 to 8 stories.
- Eliminate building setback requirements on Central Way, 6th Street, and along Peter Kirk Park.
- Allow an increase in lot coverage from 80% to 100%.
- Allow reduced on-site parking requirements based on shared use for a variety of uses allowed in the zone.

Area B. Allow a reduced building setback in the PLA 5C zone where a building adjoins a low-density use within the PLA 5A zone. Although this amendment is likely to affect only Area B, it will be applied to the entire PLA 5C zone.

Area C. Remove the requirement for a minimum lot size of 1 acre in order for maximum building heights to be the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet in the PLA 5C zone. Although this amendment is likely to affect only Area C, it will be applied to the entire PLA 5C zone.

Employment Capacity and Targets
The City plans for employment growth targets by working collaboratively with other cities to agree on each city’s share of the growth targets through the King County Growth Management Planning Council. The City periodically forecasts capacity for nonresidential development. To calculate capacity, the City estimates the maximum development potential of vacant and redevelopable properties under current zoning. This total development potential is reduced to account for current market factors, environmentally sensitive areas, right-of-way needs, and public developments such as

---

1 Since a new zoning designation is being contemplated, the DEIS reviewed major zoning features that could affect the development potential of Area A, including land uses, lot coverage and building setback, and building heights.
parks and schools. The results are summarized as capacity square footage for nonresidential development that is then converted to jobs.

According to the King County 2007 Buildable Lands Report (King County 2007 p VII-53), in 2006 the City had overall capacity for 12,606 jobs, which is 3,806 more than necessary to accommodate the City’s job growth target of 8,800 new jobs for the 2001–2022 planning period.

The Proposed Action would add to the City’s employment capacity by an estimated 3,798 jobs over the No Action alternative, increasing the City’s surplus of employment capacity above its target from 3,806 jobs to 7,604 jobs (King County 2007). It should be noted that for purposes of this FEIS and the DEIS, the City has utilized its standardized methodology for calculating employment that is consistent with the City’s BKR transportation model and provides more conservative employment figures. An approach that provides more detail on specific mix of land uses may result in lower employment estimates.

**Housing Capacity and Targets**

Similar to employment targets and capacity, the City plans for residential growth and is assigned a household growth target. In 2006, the City had capacity for 4,702 households, more than enough to meet the 4,152 households remaining to be met by the City’s 2001–2022 residential targets (King County 2007).

The Proposed Action is not expected to add to the City’s housing capacity since development is anticipated to occur as office or commercial use. However, the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map and Zoning Map designations requested under the Proposed Action would allow residential development as a future option. For purposes of environmental review, residential dwellings are estimated for select environmental topics as a worst case approach (aesthetics, schools).

**Planned Action Ordinance (PAO)**

The Proposed Action includes the adoption of a PAO. Review of a Planned Action is intended to be simpler and more focused than for other projects. When a permit application and environmental checklist are submitted for a project that is being proposed as a Planned Action project, the City must first verify that:

- the project meets the description of any project(s) designated as a Planned Action by ordinance or resolution;
- the probable significant adverse environmental impacts were adequately addressed in the DEIS; and
- the project includes any conditions or mitigation measures outlined in the ordinance or resolution.
If the project meets the above requirements, the project qualifies as a Planned Action project and a SEPA threshold determination is not required. However, the following City actions are still applicable:

- The project must continue through the City’s permit process pursuant to any notices and other requirements contained in the City’s development regulations.
- The project must still be analyzed for consistency with the City’s zoning and development regulations.
- Designation of a Planned Action project does not limit the City from using other authority (e.g., conditional use permit) to place conditions on a project. The City may still use applicable laws or regulations to impose conditions on a project qualifying as a Planned Action project.
- Public notice for a Planned Action project is tied to the underlying permit. If notice is required for the underlying permit, then the notice will indicate that the project qualifies as a Planned Action.

This permit process is illustrated in Figure 2–2.

The manner in which the City would monitor the development levels approved in the three planned action areas is likely to be as follows:

- Determine if the proposed land uses are within categories of land use studied in the DEIS, including office and various types of commercial (retail/commercial, restaurant, supermarket, hotel, movie theater, mixed retail, and athletic/health club).
- Establish the maximum development potential for each planned action area as reviewed in the DEIS. Development potential can be expressed in square feet of development and in total vehicle trips.
- Deduct from each planned action area’s maximum development potential the proposed development total to verify that the planned action area maximum development level is not exceeded.

The FEIS Review alternative is generally similar to or less intense than the Proposed Action, but differs in several specific design and use parameters. The FEIS Review alternative falls within the range of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The specifics of the FEIS Review alternative differ somewhat from the Proposed Action. If not specifically noted as a difference, the FEIS Review alternative features are consistent with the features of the Proposed Action.
City verifies the following for each proposed project:
- Is it within a Planned Action area?
- Is the project within the scope of the Planned Action Ordinance?
- Are environmental impacts within the scope of the Planned Action EIS?
- Does it include mitigation measures or conditions outlined in Planned Action Ordinance?

1. Prepare EIS
2. Adopt Planned Action Ordinance
3. Review Planned Action Projects

Developer submits application and environmental checklist

Questions

Q1 If a project is a Planned Action with no further SEPA environmental review, can the City add additional conditions to the project?

A1 Yes, but not for aspects that are addressed by the Planned Action Ordinance, and only if authorized by city regulations.

Q2 How will citizens know about a Planned Action project?

A2 Public notice of Planned Action projects is tied to the development review process. If public notice is required (e.g., design review), then the notice will indicate that this is a Planned Action project.

Standard City permit process

Additional environmental review required

Figure 2-2
Planned Action Area Development Process
City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendments

The City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the amendments under the Proposed Action, except as noted below (see Figure 2–3):

Area B

- Retain the existing HDR land use designation, similar to the No Action alternative.

City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative includes the following Comprehensive Plan text amendments that are consistent with the Proposed Action but were not specified as part of the Proposed Action in the DEIS:

Area A

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan consistent with mitigation measures identified in the DEIS to allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in CBD 5A and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures in CBD 5A.

- Replace the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405.

- Include a description of how development in Area A is subject to design guidelines of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for the Kirkland Parkplace booklet.

- Update the City’s employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters.

Zoning Map Amendments

The City’s Zoning Map amendments for the FEIS Review alternative are consistent with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The FEIS Review alternative Zoning Map amendments are the same as outlined in the Proposed Action, except as noted below (see Figure 2–4):

Area B

- Retain the existing PLA 5D zoning designation similar to the No Action alternative.
Figure 2-3

Review Alternative Comprehensive Plan Map Amendments

Source: City of Kirkland 2008
Figure 2-4
FEIS Review Alternative Zoning Map Amendments

Source: City of Kirkland 2008
Zoning Code Amendments

The FEIS Review alternative Zoning Code amendments are consistent with the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives reviewed in the DEIS. The Zoning Code amendments in the FEIS Review alternative are the same as those identified in the Proposed Action of the DEIS, except as noted below:

Area A

- Create a new CBD 5A zone.
- Require that development in Area A comply with the Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines contained in Kirkland Municipal Code 3.30 (see Kirkland Municipal Code amendments below).
- Require that the amount of retail provided equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development, consistent with the mix of uses discussed in the Proposed Action.
- Establish other land uses, including hotel, athletic club, and movie theater as allowed uses subject to conditions. These uses are consistent with the mix of uses considered in the Proposed Action.
- 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 Proposed Action.
- Establish the following maximum building heights (see Figure 2–5):
  - four height districts in CBD 5A with lower heights to the north and west and up to 115 feet maximum height (as noted in Figure 2–5), equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives,
  - maximum building height measurement points within the CBD 5A zone as shown in Figure 2–6, and
  - an exceedance in rooftop appurtenances height by 16 feet if covering less than 25% of the rooftop.
- 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 Proposed Action.
Figure 2-5
FEIS Review Alternative Maximum Building Heights for Area A

Source: City of Kirkland 2008

NOTE: DIMENSIONS ARE BASED ON PROPERTY LINE LOCATIONS IN OCTOBER, 2007 BOUNDARY AND TOPOGRAPHIC LAND SURVEY FOR TOUCHSTONE CORPORATION BY BUSH, ROED & HITCHINGS, INC.
Building Height Measurement Points

GENERAL NOTES:
1. Where a minimum of 75% of the Gross Floor Area of a building is located in area "A", the Building Measuring Point will be elevation 53.0 feet above sea level.

2. Where a minimum of 75% of the Gross Floor Area of a building is located in area "B", the Building Measuring Point will be elevation 63.0 feet above sea level.

3. Where a minimum of 75% of the Gross Floor Area of a building is located in area "C", the Building Measuring Point will be elevation 74.5 feet above sea level.

Area A: That portion of property area that lies west and south of a line between Property Corner H and Property Corner E.
Area B: That portion of property area that lies east of a line between Property Corner H and Property Corner E and west of a line from the centerline of the intersection of 5th Street and Central Way and property corner D.
Area C: That portion of property area that lies east of a line from the centerline of the intersection of 6th Street and Central Way and property corner D and west of 6th Street.

Note: Based on the Boundary and Topographic Survey for Park Place Center by Bush, Roed & Hitchings, INC., dated October 2007.

Review Alternative Maximum Building Height Measurement Points for Area A
Establish specific setback and stepback requirements based on location (see Figure 2–7), which are either consistent with or more restrictive than setbacks and stepbacks considered under the Proposed Action:

- Central Way. No setbacks along Central Way and 6th Street.
- Peter Kirk Park. A 55-foot minimum setback adjacent to the Park.
- South/southeast boundary. A 20-foot minimum setback along the south portion of the site adjacent to the existing office and residential uses.

Provide pedestrian connections as outlined within the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

Area B

- Add a mixed-use category limited to Area B that allows new office development so long as more than 50% of the building area on-site is in residential use. Office-only development will not be permitted. This mix of uses is consistent with the variety of uses considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives in the DEIS.

- Maintain existing height limits of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less for sites that are at least 1 acre in size, consistent with the No Action alternative.

- Remove special regulation that requires additional building setbacks from single-family uses in the PLA 5A zone for buildings over 30 feet above average building elevation, consistent with setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Add a special building setback regulation requiring that office use be set back at least 15 feet from residential uses on adjoining properties, which is as restrictive as or more so than setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Add a special setback regulation that requires buildings containing office uses that are over 30 feet in height to set back an additional 10 feet from the property line for portions of the building that are over 30 feet high, when residential uses are on adjoining properties, within the range of upper story stepbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.

- Require an administrative design review for mixed-use development, but not for residential-only development. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.
- Allow a maximum building height of 4 stories or 52 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less if the development site contains at least 0.8 acre. If the development site contains at least 0.4 acre, the maximum building height would be 3 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less. Heights allowed under the FEIS Review alternative are less intense than those considered under the Proposed Action.

- Require administrative design review for buildings over 30 feet in height. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

**Kirkland Municipal Code Amendments**

The FEIS Review alternative includes amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code that add a document entitled “Kirkland Parkplace Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which regulates the design of development in Area A, including the following specific features.

- Establish a network of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces in Area A and connecting Area A to adjoining streets and developments.
- Provide a large central open space.
- Building(s) south of the central open space must be terraced to allow for sun to reach 50% of the open space at 2:00 p.m. on March 21 and September 21.
- Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.

Features of the FEIS Review alternative’s Kirkland Municipal Code amendments were either included as mitigation measures for the Proposed Action or are consistent with assumptions of the Proposed Action in the DEIS.

**Planned Action Ordinance (PAO)**

The FEIS Review alternative includes City adoption of a PAO designating the three private amendment requests outlined above (Areas A, B, and C) as a Planned Action for the purposes of SEPA compliance, pursuant to RCW 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164. The Planned Action includes the following features:

- limits the amount of development in Areas A, C, and C;
- limits the amount of PM peak hour vehicle trips that may be generated by development in Areas A, B, and C;
- requires implementing TMPs for development anticipated in Areas A, B, and C and associated monitoring (a TMP was considered as part of mitigations in the DEIS); and
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- requires implementing a PMP for development anticipated in Area A and associated monitoring (a PMP was considered as part of the mitigations in the DEIS)

**Employment Capacity and Targets**

The FEIS Review alternative would add to the City’s employment capacity by an estimated 3,685 jobs over the No Action alternative, increasing the City’s surplus of employment capacity above its target from 3,806 jobs to 7,491 jobs (King County 2007). At the same time, the FEIS Review alternative would provide approximately 110 fewer jobs than the Proposed Action. It should be noted that for purposes of this FEIS, the City used its standardized methodology for calculating employment, consistent with the City’s BKR transportation model. This methodology provides more conservative employment figures. An approach that provides more detail on specific mix of land uses may result in lower employment estimates.

**Housing Capacity and Targets**

Similar to employment targets and capacity, the City plans for residential growth and is assigned a household growth target. In 2006, the City had capacity for 4,702 households, more than enough to meet the 4,152 households remaining to be met by the City’s 2001–2022 residential targets (King County 2007).

The FEIS Review alternative would require redevelopment in Area B to include residential dwelling units. In addition, Area C would be able to redevelop with either office, residential, or a mix of office and residential. Since the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives only assumed residential development for certain environmental topics (schools and aesthetics), the FEIS Review alternative assumes the addition of an estimated 69 units to the City’s residential capacity over the No Action alternative. Thus the FEIS Review alternative increases the City’s capacity for households to 4,771 dwelling units.

**Planned Action Ordinance (PAO)**

As described for the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would include the adoption of a PAO. The PAO for the FEIS Review alternative would be as described for the Proposed Action above.

**2.3.3. No Action Alternative**

The evaluation of a No Action alternative is required by SEPA. This alternative assumes that the three noncontiguous private amendment requests are not approved and implemented with an amended City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map and Zoning Map and revised zoning regulations and that future development is not facilitated with a PAO.
Under the No Action alternative, redevelopment and growth in employment and housing would be limited to what is allowed under the current Comprehensive Plan. The No Action alternative assumes an increased level of office and retail development in Areas A and C that City staff estimated could occur within the existing land use regulations. In Area B, continuance of existing nonconforming office uses is assumed.

The No Action alternative would affect the three areas as follows:

**Area A.** This area would redevelop consistent with current Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations, allowing an estimated additional 600,200 square feet of office and commercial uses over those present under existing conditions. The No Action alternative would include a total of 629,500 square feet of office use and 209,200 square feet of commercial uses (including mostly retail and restaurant uses, but also including a mixture of some or all of supermarket, movie theater, and athletic club).

**Area B.** This area would not redevelop because of its status as a legally existing nonconforming use under current Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations. The existing 33,700 square feet of office use would remain in place. However, for aesthetics and school services analysis purposes, the DEIS analyzed the potential aesthetic and public service impacts of redevelopment of Area B into taller, multifamily buildings allowed under current zoning regulations.

**Area C.** This area would redevelop consistent with current Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations, allowing an estimated additional 18,000 square feet of office use over those present under existing conditions on the Area C parcels. This scenario would include a total of 27,700 square feet of office on the two parcels. While no residential units are proposed, the DEIS analyzed potential impacts on school services if Area C were redeveloped with some residential uses.

The No Action alternative contains assumptions that result in the City exceeding its employment growth targets for 2022 by approximately 600 jobs. These assumptions include a combination of commercial development already constructed or within the development permit pipeline as of the date that this DEIS was written, as well as the assumption that redevelopment for Areas A and C represents the amount of development that city staff estimated would likely occur under the existing Comprehensive Plan. Existing nonconforming uses in Area B would remain with the exceptions noted above. These assumptions result in a greater concentration of employment growth within the DEIS analysis area than otherwise assumed by the City.
### 2.3.4. Alternatives Comparison

Table 2-1 summarizes features of the three private amendment requests that make up a portion of the Proposed Action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>11.5 acres of property at 457 Central Way</td>
<td>825, 903, and 911 Fifth Avenue. Three parcels of land totaling approximately 2.0 acres of land.</td>
<td>220 6th Street (applicant) and 603 4th Avenue (parcel to north) on 0.9 acre of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size/Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Conditions/Current Uses</strong></td>
<td>238,450 square feet of office and retail use with 742 on-site parking stalls (95,300 square feet of office, and 143,150 square feet of commercial uses).</td>
<td>Three 2-story office buildings on three separate parcels. Total office square footage according to the King County Department of Assessments is approximately 33,700 square feet.</td>
<td>Three office buildings on two parcels. The applicant’s parcel includes one single-story office building with approximately 1,400 square feet of office. The second parcel includes two 2-story office buildings with approximately 8,300 square feet of office. Total office square footage is approximately 9,700 square feet according to the King County Department of Assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Action Alternative</strong></td>
<td>629,500 square feet of office use and 209,200 square feet of commercial uses.</td>
<td>33,700 square feet of existing office. No Action alternative assumes that existing nonconforming office will remain. No Action alternative will also include a bulk and massing analysis of redevelopment to a multifamily development with heights for the lower of 4 stories or 40 feet above grade in Chapter 3.3, Aesthetics.</td>
<td>27,700 square feet of office building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Action</strong></td>
<td>1.2 million square feet of office use and 592,700 square feet of commercial (including a mixture of retail, restaurant, supermarket, movie theater, hotel, and athletic club). Proposed Action would provide approximately 3,500 parking spaces. The Proposed Action would include development of a</td>
<td>145,000 square feet of office uses. Requested change in Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning to permit both office and multifamily uses on property. The Proposed Action would: - allow a greater range of uses, in</td>
<td>103,500 square feet of office uses. Requested change in zoning designation to allow for additional height (application states “...to height of 126.48 feet”). The Proposed Action would allow the same uses; however, heights could increase from 30 feet to the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of the Alternatives

**Features**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new zoning designation that:</td>
<td>particular, office-only development, and</td>
<td>office/multifamily mixed-use;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- allows increases in height from a range of 3 to 5 stories to 4 to 8 stories;</td>
<td>- allow an increase in height from the lower of 4 stories or 40 feet to the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet;</td>
<td>- requires a Zoning Code amendment (as noted below) that would allow for a reduced setback for structures in the PLA 5C zone adjoining low-density uses within the PLA 5A zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- allows setbacks to be reduced to 0 feet on Central Way, 6th Street, and Peter Kirk Park;</td>
<td>- increase multifamily residential lot coverage from 60% to 70%; and</td>
<td>- require administrative design review for buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- allows buildings taller than 3 stories within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park;</td>
<td>- require a Zoning Code amendment (as noted below) that would allow for a reduced setback for structures in the PLA 5C zone adjoining low-density uses within the PLA 5A zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- increases the allowed lot coverage to 100%; and</td>
<td>- requires an increase in height from the lower of 4 stories or 40 feet to the lower of 6 stories or 60 feet;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- allows a reduction in required on-site parking over that required in existing Zoning Code in the area.</td>
<td>- require a Zoning Code amendment (as noted below) that would allow for a reduced setback for structures in the PLA 5C zone adjoining low-density uses within the PLA 5A zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEIS Review Alternative

**Area A**

- Create a new CBD 5A zone.
- Require that development in Area A comply with the Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines contained in Kirkland Municipal Code 3.30 (see Kirkland Municipal Code amendments below).
- Require that the amount of retail provided equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development, consistent with the mix of uses discussed in the Proposed Action.
- Establish other land uses, including hotel, athletic club, and movie theater as allowed uses subject to conditions. These uses are consistent with the uses considered in the Proposed Action.
- Prohibit retail uses from exceeding 70,000 square feet in size, and drive-through facilities, among others.
- Establish maximum height

**Area B**

- 49 dwelling units and up to 119,000 square feet of office uses.
- Add a mixed-use category limited to Area B that allows new office development so long as more than 50% of the building area is in residential use. Office-only development will not be permitted. This mix of uses is consistent with the variety of uses considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives in the DEIS.
- Maintain existing height limits of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less, consistent with the No Action alternative.
- Require administrative design review for mixed use, but not residential only, development.

**Area C**

- Requires a Zoning Code amendment (as noted below) that would allow for a reduced setback for structures in the PLA 5C zone adjoining low-density uses within the PLA 5A zone.
Area A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ouchstone Park</strong></td>
<td>Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.</td>
<td>over 30 feet in height. Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits as described below:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Four height districts with lower heights in north and west and up to 115 feet (see Figure 2–5), equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum building height measurement points within the CBD 5A zone as shown in Figure 2–6, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An exceedance in rooftop appurtenance height by 16 feet if covering less than 25% of the rooftop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require submittal of a study to justify parking less than required in the zoning code based on shared use and inclusion of a TMP and PMP as part of the parking reduction study, consistent with provisions of the Proposed Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish specific setback and stepback requirements based on location which are either consistent with or more restrictive than setbacks and stepbacks considered under the Proposed Action, see Figure 2–7:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Central Way. No setbacks along Central Way and 6th Street if there is a relationship between the building and the pedestrian level of development (such as retail uses). Otherwise, provide a building setback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peter Kirk Park. A 55-foot minimum setback adjacent to the park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South/southeast boundary. A 20-foot minimum setback along the south portion of the area adjacent to the existing office and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design review was considered a mitigation measure for the Proposed Action in the DEIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate special setback where zone abuts single-family residential use, consistent with setbacks considered under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a special building setback regulation requiring that office use must be set back at least 15 feet from residential uses on adjoining properties which is as restrictive or more than setbacks considered in under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a special setback regulation that requires buildings containing office uses that are over 30 feet in height to set back the portion of the building over 30 feet an additional 10 feet from the property line when residential uses are on adjoining properties, within the range of upper story stepbacks considered as part under both the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of the Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Area A</th>
<th>Area B</th>
<th>Area C</th>
<th>Area D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan. Establish a network of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces in Area A and connecting Area A with adjoining streets and developments. Provide a large central open space. Building(s) south of the central open space must be terraced to allow for sun to reach 50% of the open space at 2:00 pm on March 21 and September 21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEIS Review, Required Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment</strong></td>
<td>Remains Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation, but applies new zoning designation (called CBD 5A for purposes of this FEIS) and map that designation at Area A (see below for new zoning designation).</td>
<td>Designation remains HDR.</td>
<td>Remains O/MF 24, but changes designation from PLA 5B to PLA 5C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEIS Review, Required Zoning Map Amendment</strong></td>
<td>Create a new zoning designation (called CBD 5A for purposes of this FEIS) and map that designation at Area A (see below for new zoning designation).</td>
<td>Zoning remains PLA 5D.</td>
<td>PLA 5B to PLA 5C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEIS Review, Required Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment</strong></td>
<td>The FEIS Review alternative includes the following Comprehensive Plan text amendments that are consistent with the Proposed Action but were not specified as part of the Proposed Action in the DEIS: Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan consistent with mitigation measures identified in the DEIS to allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in CBD 5A and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*October 2008*
Features

- spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures in CBD 5A;
- Replace the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405;
- Include a description of how development in Area A is subject to design guidelines of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for Kirkland Parkplace booklet.
- Update the City’s employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters.


Create a new zoning designation (called CBD 5A for purposes of this FEIS) that differs from current CBD 5 zoning as described under the FEIS Review alternative above.
Amend the Kirkland Municipal Code to add a document entitled “Kirkland Parkplace Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which regulates the design of development in Area A as described under the FEIS Review alternative above.

Amendments to PLA 5D zone as described under FEIS Review alternative above.
Amendments to PLA 5C zone as described in Review alternative above.

Table 2-2 summarizes employment and residential outcomes and zoning requirements of the alternatives.
### Alternatives Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>FEIS Review Alternative</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jobs by 2022</td>
<td>6,138&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,025&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,340&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs by 2022</td>
<td>6,980&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,867&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3,182&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dwellings by 2022</td>
<td>0-71&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>69&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0-71&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Square Footage</td>
<td>2,041,200 square feet&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,012,900 square feet&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>900,100 square feet&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Private Amendment Requests**

City approval of the three private amendment requests that results in amendments to the Comprehensive Plan text and map, zoning text, and Zoning Map as outlined in Proposed Action in Table 2–1, above.

As described for the FEIS Review alternative in Table 2–1, above.

Retain existing City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Land Use text and map, zoning text, and Zoning Map.

**Planned Action**

Designate the three noncontiguous areas (A, B, and C) as a Planned Action and streamline environmental review for individual development proposals that are consistent with the Planned Action designation. Facilitate future development permit procedures with advanced environmental review by adopting a PAO.

Designation of the three noncontiguous areas (A, B, and C) as a Planned Action, as described for the Proposed Action.

Maintain standard SEPA review process for individual area-specific development proposals.

---

<sup>a</sup>This number reflects the following square footage/employee rates: 250 square feet for office and 500 square feet for the commercial component.

<sup>b</sup>A potential multifamily development allowed under existing zoning regulations was studied in Area B for purposes of reviewing height and views in DEIS Chapter 3.3, Aesthetics for the No Action alternative. In addition, potential multifamily development in the planned action areas was reviewed in the DEIS for purposes of a reviewing school impacts under Public Services.

<sup>c</sup>Area A: 1,792,700 square feet; Area B: 145,000 square feet; and Area C: 103,500 square feet.

<sup>d</sup>Area A: 838,700 square feet; Area B: 33,700 square feet; and Area C: 27,700 square feet.

<sup>e</sup>Under the FEIS Review alternative, redevelopment of Area B must include at least 50% multifamily development.

<sup>f</sup>Area A: 1,792,700 square feet; Area B: 119,000 square feet; and Area C: 101,200 square feet.

### 2.4. Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying Proposed Action

Delaying implementation of the Proposed Action would delay the potential impacts identified in the DEIS, including potential land use conflicts, changes to visual character, increased traffic congestion, and increased demand for public services and utilities. Delay would not allow new development and associated review processes to benefit from the analysis developed through this Planned Action process.
2.5. a or Issues to e Resolved

Adoption of a PAO and concurrent City of Kirkland Comprehensive Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning 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 the Downtown area consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. The key environmental issues facing decision-makers are:

- the impact of additional traffic on area roadways,
- adequate parking in the area,
- transit service and facilities to meet increased demand,
- potential land use conflicts,
- changes to visual character resulting from increased building heights,
- impact of increased building heights on public view corridors,
- increased demand on public services, including parks and recreation facilities and services, and
- mitigating measures to address all such impacts.
Chapter 3. FEIS Review Alternative Analysis

Chapter 3 compares the environmental impacts anticipated for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Review alternative to the environmental impacts described for the Proposed Action in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). In general, because the FEIS Review alternative would result in development levels that are greater than the No Action alternative and similar or slightly less than the Proposed Action, impacts are expected to be similar to those described for the Proposed Action and within the range discussed in the DEIS. Where potential impacts of the FEIS Review alternative differ from the Proposed Action, this Chapter provides additional explanation.

Consistent with the analysis in the DEIS, this Chapter addresses potential impacts associated with the following elements of the environment:

- Land Use Patterns
- Plans and Policies
- Aesthetics
- Transportation
- Public Services
- Utilities

3.1. Land Use Patterns

Development under the FEIS Review alternative would result in a land use pattern that is very comparable to that anticipated by the Proposed Action. In general, changes since the DEIS would reduce potential land use impacts. Specific changes that are now incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative include:
- **Area A.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would reduce height limit requirements along Central Way and in proximity to Peter Kirk Park. Increased setback requirements would also be required adjacent to Peter Kirk Park and along the south portion of Area A, adjacent to the office and residential uses. The FEIS Review alternative includes a requirement for a central open space as part of future development. The FEIS Review alternative would require that the amount of retail provided must equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development, consistent with the mix of uses discussed in the Proposed Action.

- **Area B.** In contrast to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would not allow office-only development. For mixed-use development, more than 50% of the building area on-site must be in residential use. The FEIS Review alternative would maintain the existing building height limit of 4 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, rather than increasing it as contemplated under the Proposed Action. The FEIS Review alternative would require administrative design review of mixed-use development.

- **Area C.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would allow a decreased maximum height of 4 stories or 52 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less, only if both sites are combined. If a single site is developed, 3 stories or 40 feet above average building elevation, whichever is less, would be allowed. Administrative design review for mixed-use development would be required.

### 3.1.1. Land Use Compatibility

The FEIS Review alternative would generally result in similar or lesser land use compatibility impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action in the DEIS. Changes incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative that would decrease potential land use compatibility impacts include the following:

- **Area A.** Compared to the Proposed Action, maximum building heights would be decreased along Central Way, and in proximity to Peter Kirk Park. In addition, minimum building setbacks would be required along the western and southern edges of Area A. This decrease in height and added building setback allows for greater compatibility with Peter Kirk Park, nearby residential uses, and surrounding buildings of lower height and smaller scale than does the Proposed Action.

- **Area B.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative’s inclusion of a requirement for multi-family residential uses in Area B would increase the potential of land use compatibility with adjacent residential uses to the south and east. Similarly, building height limits and administrative design review of non-residential uses would also help maintain future land use compatibility.
• **Area C.** Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would reduce the allowable maximum building height. This reduction would increase the potential for new development to be more compatible in height and scale to adjacent areas.

3.1.2. Employment and housing

Similar to the Proposed Action, development under the FEIS Review alternative would significantly increase the number of employees over current conditions. However, under the FEIS Review alternative, Area B would include some residential development, which may moderate and balance overall employee growth with a slight growth in residential population. However, because the growth in new residential population is likely to be relatively small, this change is not expected to be significant.

3.1.3. Mitigation measures

The FEIS Review alternative incorporates mitigation measures similar to those discussed for the Proposed Action. The FEIS Review alternative includes a Zoning Code amendment that requires a mix of office and commercial uses as an incorporated plan feature. Other amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code that are part of the FEIS Review alternative address pedestrian-oriented design guidelines.

The FEIS Review alternative would include elements that eliminate or reduce the need for some of the mitigation measures identified in the DEIS. Specifically, measures addressing building heights, setbacks, and building stepbacks are no longer directly applicable because these measures have been incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative. No new or additional mitigation measures would be required.

3.2. Plans and policies

The relationship of the FEIS Review alternative to applicable policies and regulations of the City of Kirkland is consistent with the DEIS analysis for the Proposed Action. As noted for the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative is also consistent with the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan. Compared to the Proposed Action, the FEIS Review alternative would increase consistency with the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan by retaining the existing High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation for Area B. No new impacts relative to comprehensive plan and regulatory consistency are anticipated.

3.2.1. Mitigation measures

Many of the mitigation measures described in the DEIS for the Proposed Action are also applicable to the FEIS Review alternative. However, some of the measures that address building heights, setbacks, and stepbacks have been incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative and are
no longer necessary or applicable. Similarly, the mitigation measure that addresses a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendment to change the Area B land use designation from HDR to Office/Multi-family (OMF) has been incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative and is no longer necessary or applicable. No new or additional mitigation measures are required.

### 3.3. Aesthetics

#### 3.3.1. Visual Character

- **Area A.** The FEIS Review alternative would include both a building setback and upper-story setbacks along the area’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.

- **Area B.** The FEIS Review alternative would closely resemble the No Action alternative in height, lot coverage, and building type (i.e., residential or mixed-use with residential) allowed. As such, impacts on visual character are expected to be less than under the Proposed Action in which buildings would be taller and the type of building would differ from those located to the south and east.

- **Area C.** The FEIS Review alternative is essentially the same as the Proposed Action, save for the reduction of maximum height from 60 feet to 52 feet. The lower height limit will reduce visual bulk on the property, and reduce impacts on visual character, as compared with the Proposed Action.

#### 3.3.2. Views

*Pedestrians and Bicyclists*

Impacts on views for pedestrians and bicyclists are expected to be similar under the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action. New development would still encroach upon the visual environment; however, increased setbacks of upper floors along Central Way and Peter Kirk Park 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.

*Territorial Views*

**View Corridor 1**

The public view identified at the eastern gateway to Downtown (View Corridor 1 southwest view from the intersection of Central Way and 6th Street) is being removed from the Moss Bay
Neighborhood Plan as part of the FEIS Review alternative. Impacts on this view corridor are expected to be similar under the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action. New development would encroach into the periphery of the view corridor; however, 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.

**View Corridor 2**

Impacts on View Corridor 2 (southwest view from the intersection of NE 85th Street and Kirkland Way) are expected to be similar under the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action.

**Rooftop Appurtenances**

There will be rooftop appurtenances in Area A that exceed the maximum building height in the FEIS Review alternative by up to 16 feet not to exceed 25% of the total building rooftop (see Appendix B). Depending on location and actual height of the rooftop appurtenances, they may be a visible middle ground element from View Corridor 2. However, existing vegetation already partially obscures middle ground views of the lake in View Corridor 2. Additionally the FEIS Review alternative’s design guidelines (Appendix C) state that rooftop equipment shall be located or screened so as not to be visible from public streets or other public spaces. Thus, the appurtenances would tend to blend into existing vegetation or be partially obscured during the winter and either blend into or be totally obscured in the summer. With this mitigation measure and the amount of existing vegetation, there will be no significant impact from rooftop appurtenances on view corridors.

**Light and Glare**

- **Area A.** Impacts on light and glare under the FEIS Review alternative would be similar to impacts under the Proposed Action, although the included setback would reduce impacts on Peter Kirk Park.

- **Area B.** Light and glare impacts in Area B are anticipated to be similar under the FEIS Review alternative and the No Action Alternative.

- **Area C.** Similar to the Proposed Action, the increased square footage of office space under the FEIS Review alternative could potentially increase ambient light and glare on 6th Street through increased exterior building illumination and vehicular traffic.

**Shading Conditions**

- **Area A.** The FEIS Review alternative includes rooftop appurtenances that exceed the maximum height studied in the DEIS by up to 16 feet covering less than 25% of the rooftop and reductions in building size through building setback requirements. As illustrated in Figures 3.3–1 and 3.3–2, the shading analysis showing impacts on shading conditions under
the FEIS Review alternative are anticipated to be less than 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.

- **Area B.** As illustrated in Figures 3.3–3 and 3.3–4, impacts on shading conditions under the FEIS Review alternative are anticipated to be similar to those under the No Action alternative. Afternoon shading impacts, both winter and summer, are anticipated to duplicate those seen under the No Action alternative. Shading impacts on the property immediately to the west of the area could be slightly increased over the No Action alternative as a result of the removal of the special single-family setback. With the removal of this setback, the southwest corner of the area would be open to development that could shade the adjacent property. However, shading on the property immediately west of the area would be less under the FEIS Review alternative than under the Proposed Action, which would remove the special single-family setback and place a 6-story office building in the southwest corner of Area B.

- **Area C.** As shown in Figures 3.3–5 and 3.3–6, impacts on shading conditions under the FEIS Review alternative are anticipated to be less than those under the Proposed Action. The reduction in maximum building height would reduce winter morning and afternoon shading.

### 3.3.3. Mitigation Measures

Development in Area A would be required to comply with the applicable urban design principles set forth in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan as amended by the FEIS Review alternative. Development would also need to comply with the design guidelines included as part of the FEIS Review alternative (Appendix C), consistent with those mitigations anticipated in the Proposed Action. The FEIS Review alternative includes similar mitigation measures as those outlined under the Proposed Action for Applicable Regulations and Commitments with the following exception:

- The public view identified at the eastern gateway to Downtown (View Corridor 1) is being replaced with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate 405 in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan as part of the FEIS Review alternative. Therefore, that mitigation associated with View Corridor 1 is removed from the FEIS Review alternative.

The Other Potential Mitigation Measures of the Proposed Action are incorporated into the FEIS Review alternative. No additional mitigation measures are required for the FEIS Review alternative.
Figure 3.3-1
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area A Summer Shading Conditions
Figure 3.3-2
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area A Winter Shading Conditions
Figure 3.3-3
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area B Summer Shading Conditions
Figure 3.3-4
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area B Winter Shading Conditions
Figure 3.3-5
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area C Summer Shading Conditions
Figure 3.3-6
FEIS Review Alternatives—Area C Winter Shading Conditions
3.4. Transportation

3.4.1. Impacts

The FEIS Review alternative would generally result in similar or lesser transportation impacts compared to those described for the Proposed Action in the DEIS. The changes in building sizes and uses in Area B and C resulted in a reduction of 11 PM peak hour trips for the FEIS Review alternative as shown in Table 3.4–1.

| Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Enter Arearips</th>
<th>Exit Arearips</th>
<th>Total rips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>No Action²</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Action³</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEIS Review Alternative³</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>No Action²</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Action³</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEIS Review Alternative³</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>No Action²</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Action³</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEIS Review Alternative³</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Development of Areas A, B, and C is assumed to occur by 2014 under both the No Action and Proposed Action scenarios – so the number of projected vehicle trips to and from the planned action areas would be approximately the same under the 2014 and 2022 scenarios.

² Trip generation derived from the BKR model.

³ Vehicle trips were estimated using trip generation rates provided in the Trip Generation Manual (Institute of Transportation Engineers 2003). Adjustments to vehicle trips were made, assuming pedestrian and bicycle modes would make up 3.5% of retail trips and 4% of office trips, and 6% of total office trips would be made via transit. These mode split assumptions were based on local census data and CTR data for the City.

⁴ If Area C includes the maximum number of multifamily units with a commensurate reduction in office space, the trips would reduce to 26 entering and 128 exiting.

This small FEIS Review alternative trip reduction would result in very little change in the forecasted traffic volumes. Thus, the results of the AM and PM peak hour level of service (LOS) assessment shown in DEIS tables 3.4–11, 3.4–12, 13, and 3.4–14 for the Proposed Action would be the same as those for the FEIS Review alternative.

In addition and 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. Additional parking stall and aisle design efficiencies could raise this value another 100 spaces to 3,750.
3.4.2. Mitigation Measures

Capacity Improvements

Table 3.4–2 presents the capacity improvement projects that have been developed to address the LOS and concurrency impacts identified for the FEIS Review alternative. The projects for the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives are also shown. The mitigation measures for the FEIS Review alternative are shown in Figure 3.4–1. The FEIS Review alternative proposes the same or similar 2014 capacity improvements as the Proposed Action alternative with three modifications. For 2022, the FEIS Review alternative proposes the same 2022 capacity improvements as the Proposed Action alternative.

The FEIS Review alternative improvement projects differ from the Proposed Action alternative in the following ways:

- Improvements at 6th Street and 7th Avenue (intersection number 169) would be modified; only a northbound left-turn pocket is proposed at this intersection. Installing the southbound left-turn pocket would require the removal of existing median and curb bulbs. The LOS failure at this intersection was the result of the northbound left turn volumes. A southbound left turn is not required to mitigate the impacts.

- The traffic signal proposed for Market and 15th Avenue (intersection number 211) could be installed at 7th Avenue instead, as long as adequate gaps are created at 15th Avenue to resolve the LOS failure.

- Improvements proposed at NE 85th Street and 124th Avenue NE (intersection number 402) would only reduce the average vehicle delay at the intersection by 3 seconds and primarily benefit the minor street traffic. Based on TIA mitigation guidelines alternative improvements, to be identified, along the 85th Street corridor of equal value would be substituted for improvements at this location.
Figure 3.4-1
Summary of Improvements—FEIS Review

Source: City of Kirkland 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>o Action¹</th>
<th>Proposed Action¹</th>
<th>FEIS Review¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Way/Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td>Install signal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lake Washington Boulevard/NE 38th Place</td>
<td>Add 720-ft right lane on northbound receiving lanes (north of the Intersection), modified to extend up to NE 43rd St w/ bike lanes)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Central Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Construct dual westbound left turn lane and a southbound right turn lane between Central and 4th Avenue. Modify signal to provide westbound left/northbound right overlap phase.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/14th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Restripe southbound dual left and eastbound right to through conversion.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>6th Street/4th Avenue</td>
<td>Dual eastbound left turn, with widening on 6th Street</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kirkland Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Install signal. (CIP Project #TR20-3)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Central Way/5th Street</td>
<td>Install signal.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td>Extend two-way-left-turn by moving crosswalk to Parkplace Signal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>Add left turn lanes on northbound and southbound approaches</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>Add northbound approach left turn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>o Action(^1)</td>
<td>Proposed Action(^1)</td>
<td>FEIS Review(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 IA Conc</td>
<td>2022 Conc</td>
<td>2014 IA Conc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>100th Avenue NE/NE 124th Street</td>
<td>Modify the signal phase to be the same as during AM peak period, with northbound and southbound to be split phase, and southbound configuration to be left, left/through shared, and through/right shared.(^2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>116th Way NE/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td>Reconfigure the intersection based on the 132nd Street Study and new I-405 northbound on-ramp</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Market Street/15th Avenue</td>
<td>Install signal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Market Street/15th Avenue</td>
<td>Install signal at this location or at 7th Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>NE 132nd Street/124th Street NE</td>
<td>Construct eastbound dual left turn lane, based on the 132nd Street Study</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Totem Lake Boulevard/NE 132nd Street</td>
<td>Reconfigure the intersection based on the 132nd Street Study and new I-405 northbound on-ramp</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Add northbound right-turn-only pocket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Provide corridor improvements such as traffic signal interconnect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)TIA = Traffic Impact Analysis; Conc = Concurrency

\(^2\) No concurrency impact was identified at this intersection. This mitigation measure is recommended in order to improve conditions in the subarea, to address the concurrency impact that was identified in the northwest subarea under the 2022 Proposed Action scenario.
**TIA results with Mitigation**

Table 3.4–3 presents the 2014 PM peak hour LOS under the FEIS Review, Proposed Action and No Action alternatives with mitigation in place. Table 3.4–4 presents the 2014 AM peak hour LOS under the FEIS Review, Proposed Action and No Action alternatives with mitigation in place. The tables show that the resulting LOS for all intersections except two would be LOS E or better under all three alternatives. One of the intersections, 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).

**Concurrency results with Mitigation**

**2014 Conditions**

The 2014 concurrency analysis results for the FEIS Review alternative with mitigation in place and the Proposed Action alternative are the same. See Table 3.4-12 of the DEIS.

**2022 Conditions**

The 2022 concurrency analysis results for the FEIS Review alternative with mitigation in place and the Proposed Action alternative are the same. See Table 3.4-22 of the DEIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control 1</th>
<th>LOS Delay</th>
<th>LOS Delay</th>
<th>LOS Delay</th>
<th>LOS Delay</th>
<th>LOS Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Southwest Subarea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Way/Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>F 200 A 10.0</td>
<td>F 200 C 21.3</td>
<td>F 200 C 21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Central Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 6.3 D 39</td>
<td>F 6.3 D 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>F 132.1 F 3.0</td>
<td>F 227.9 F 110.4</td>
<td>F 227.9 F 110.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>6th Street/4th Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>E 75.1 C 22.0</td>
<td>E 75.1 C 22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kirkland Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 231.0 C 23.6</td>
<td>F 231.0 C 23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Central Way/5th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>E 66.2 D 38.7</td>
<td>E 66.2 D 38.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td>TWS</td>
<td>F 82.4 C 18.1</td>
<td>F 119.0 C 21.3</td>
<td>F 119.0 C 21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 86.7 E 42.6</td>
<td>F 86.7 E 42.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>northwest Subarea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Market Street/15th Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 153.3 B 15.9</td>
<td>F 153.3 B 15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>East Subarea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/124th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 81.0 E 78.4</td>
<td>F 81.0 E 78.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Traffic control for mitigated conditions. AWS = All Way Stop; TWS = Two Way Stop (LOS/Delay shown for worst movement at TWS)

Source: Heffron Transportation, Inc. 2008
### Table 3.4. IA Assessment - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>FEIS Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS Delay</td>
<td>LOS Delay</td>
<td>LOS Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nmitigated</td>
<td>nmitigated</td>
<td>nmitigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>itiated</td>
<td>itiaded</td>
<td>itiaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Central Way/Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>F 200</td>
<td>C 23.7</td>
<td>F &gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Central Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 126.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>NE 85th Street/114th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>F .</td>
<td>D 39.9</td>
<td>F 141.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>6th Street/4th Avenue</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>C 23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kirkland Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>F 133.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Central Way/5th Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>C 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td>TWS</td>
<td>D 25.0</td>
<td>C 24.2</td>
<td>D 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>AWS</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>E 40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Traffic control for mitigated conditions. AWS = All Way Stop; TWS = Two Way Stop (LOS/Delay shown for worst movement at TWS)

Source: Heffron Transportation, Inc. 2008
Cost Estimates for Capacity Improvements

Table 3.4–5 summarizes planning level cost estimates for the capacity improvement projects that have been presented as mitigation measures. Capacity improvements presented in Table 3.4–5 would be funded by a variety of sources. Only the improvements that would allow restriping of the intersection of 85th Street NE and 114th Avenue NE are included as a funded project in the current 6-year capital improvement project. Funding for all other improvements could potentially include city funds, transportation grants, revision of the current citywide transportation impact fee, or developer improvements or contributions. Additional analysis and policy discussion would determine the amount of funds that would be derived from these sources.

Transportation Management Plan

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is required for each of the three planned action areas. A detailed program has been identified for Area A and is included as a mitigation requirement. This program includes specific measures to reduce vehicular trips including retaining a Site Transportation Coordinator, carpooling, vanpooling and transit passes (see Appendix E).

Parking

The parking mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS have been refined and included as mitigation measures for Area A in the FEIS Review alternative. The mitigation measures provide specific requirements for operating the parking garage, reducing trips to and from the area, monitoring, and remedies to reduce parking spillover (see Appendix E). The City will require compliance with these measures with development under the Planned Action ordinance (PAO) and when modifying existing parking standards, in conformance with Kirkland Zoning Code Section 105.103.3.c.

This FEIS and the PAO assume the maximum amount of development in Area A at 1.8 million square feet with a minimum of 3,650 parking stalls. If a smaller amount of building space is built, the amount of parking spaces could be scaled back proportionally based on the mix of office and non-office uses. A parking study would need to be prepared by the applicant similar to the one included in the DEIS to substantiate the reduction in parking spaces. However, even with a reduction in parking spaces, the mitigation measures included in Appendix F would still be required.
### Table 3.4. Estimated Costs of Proposed Capacity Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Potential Action</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>FEIS Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements needed through 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Central Way/ Parkplace Driveway</td>
<td>Install signal</td>
<td>$566,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 NE 85th Street/ 114th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Restripe southbound dual left and eastbound right to through conversion (CIP Project #TR-0079 - funded). Requires CIP Project #TR-0056 (currently unfunded) HOV Queue Bypass for the eastbound-to-southbound on-ramp</td>
<td>166,400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 Central Way/4th Street</td>
<td>Extend two-way-left-turn by moving crosswalk to Parkplace Signal</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 Central Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Construct dual westbound left turn lane. Modify signal to provide westbound left/northbound right overlap phase</td>
<td>3,044,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 6th Street/4th Avenue</td>
<td>Dual eastbound left turn, with widening on 6th Street</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Kirkland Way/6th Street</td>
<td>Install signal. (CIP Project #TR-0065 - unfunded)</td>
<td>564,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Central Way/5th Street</td>
<td>Install signal.</td>
<td>564,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>Add left turn lanes on northbound and southbound approaches</td>
<td>89,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 6th Street/7th Avenue</td>
<td>Add left turn lanes on northbound and southbound approaches</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Market Street/15th Avenue</td>
<td>Install signal. (CIP Project #TR20-11 - unfunded)</td>
<td>564,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402 NE 85th Street/ 124th Avenue NE</td>
<td>Add northbound right-turn-only pocket</td>
<td>889,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Improvement events through 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$763,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,058,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,988,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements needed through 2022</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Lake Washington Boulevard/NE 38th Place</td>
<td>Add 720 ft right lane on northbound receiving lanes (north of the Intersection), modified to extend up to NE 43rd St w/ bike lanes (CIP Project #TR-0090 – unfunded)</td>
<td>1,953,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204 116th Way NE/ NE 132nd St</td>
<td>Reconfigure the intersection based on the 132nd St Study and New I-405 SB off-ramp. (CIP Project #TR20-11 – unfunded)</td>
<td>WSDOT³</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4.3. Significant Avoidable Adverse Impacts

Implementation of the FEIS Review, Proposed Action, or No Action alternatives will 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. Significant impacts will occur in 2014 at the intersection of NE 85th Street and 124th Avenue NE. This impact will be mitigated through the implementation of 85th Street corridor transportation improvements of equal value.

### 3.5. Public Services

#### 3.5.1. Police Protection

Development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action; therefore, police calls for service are anticipated to be comparable. No new significant impacts are anticipated.

#### 3.5.2. Fire and Emergency Medical Service

Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action, fire and emergency medical calls
for service are expected to be comparable. No new significant impacts are anticipated.

3.5.3. Parks and Recreation

Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action, impacts on park and recreational services are expected to be comparable. It should be noted that the FEIS Review alternative proposes residential development that was not anticipated in the Proposed Action. Even though the DEIS did not assess effects of residential development on the parks and recreation facilities, the reduction in office employees that occurs when residential development is added into the mix of uses in Areas B and C offsets the addition of residential parks and recreation patrons in the analysis area. By allowing up to 69 dwelling units in Areas B and C, the FEIS Review alternative would also reduce the estimated number of employees allowed in the same area by 184 employees. Therefore, no new significant impacts are anticipated.

3.5.4. Schools

Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action, impacts on schools would be comparable. It should be noted that the FEIS Review alternative includes residential development that is not found in the Proposed Action. However, even though no residential development was planned for the Proposed Action, the DEIS assumed a limited amount of new residential growth as a conservative approach to estimating school impacts. The FEIS Review alternative would allow an estimated 69 units, comparable to the DEIS assumption of 71 future residential units. Therefore, no new significant impacts are anticipated.

3.5.5. Mitigation Measures

Under the FEIS Review alternative, no new or additional mitigation measures would be required for police services or fire and emergency medical services. Similarly, because the DEIS assumed 71 residential units, and the FEIS Review alternative’s maximum number of 69 residential units would be accompanied by a reduction of approximately 184 employees, no new mitigation measures would be required for parks and recreation services or schools.
3.6. Utilities

3.6.1. Water and Sewer

Because development levels and character are generally comparable between the FEIS Review alternative and the Proposed Action, impacts on water supply and sewer services would be comparable. No new significant impacts are anticipated with the FEIS Review alternative.

3.6.2. Mitigation Measures

No new or additional mitigation measures are required for water supply or sewer services.