

# DSEIS Comment Summary

## Table of Contents

Overview	2
Summaries of Engagement Activities	6
A Real-time Online Open House	6
B Online Survey	14
C Written Comment	37
D Service Provider Work Group	42
E Meetings-in-a-Box	46
F Lake Washington High School Student Presentations	48
G City Staff Presentations at Virtual Community Organization Meetings	59

## Overview

This summary provides an overview of public comments received throughout the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) outreach and engagement period. Outreach was conducted consistent with the overall engagement objectives set forth in the [Station Area Plan Public Engagement Plan](#), and as part of the City's commitment to an inclusive and robust community engagement process. The comment period was held January 5, 2021 through February 19, 2021.

This is a preliminary summary of comments. Comments will be considered in the preparation of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS), which may include analysis of the topics in the DSEIS or referencing other planning or environmental documents or current development regulations that address the concerns. For a description of SEIS topics and a checklist, please see the project website at [www.kirklandwa.gov/stationareaplan](http://www.kirklandwa.gov/stationareaplan).

## Outreach

The project team conducted outreach through several channels to inform public and stakeholders of the project and opportunities to engage. Channels included:

- **Legal publication** in the Seattle Times.
  - **Notice of availability** sent to agencies according to the City's standard procedure.
  - **Press releases**.
  - **Posters** mailed to essential locations within and nearby the study area.
    - › 20 multifamily housing buildings within the study area.
    - › 5 senior housing facilities within the study area.
    - › 16 ethnic groceries and businesses within the study area and neighboring communities.
  - **Email and phone notification and coordination** with 51 community contacts, including:
    - › Businesses and employers, including large employers.
    - › Service- and faith-based organizations.
    - › Transit-, pedestrian-, and bike-based organizations.
    - › Unions.
    - › Community organizations.
    - › Lake Washington School District and Lake Washington High School
- Many of these organizations distributed messages about the engagement

period to their membership via emails, social media postings, and announcements at events.

- **Project Listserv emails** sent at three points leading up to, and during, the DSEIS comment period to 170 subscribers (subscribers as of February 2021).
- **Social media posts** on City of Kirkland Facebook and Twitter accounts at least once per week throughout the comment period.
- Weekly **articles** in This Week in Kirkland, the City's e-newsletter, throughout the comment period. The e-newsletter listserv reaches approximately 4,000 recipients (subscribers as of February 2021).
- A City-produced [DSEIS Introduction video](#) with information about what a DSEIS is, and how community members could participate in the project posted to the City's YouTube channel and linked in social media posts.
- Project **materials in Chinese**, distributed through the Chinese Information Service Center to over 500 recipients. The materials included instructions for how to request a Chinese-language community meeting with the City.
- City Staff presentations at 10 virtual community organization meetings.

## Engagement

The project team conducted several engagement activities to provide the public and stakeholders with a range of methods of providing input.

### Real-time Online Open House

At 6 PM on January 7, 2021, the City hosted a live online open house. The meeting included a large presentation to share out information and small group activities to collect input. Approximately 140 people participated in the open house. After the open house was completed, a [video of the event](#) was made available for viewing on the City's website.

### Online Survey

An online survey offered an opportunity for stakeholders and the public to learn about and provide input on the three alternatives in the DSEIS. The survey was made available to participants at the conclusion of the open house on January 7, 2021 and remained open throughout the comment period. The survey received 408 responses.

### **Written Comment**

Stakeholders and members of the public submitted written comments. The City received 114 written comments from individuals, corporations, small businesses, and organizations, one regional transportation district, and one State agency.

### **Service Provider Work Group**

Representatives from four human service providers with clients in the Station Area joined a virtual roundtable discussion to learn about the SAP and provide input about how the plan can support client needs. The first portion of the meeting included a brief presentation about the Plan and the planning process, including an overview of the three alternatives. Following this presentation, participants engaged in a roundtable discussion about how their clients use the Station Area and their top concerns and hopes about the outcomes of the SAP.

### **Meetings-in-a-Box**

Staff from The Sophia Way, a service provider located in the Station Area, hosted two in-person meetings-in-a-box and a few one-on-one discussions to gather input from 26 clients on the DSEIS. The meetings occurred during the weeks of January 18, 2021 and February 5, 2021. All participants were women experiencing homelessness. About one-third were full-time employed and about two-thirds have received disability or have a disability claim filed. Participants' ages ranged from approximately 30-70 years, with a large proportion aged 55 and older.

### **Student engagement at Lake Washington High School**

Students from two economics classes at Lake Washington High School engaged in a monthlong project to learn about the SAP and to provide input during the comment period. The project culminated with student presentations to City staff and members of the Kirkland City Council. Members of the project team joined eight class sessions (four per class) in December 2020 and January 2021 to teach and support students in the project.

### **City Staff Presentations at Virtual Community Organization Meetings**

In the weeks leading up to, and during, the DSEIS public comment period City staff accepted several invitations to present information about the Station Area Plan to various community organizations. Community organization meetings were all held virtually. Staff presentations generally included a NE 85<sup>th</sup> St Station Area Plan project introduction, a summary of the three DSEIS alternatives,

information about how to provide DSEIS comments or otherwise engage with the project, and responses to questions from the respective membership.

## Comment Themes

Comments from the various sources illustrated a range of support or concern about:

- Need for affordable and diverse housing opportunities.
- Integrating greenspace and public parks, adding/retaining trees.
- Traffic congestion and costs.
- Enhancing pedestrian and bicycle connections.
- Balancing jobs and housing.
- Providing jobs for employees from a range of backgrounds and experience levels.
- Density and transitions of heights and activity to protect residential character and views.
- Considering growth impacts on schools and solutions.
- Preferences for growth or heights at lower levels in particular locations or overall but with affordable housing and amenities, as well as preferences for greater growth near transit and to provide more housing and jobs as well as amenities.

## Summaries of Engagement Activities

### A Real-time Online Open House

#### Exhibit 2: Online Open House Participants



Source: Mithun, 2021.

#### Overview and Executive Summary

The City of Kirkland held a live, online public open house on January 7, 2021. Given the technical nature of the DSEIS document, the City held the meeting early in the comment period to introduce the concepts and alternatives studied to improve understanding of the choices being considered.

There was robust participation in the meeting, estimated at about 140 participants. Outreach to notify the community about the engagement period and the public meeting began in December 2020. The meeting was conducted over zoom, and there were 122 zoom accounts that participated in the meeting.<sup>1</sup> However the number of participants was higher, as several accounts included multiple participants. Participation was greater than a summer 2020 workshop, which had about 80 participants, and typical pre-COVID in-person open house of about 30-45 participants.

Presentations included an overview of the DSEIS process and commenting, a summary of the three Alternatives studied, their alignment with project objectives and evaluation, and next steps toward a Preferred Alternative which will likely be

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Kirkland representatives and members of the consulting team were not included in this number.

a combination of features from multiple alternatives. Small group discussions followed the presentation.

Common themes and priorities from these discussions included desire for open space, bike, and pedestrian connections; strong support for better transit and mobility connections with the new bus rapid transit (BRT) and potential Houghton P&R connections; importance of more affordable housing opportunities; desire to focus density around transit and concerns about transitions between higher density areas and adjacent neighborhoods; questions around the balance of jobs/housing as well as balance of new development and required infrastructure and services; and concerns and questions about traffic impacts.

After group discussion, Q&A lasted for about 15 minutes, which primarily revolved around questions related to process and participation. The meeting ended with a summary on how and where to comment, ask questions, how to participate in the survey, and a reminder to submit comments by February 5th at 5 p.m. by postal or electronic mail.<sup>2</sup>

A recording of the open house and the presentation slide deck was made available on the City's website for people who were unable to attend. This allows anyone interested in the plan access to this information and benefit from the summary and explanatory information.

### **Detailed Agenda**

The meeting began with a presentation by City staff and the project team. Adam Weinstein, Director of Planning, gave an overview of the project and its purpose. Becca Book of Mithun introduced participants to meeting protocols, including tips on effectively using the zoom platform and meeting ground rules and the overall planning process. Lisa Grueter of BERK Consulting explained the overall process for the DSEIS and how to submit comments. Brad Barnett of Mithun summarized the three alternatives that were studied, highlighting areas of similarity and contrast. Erin Ishizaki of Mithun presented an evaluation of the alternatives and their consistency with overall project and community goals.

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants joined small group discussions for about 30-40 minutes in virtual breakout rooms. Facilitators, which included City staff and consultant team members, supported these discussions, and took live notes using the Miro platform. The Miro platform was set up to provide visuals and other support materials, as would be available to participants in a traditional open-house setting. Facilitators took notes on participant comments using virtual

---

<sup>2</sup> The comment period deadline was later extended to February 19, 2021.



“sticky-notes.” A sample tableau of the materials available in each virtual breakout room is shown in Exhibit 1

**Exhibit 1. Sample Tableau of Materials Available in Each Virtual Breakout Room.**

The tableau is organized into two main sections: Discussion Group Questions and Alternatives Summary.

**Discussion Group Questions:**

1. Introduce yourself, what makes your community special? What would you like to preserve for future generations?
2. How do you envision this neighborhood in 20 years? Which elements of the alternatives shared today align with this vision?
3. Which elements from the alternatives measures best achieve the project goal of creating an equitable, livable, and sustainable Kirkland? Which do not?
4. Out of these Future Community Characteristics, which are your top 3?
5. Which, if any, of the mitigation measures described would you like to see incorporated in the preferred alternative?

**Alternatives Summary:**

- Alternative 1: No Action** - Reflects existing zoning and current plans. It makes no planning changes to accommodate projected growth.
- Alternative 2: Guiding Transit Oriented Growth** - Allows moderate growth around transit, primarily focused on existing commercial areas such as Rose Hill.
- Alternative 3: Transit Oriented Hub** - Allows most growth to support transit-oriented development, primarily focused on existing commercial areas such as Rose Hill.

**Community Characteristics:**

1. Creating and preserving public open space
2. Ease and safety of travel by walking, biking, and transit
3. Ease of travel in private vehicles
4. Limited building heights and densities
5. More affordable homes
6. More jobs in Kirkland
7. More green buildings and features
8. Preservation of neighborhood character
9. Support for local businesses, existing and new
10. The ability for people from all walks of life to live in Kirkland

**Example Mitigation Measures:**

Element	Proposed Measure Highlights
<b>Housing/ Land Use / Aesthetics</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Require more affordable housing units beyond 10% existing inclusionary housing regulations</li> <li>2. Provide new incentives to developers to develop more affordable housing</li> <li>3. Allow developers to pay an in-lieu fee if fewer affordable units are constructed than planned</li> <li>4. Promote in-regional efforts to leverage funding</li> <li>5. Design standards for compatible development and transitions acrossing neighborhood</li> <li>6. Focus the highest buildings near the interchange, with lower height buildings to transition into the surrounding neighborhoods</li> </ol>
<b>Environment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Create vegetated buffers between heavily trafficked areas and residential development to help improve air quality, preserve or replace mature tree cover</li> <li>2. Other incentives, or requirements for green building to improve air quality and neighborhood</li> </ol>
<b>Transportation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add capital improvements to roads to accommodate cars (e.g. add travel lanes, turn lanes, signals)</li> <li>2. Improve bicycle and pedestrian networks</li> <li>3. Incentivize carpool and ride sharing</li> <li>4. Alter parking standards such as altered parking ratios, managed on-street parking</li> <li>5. Change the land use mix to better use existing and planned infrastructure</li> <li>6. Alter policies to balance available infrastructure capacity, funding, and availability of other modes of travel.</li> </ol>

Source: Mithun, 2021.

After participants introduced themselves in their small groups, facilitators led discussion of five questions:

- What makes your community special? What would you like to preserve for future generations?
- How do you envision this neighborhood in 20 years? Which elements of the alternatives shared today align with this vision?
- Which elements from the alternatives measures best achieve the project goal of creating an equitable, livable, and sustainable Kirkland? Which do not?
- Out of the Future Community Characteristics, which are your top 3?
- Which, if any, of the mitigation measures described would you like to see incorporated in the preferred alternative?

At the conclusion of the discussion groups, participants were asked to submit their three top ideas for the NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area plan. This generated the word



cloud in Exhibit 2.

### Exhibit 2. Participants' Three Top Ideas for the SAP



Source: Mithun, 2021.

While the word cloud activity was happening, a handful of participants jumped in and provided overall comments on the plan, process, and public engagement. The meeting ended with a reprise of information on how to comment, where to get more information or ask questions, tips for effective comments, and a reminder to submit comments by February 5<sup>th</sup> at 5 p.m. by postal or electronic mail.<sup>3</sup> A survey was also available on the project website.

## Summary of Input

### What Makes Kirkland Special? Unique Qualities to Preserve

- Charming, small town feel.
- Nonprofit and arts organizations.
- Welcoming place to live.
- Sense of community and neighborliness.
- Parks, open spaces, trails.
- Views of lakes, mountains.
- Can walk to grocery store and shopping.
- Community diversity.
- Trees.
- Several participants noted that “preserving” qualities is not inclusive and

<sup>3</sup> The comment period deadline was later extended to February 19, 2021.

welcoming and suggested modifying this question to Unique Qualities to see for Future Generations.

### **Overall growth**

- Desire to keep growth and density focused near new BRT station, growth will help maximize transit.
- High growth in Kirkland is not in line with the community's history.
- The project is biased toward big growth.
- Kirkland does not need another urban center.
- People who moved to Kirkland for a suburban experience do not want urban style growth.
- Growth should go to other parts of the region.
- Concerns that growth in this area will add noise and traffic similar to recent trends.
- Socio-economic diversity is important – people who work here should be able to live here.
- Lower growth seems appropriate for the west side of the interchange and higher growth seems appropriate for the east side of the interchange.
- Desire to balance growth with mobility, infrastructure, and service needs. Moderate growth is a compromise.
- Form of growth and density should provide quality of life with open spaces and views.
- Strong desire to keep housing away from I-405 due to noise and air quality.

### **Land Use and Zoning**

- It's worthwhile to plan for better utilization of this area.
- New development and improvements are not spread equally across the full station area.
- Center density around the transportation hub. Good TOD [transit-oriented development] will reduce traffic impacts.
- What makes this area a destination? Ensure it is a destination for the region.
- Support single-family neighborhoods.
- Create child-friendly neighborhoods where housing has play areas and parks that are easy to walk to.
- Ensure views are preserved.

- High rises support more population vertically and prevent sprawl.
- Integrate density with transit opportunities to get rid of auto-dependence.
- Add mixed use to existing commercial areas.
- Use townhouses to achieve medium densities.
- Could the light industrial areas near the Cross-Kirkland-Corridor be changed to residential?
- Ensure that there are amenities and parks to make densities and smaller living spaces livable – integrate green spaces with new development.
- Form based zoning is a good approach.
- Require sustainable development, LEED.
- This area needs to be optimized for people.
- Do not place housing near the highway.
- Zone to leverage investment in transit.
- Ensure the integration of public art.
- Create a unified design theme and public gateways.
- Focus on infill housing instead of large complexes.

### **Housing**

- Importance of preserving affordability in the community- both market rate and subsidized.
- Increase the diversity of housing in this area: missing middle, mixed use, etc.
- What are the effects of bringing low income housing into this area on existing homes?
- Will new housing displace existing residents by raising taxes?
- 10% provision does not create enough affordable housing. Hold developers to more.
- Housing needs daycares and other amenities like play areas, open spaces, and access to parks.

### **Transportation and Parking**

- Traffic is already a concern in the 85<sup>th</sup> street corridor and adding new growth will make it worse.
- Consider diverting traffic to 87<sup>th</sup> and put the crossing with 114<sup>th</sup> there.
- Making biking feasible. Is there adequate ROW space to support safe biking? Particularly in neighborhoods?

- Making walking feasible. Add greenspaces for safety and widen sidewalks. More midblock pedestrian connections.
- Connect to the Cross Kirkland Corridor.
- Google expansion will affect residential streets.
- Green street should be at: 120<sup>th</sup>, near the high school, near the women and children's center.
- More people and less parking will not work in this area.
- How will construction impacts to 85<sup>th</sup> be mitigated during development?
- Address the dead-end streets near Costco.
- Connect Houghton P&R to this area via bus connections and walking / biking trails.
- Is 80<sup>th</sup> street wide enough?
- Need to move people up/down hill on 85<sup>th</sup> to connect downtown to the station.
- Buses get stuck in traffic too – need dedicated transit lanes.
- BRT is not as impactful on transportation habits as light rail.
- Address pass through and cut through traffic.

### **Environment and Open Space**

- Preserving wetlands and the ecosystem is a priority.
- More open spaces are needed in these alternatives – and more access to nature.
- Restore native plants to this area.
- Address the increase in noise.
- Preserve and add tree canopy.
- Address climate change.
- Desire for open space, bike, and pedestrian connections
- Ensure that there are amenities and parks to make densities and smaller living spaces livable – integrate green spaces with new development.
- Create child-friendly neighborhoods where housing has play areas and parks that are easy to walk to.

### **Economic Development and Employment**

- A full range of employment is needed. Are the jobs anticipated to be service jobs? Office jobs?

- Does this area need 30,000 jobs?
- It's important to plan for new jobs from Google and other major employers in this area.
- Is the jobs-housing balance right? Are there enough jobs to support the proposed housing?
- Reduce commercial development in this area in favor of greening the area.
- Costco doesn't fit with the plans for this area.

### **Neighborhoods**

- Highland neighborhood should not be connected to 405 in the future.
- Neighborhoods should not be pressured to change.

### **Services and Infrastructure**

- Question about City's anticipated revenues versus expenses for providing services for new developments.
- What are impacts on schools?
- What will be the impact on crime?

### **Overall process concerns and questions**

- The process should include significant outreach efforts and follow the established outreach plan.
- Questions regarding what outreach was conducted especially postcards and mailers.
- Project team should update public on progress toward outreach plan.
- Questions about when public can comment and how that relates to decision making.
- New City website format is not user friendly and previous plans and EIS documents need to be added back.
- Better coordination with Sound Transit.

## B Online Survey

Below is a summary of the 408 responses to the online survey. The first several subsections summarize responses to multiple choice and ranking questions. Free-response comment themes are summarized in the last subsection.


Survey responses are disaggregated by age when trends differ meaningfully by age. Responses do not differ meaningfully by other demographics. Unless otherwise noted, demographic information of participants is compared to demographics of Station Area and Kirkland residents based on the [Opportunities and Challenges Report](#), 2020 or citywide statistics consistent with Census or other noted data.

### Respondent Characteristics and Demographics

Exhibit 3 shows some of the key characteristics of respondents. Response to demographic questions was an optional section of the survey.

- 89% of survey respondents live in Kirkland and own their home, and just 6% live in Kirkland and rent their homes. This is a significantly higher rate of homeownership than residents of the Station Area, of whom 36% are renters.
- 26% of survey respondents work in Kirkland. This is a higher rate of Kirkland employment than Kirkland residents, of whom 11% work in Kirkland.

**Exhibit 3. Respondent Characteristics (338 responses)**




Note: Percentages do not sum to 100% because respondents could select multiple options.  
 Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 4 shows the household incomes of survey respondents.

- Survey respondents have relatively high incomes, as over two-thirds of respondents have annual household incomes of \$125,000 or more. The median household income for the city as a whole per the American Community Survey 2015-2019 was \$117,190.
- 15% of survey respondents have household incomes below \$75,000 per year, compared to 31% of Kirkland households with household incomes below \$75,000. <sup>4</sup> 6% of Station Area residents have household incomes below \$40,000 per year, and 48% of Station Area Employees make under \$40,000 per year.

**Exhibit 4. Respondent Household Incomes (287 responses)**



Source: BERK, 2021.


Exhibit 5 shows the ages of survey respondents.

- Survey respondents are more likely to be older adults than Station Area residents. One-third of survey respondents are aged 60 or older, compared to 12% of Station Area residents who are aged 65 or older.
- Station Area residents are 26% under the age of 18, 10% between 18-24, 20% between 35-44, 32% 45-64, and 12% 65 or older.

<sup>4</sup> American Community Survey 5-year estimates 2015-2019 S1901.



**Exhibit 5. Respondent Ages (310 responses)**




Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 6 shows the race and ethnicity of survey respondents, and Exhibit 7 disaggregates race and ethnicity by the age of survey respondents.

- The race and ethnicity of survey respondents closely matches the demographics of Station Area Residents. 82% of Station Area residents are White, 10% are Asian, and 7% identify with two or more races.
- Younger survey respondents are less likely to be White than older survey respondents.


**Exhibit 6. Respondent Race or Ethnicity (302 responses)**



Note: Respondents were asked to select a single option that best described them. Source: BERK, 2021.

**Exhibit 7. Respondent Race or Ethnicity, Disaggregated by Age (301 respondents)**

- 234 Responses from Participants Ages 40 and above
- 67 Responses from Participants Ages 39 and under



Note: Respondents were asked to select a single option that best described them. Source: BERK, 2021.


## Respondent Opinions on Existing Conditions

Exhibit 8 shows survey respondents' level of support for existing station area features.

- On average, survey respondents are neutral about or support all listed features.
- Survey respondents are most supportive of the current building heights in the Station Area.
- Survey respondents feel neutral or slightly supportive of the current level of environmental features and mobility features in the Station Area.

### Exhibit 8. Respondents' Level of Support\* for Existing Station Area Features (401 responses)

Survey Question: "The no action alternative assumes no planning adjustments to accommodate the growth which the Eastside is experiencing. Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for:"




\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 9 shows survey respondents' levels of confidence that the existing zoning and mix of uses will accommodate Kirkland's continued growth in an equitable, livable, and sustainable fashion.

- Survey respondents are split equally between confidence and lack of confidence in the current zoning and mix of uses, with 43% confident or very confident, and 44% somewhat not confident or not confident at all.

**Exhibit 9. Survey Respondents' Confidence that the Existing Zoning and Mix of Uses will Accommodate Kirkland's Continued Growth in an Equitable, Livable and Sustainable Fashion (395 responses)**




Source: BERK, 2021.

On the next page, Exhibit 10 shows survey respondents' ranking of community characteristics.

- **Top priorities:** Respondents most highly prioritize creating and preserving public open space and ease of transportation by bike, walking, and public transit. Respondents also value limited building heights and densities and preservation of neighborhood character.
- **Lowest priorities:** Respondents least prioritize the addition of jobs in Kirkland. Respondents also are less likely to prioritize sustainable buildings, affordable housing, and the ability for people from all walks of life to live in Kirkland.

**Exhibit 10. Survey Respondents' Ranking\* of Community Characteristics (362 responses)**

Survey Question: "Please rank the following community characteristics from most important to least important to help us understand where the City should invest."



\*Average ranking. Respondents ranked all characteristics from least important (1) to most important (10). Source: BERK, 2021.


## Respondent Opinions on the Alternatives

Exhibit 11 shows survey respondents' level of support for aspects of Alternative 1.

- On average, survey respondents equally value and feel some support for all features of the alternative, with one exception: respondents slightly dislike the alternative's limited opportunities for development of new parks or public space.

### Exhibit 11. Survey Respondents' Level of Support\* for Aspects of Alternative 1 – No Action (397 responses)

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following aspects of the Alt 1 - No Action plan. Note - these are likely outcomes based on what existing policies and regulations already allow in the Station Area."




\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 12 shows survey respondents' level of support for aspects of Alternative 2.

- On average, survey respondents support the aspects of this alternative surrounding increased bike and pedestrian connectivity and improved stormwater management.
- Survey respondents dislike the reduced parking aspects of Alternative 2 most strongly. Respondents are also less supportive of the alternative's building heights, mixed use development, and limited residential infill.

**Exhibit 12. Survey Respondents' Level of Support\* for Aspects of Alternative 2 (378 responses)**

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following aspects of the Alt 2- Guiding Transit-Oriented Growth plan:"



\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.



Exhibit 13 shows survey respondents' level of support for aspects of Alternative 3.

- On average, survey respondents support the aspects of this alternative surrounding increased bike and pedestrian connectivity, green buildings, and improved stormwater management.
- Survey respondents dislike reduced parking and increased office development aspects of Alternative 3. Of all features of this alternative, respondents most dislike the possibility of buildings up to 20 stories in height right next to the BRT station.

**Exhibit 13. Survey Respondents' Level of Support\* for Aspects of Alternative 3 (373 responses)**

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following aspects of the Alt 3 Transit-Oriented Hub plan:"




\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 14 shows how survey respondents rank the three alternatives by how well each will promote the project vision of livability, sustainability, and equity.

- Over half of respondents rank Alternative 1 as the best alternative. The remaining respondents are equally likely to select either alternatives 2 or 3 as the best alternative.
- Two-thirds of respondents rank Alternative 3 as the worst alternative. Nearly one-third of respondents rank Alternative 1 as the worst alternative. Few respondents – 4% -- rank Alternative 2 as the worst.
- Respondents feel most neutral about alternative 2, with 71% of respondents ranking this as the middle alternative in terms of promoting the project vision.
- As shown in the lower chart in Exhibit 14, on average, respondents are equally supportive of alternatives 1 and 2. Even though more respondents select Alternative 1 as the best alternative (52% rank Alternative 1 as best compared to 25% for Alternative 2), more respondents also rank Alternative 1 as the worst alternative (30% rank Alternative 1 as the worst compared to 4% for Alternative 2).

**Exhibit 14. Survey Respondents’ Ranking\* of How Well Each Alternative Will Promote the Project Vision of Livability, Sustainability, and Equity (326 responses)**

Survey Question: “Rank the alternatives based on how well they promote the project vision of Livability, Sustainability and Equity from best to worst.”



\*Top chart shows distribution of rankings. Bottom chart shows weighted averages, with 3 points given for “Best,” 2 points given for “Middle,” and 1 point given for “Worst.”

Source: BERK, 2021.


On the next page, Exhibit 15 disaggregates respondents' rankings of the alternatives by age.

- Across all ages, survey respondents give Alternative 2 an average ranking of 2.2 points, on a scale from 1 (worst) to 3 (best).
- Respondents **below the age of 40** prefer Alternative 3 to Alternative 1.
  - › Sample comment in **support of Alternative 3**: “Alternative 3 maximizes the development opportunities around the future BRT station. As a bonus, the tall building heights would be the most useful in blocking out freeway noises from surrounding neighborhoods. Most importantly it allows for the most affordable housing, best green spaces, and best walking/biking infrastructure. As a long time resident (born and raised) I still feel like we could do more to densify. However, Alt 3 does a great job and would be a welcome change/addition to Kirkland”
  - › Sample comment in **opposition to Alternative 1**: “No action isn't sustainable. People keep moving to Kirkland and to WA, and growth is unavoidable. Pretending that everything can stay the same will be a huge source of long-term problems and drive people out of the area.”
- Respondents **above the age of 40** prefer Alternative 1 to Alternative 3.
  - › Sample comment in **support of Alternative 1**: “Please stop trying to make Kirkland another Bellevue. Families who moved here 15 years ago because it was a nice community are being forced out because it is too expensive.”
  - › Sample comment (lightly edited for typos) in **opposition to Alternative 3**: “Way out of scale for existing neighborhoods, will ruin quality of life for current residents. This kind of development is appropriate for the existing light industrial area near Totem Lake and north. Traffic already a nightmare on 85th, this will result in non-stop traffic jams. Also doubt this will result in any significant increase in affordable housing. Developers will not stop building market rate housing.”

**Exhibit 15. Survey Respondents' Ranking\* of How Well Each Alternative Will Promote the Project Vision of Livability, Sustainability, and Equity, Disaggregated by Age (274 responses)**

Survey Question: "Rank the alternatives based on how well they promote the project vision of Livability, Sustainability and Equity from best to worst."

- 66 Responses from Participants Ages 39 and below
- 208 Responses from Participants Ages 40 and above



\*Weighted averages, with 3 points given for "Best," 2 points given for "Middle," and 1 point given for "Worst."  
Source: BERK, 2021.


## Respondent Opinions on Mitigation Measures

Exhibit 16 shows survey respondents' opinion on proposed housing and land use mitigation measures.

- Survey respondents feel neutral or slightly supportive about all mitigation measures except one: respondents dislike the option to allow developers to pay an in-lieu fee if fewer affordable units are constructed than planned.

### Exhibit 16. Survey Respondents' Support\* for Proposed Housing and Land Use Mitigation Measures (346 responses)

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following proposed Mitigation Measures:"




\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 17 shows survey respondents' opinion on proposed aesthetics mitigation measures.

- Survey respondents support all proposed measures about equally. Of the Aesthetics Mitigation Measures listed, respondents like setback and height limitations to transition to low-density residential properties the most.

**Exhibit 17. Survey Respondents' Support\* for Proposed Aesthetics Mitigation Measures (346 responses)**

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following proposed Mitigation Measures:"




\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

Exhibit 18 shows survey respondents' opinion on proposed environmental mitigation measures.

- Respondents support or strongly support the presented Environmental Mitigation Measures, except the option of allowing developers to pay an in-lieu fee to remove tree canopy. The most highly supported mitigation measures were preserving or replacing mature trees and adding vegetated buffers, as well as incentives for green building features.

**Exhibit 18. Survey Respondents' Support\* for Proposed Environmental Mitigation Measures (342 responses)**

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following proposed Mitigation Measures:"



\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.


On the next page, Exhibit 19 shows survey respondents' opinion on proposed transportation mitigation measures.

- Survey respondents most support the proposed mitigation measure to improve bicycle and pedestrian networks.
- Respondents also support capital improvements to better accommodate cars and incentives for transit and ride sharing.
- Respondents feel neutral or nearly neutral about changes to the land use mix and level of service policies.
- Respondents slightly dislike altered parking standards.



**Exhibit 19. Survey Respondents' Support\* for Proposed Transportation Mitigation Measures (345 responses)**

Survey Question: "Indicate your level of support on a scale of 1 (strongly dislike) to 5 (strongly support) for the following proposed Mitigation Measures:"



\*Weighted averages. Response options included: 1 (Strongly Dislike), 2 (Dislike), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Support), and 5 (Strongly Support). Source: BERK, 2021.

## Summary of Themes from Free Response Comments

The following qualitative summary presents the range of topics raised throughout the free-response comment sections of the online survey. The summary does not reflect the frequency with which commenters raised topics and themes.

### What Makes Kirkland Special? Unique Qualities to Preserve

- A small-town perspective and sense of community. People-friendly character and neighborhoods with a feeling of "togetherness". Quiet and quiet surroundings with charm and character.
- Amenities for growing families and seniors.
- Urban forests, vibrant parks, outstanding air- and water quality.
- Walkable streets for transportation and leisure. A sense of safety at all hours of the day and night.
- Lack of high-rise buildings allows for views of mountains and sunsets.
- Small, unique, locally owned, and minority-owned businesses.
- Concern about Kirkland becoming too similar to Bellevue, Redmond, or Seattle. Kirkland is less congested and less densely populated than surrounding communities, but nonetheless has amenities, infrastructure, and moderate-sized office and retail.

### Overall growth

- Concerns about impacts of growth on the community.
  - › Some opposition to accommodating growth beyond that in the Comprehensive Plan, doubt that growth will occur, or concern that Kirkland already has unused office and residential developments.
  - › Some interest in developing proactive solutions to accommodate growth, ensure adequate infrastructure, and minimize sprawl.
- Questions about projected growth following COVID-19 pandemic.
- West side of the station area can better accommodate growth as the East side has a steep incline that makes it less pedestrian- and bike-friendly.
- Interest in aligning growth with Redmond's and Bellevue's plans.

### Land Use and Zoning

- Varied perspectives on land use and zoning. Some support for height restrictions and building setbacks to minimize shadow. Some interest in maintaining existing zoning, and some interest in increasing housing or jobs in the area. Some interest in infilling and densifying the project area.
- Desire for homes to have yards and green space to support stormwater management.

- Question about geological stability has been considered/studied regarding the large building plans uphill. Concern about increased load on the hillside.

## **Housing**

### **– Affordable housing**

- › Desire for higher proportion of affordable housing. Concern that the plan will not create enough affordable housing. Permit priority to projects that include affordable and Section 8 housing.
- › Questions around the definition of affordability.
- › Market has too many luxury apartments.
- › Concern that the 50% AMI level is too low for smaller sites or high-cost land, and that the City should leverage larger sites with over 200 units.
- › Concern that more affordable housing will be located in less desirable areas like near arterial roads and highways.
- › Balance affordable housing requirements with need to promote development of new units by keeping costs low for developers.
- › Tie affordability requirements to the height of buildings
- › If in-lieu fee is used, locate alternate housing units near transit and commercial hubs elsewhere in the city.

### **– Housing supply**

- › Support for mixed-income housing.
- › Need for missing middle duplexes, triplexes, and groups of cottages.
- › Streamline permit process for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and cottage houses.
- › Varied perspectives about developer incentives and perks. Support for city incentives for missing middle or workforce housing. Concern that City favors developers over residents.
- › Support for the City to facilitate improvements to existing housing stock, including easing remodel permits.
- › A few comments wanting less housing in favor of more jobs or parking.

### **– Housing costs and workforce housing**

- › Concern over rising property taxes and displacement of existing residents.
- › Coordinate additional retail job growth with additional housing that is affordable for these employees.

### **– Housing quality and amenities**

- › Ensure building management can maintain and renovate buildings over time to maintain quality of living spaces as families grow and move out.
- › Livability for families and seniors beyond large-scale multifamily housing.

Consider townhouses.

- › Child-friendly housing, including play areas and green space.
- › Houses with yards and gardens.

## **Transportation and Parking**

### **– Public transit**

- › Concern about low ridership projections.
- › Maximize ADA accessibility beyond minimum compliance.
- › Incorporate additional east-west transit. Not everyone can afford or wants a car.
- › Amenities for commuters, such as covered bus stops and shelter to protect from wind and rain and charging stations for phones/laptops.
- › Clear wayfinding signage.

### **– Traffic**

- › Concerns about traffic congestion and impact to commuters. Should consider traffic impact and relieve existing traffic.
- › Impact of traffic on emergency response times.
- › Impacts of potential sprawl on traffic.

### **– Car infrastructure and parking**

- › Concern that the plan will not change people's preferred method of transportation from cars to public transit, especially for seniors.
- › Support for maintaining parking via a park & ride, parking lots, or parking garages. Concern that lack of available parking will drive away prospective patrons of local businesses and decrease tax revenues.
- › Some support for wider roads. Some concern that wider streets outside the Station Area would into high-traffic thoroughfares for pass-through residents of surrounding communities.
- › Incorporate electric vehicle charging stations.

### **– Pedestrian and bike infrastructure**

- › Safe bike and pedestrian infrastructure, separated from traffic, including safe crossings, extra-wide sidewalks, and secure bike parking. Some concern that putting more bicycles on busy streets is dangerous for both cars and bicycles.
- › Improve existing bike trails and minimize bike use on sidewalks.
- › Design for a walking/bike scale to support seniors and alternative transportation.
- › Develop consistent and continuous curb, gutter, sidewalk in right-of-way throughout the station area.

### – **Neighborhood connections**

- › More connections from downtown Kirkland to the BRT station and to neighboring communities. Suggestions include:
  - Shuttle service, possibly electric buses.
  - Rail or streetcar access.
  - Links to the Cross Kirkland Corridor.
  - Gondola or funicular.
  - Pedestrian and bike bridges over I-405.
- › Improve dedicated alternative transport (bike/walk/e-scooter) through dedicated bridge/overpasses.

### **Environment and Open Space**

- Green development
  - › Development should be electric-only to phase out fossil fuels and minimize GHG emissions.
  - › Support or require net zero development or provide credit for onsite power generation (solar).
  - › Incentivize rainwater capture, onsite greywater reuse to reduce grid stress and minimize runoff, impervious surface, stormwater issues associated with increased density.
- Parks and open space
  - › Create shared public park space around the new developments to encourage community interaction. Include green community areas such as walkways, parks, pea patches, pocket parks, wetland interaction.
  - › Provide lighting, benches, and covered outdoor areas. Consider amenities like natural gas fireplaces.
  - › Incorporate recreation such as a play area for children or a dog park.
  - › Incorporate more tree cover. Maintain old-growth trees and established urban forests.
  - › Pave the Cross Kirkland Corridor.
  - › Add a lid over I-405
  - › Roof-top public spaces on buildings over 150 ft
  - › Urban design elements that provide identification and wayfinding.
- Noise pollution due to traffic.

### **Economic Development and Employment**

- Importance of jobs in the station area, including for workers with middle incomes. Wages should allow Kirkland workers to live in Kirkland.

- Mixed-use space should be accessible to service businesses, not just retail that only high-cost vendors can afford. Concern about displacement of small local businesses. Provide support for downtown parking during construction to support local businesses.
- Support for maintaining Costco in its current location.
- Impacts of long-term work from home as economy changes post COVID-19. Will office buildings still be needed?
- Provide incentives like deferred taxes or permits for black owned businesses and other minority owned businesses to come into the area.
- Support unique shops, experiences, gathering spaces, and restaurants near the BRT that would draw customers from outside Kirkland. Make parking free to support retail business customers.
- Sidewalk storefronts create interest on a walkable scale. Business may not want storefront at 85th Hillside.
- Hold Google to a higher responsibility in the community.

### **Aesthetics**

- Strong interest in public art that represents Kirkland and creates an inclusive and welcoming space, including art by black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC) artists.
- Design standards. Contemporary look that is distinctive.
- Create a stronger Kirkland identity by adding a welcome at the entrance to Kirkland. Add wayfinding signage.
- Plantings for year-round visual interest
- Support for maintaining public north-south sweeping views of nature and the Olympic Mountains. Concern that development would create permanent loss of views.

### **Neighborhoods**

- Neighborhood preservation. Some comments expressed disinterest in preserving the existing neighborhood.
- Concerns about how parking will impact neighborhoods.

### **Services and Infrastructure**

- **Amenities:** Restrooms, garbage cans, and compost bins for pedestrians and transit riders. Variety of cuisines and cultural offerings.
- **City staffing:** Hire more BIPOC City personnel and police.
- **Emergency services:** Concern that emergency services like the fire department will need to accommodate growth.

- **Facilities:** Interest in a subsidized space for child and elderly care services within new developments. Community center with athletic and flexible spaces to support health, wellness, gathering, education. Communal meeting rooms open to public use. A community bulletin board
- **Funding:** Concerns about taxes and bonds. Desire for developers to pay for increased services needed to accommodate growth.
- **Homelessness:** Dedicated spaces for addressing homelessness
- **Schools:** Need for additional schools and school funding to support increased density. Include daycares in office buildings to support workers' use of public transit.

### **Overall process concerns and questions**

- Concern about project budget.
- Questions about how the plan will address long-term COVID-19 impacts. Need for a flexible plan to adapt to unanticipated future needs.
- Questions around how the SAP would integrate with Redmond's or Bellevue's plans.
- Questions about the definitions of the project objectives, affordability, and inclusivity.
- Concern about perceived biased survey wording. Confusion around survey design and questions, especially with language in the transportation mitigation section (e.g., "midblock connections"). Desire for additional outreach to share survey with more people.
- Requests for charts to be reformatted for accessibility by people with vision impairments or color blindness.

## C Written Comment

Stakeholders and members of the public submitted written comments during the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) comment period. The City received 114 written comments from individuals, corporations, small businesses, and organizations, one regional transportation district, and one State agency. Exhibit 20 shows a full list of commenters.

Full copies of these comments will be posted on the City's project webpage. Detailed responses to comments will be provided in the Final SEIS.

### Exhibit 20. Individuals and entities that submitted written comments

Commenter	Commenter Affiliation
Jason Bendickson	Salt House Church
Marc Boettcher	MainStreet Property Group LLC
Brian Buck	Lake Washington School District
Colleen Clement	People for Climate Change - Kirkland
Paul Cornish	Sound Transit
Lisa Hodgson and Dylan Counts	Washington State Department of Transportation
John McCullough	Lee Johnson
Mark Rowe	Google
Mike Anderson	Individual
Anne Anderson	Individual
Yasminah Andrienas	Individual
David Aubry	Individual
Anna Aubry	Individual
JoAnne Baldwin	Individual
Preetesh & Heena Banthia	Individual
Christy Bear	Individual
Brad Beckmann	Individual
Brandon Bemis	Individual
Mari Bercaw	Individual
Christy Bibler	Individual
Seth Bibler	Individual
Jennifer Bosworth	Individual



<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Commenter Affiliation</b>
Margaret Bouniol Kaifer	Individual
Peder Brakke	Individual
Curtis Brown	Individual
Margaret Bull	Individual
Carl Burch	Individual
Susan Busch	Individual
Peggy Bush	Individual
Sylvia Chen	Individual
Lisa Chiappinelli	Individual
Sharon Cox	Individual
Susan Davis	Individual
Christine Deleon	Individual
Robbi Denman	Individual
Ken & Jill DeRoche	Individual
Jivko Dobrev	Individual
Bari Dorward	Individual
Keith Dunbar	Individual
Paul Elrif	Individual
Lana Fava	Individual
Alice Fleck	Individual
Syd & Margaret France	Individual
Kathy Frank	Individual
Jill Gough	Individual
Betty Graham	Individual
Brian Granowitz	Individual
Gayle Gray	Individual
Matt Gregory	Individual
Boaz Gurdin	Individual
Kathryn Hammer	Individual
Kirsten Hansen	Individual
Brian Harper	Individual
Jess Harris	Individual

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Commenter Affiliation</b>
Christine Hassett	Individual
Brad Haverstein	Individual
Mark Heggenes	Individual
Matt Holle	Individual
Jeffrey Hoyt	Individual
Stephanie Hurst	Individual
Kathy Iverson	Individual
John Janssen	Individual
Jill Keeney	Individual
Erika Klimecky	Individual
Teri Lane	Individual
Leah Lang	Individual
Paula Lavin	Individual
Jim & Sandy Lazenby	Individual
Patty Leverett	Individual
Andy Liu	Individual
Peter & Janice Lyon	Individual
David Macias	Individual
Ken MacKenzie	Individual
Angela Maeda	Individual
David Malcolm	Individual
Beverly Marcus	Individual
Cheryl Marshall	Individual
Ingrid Martin	Individual
Carolyn McConnell	Individual
Bob McConnell	Individual
Dave Messner	Individual
Doug Murray	Individual
Erik Oruoja	Individual
Louise Pathe	Individual
Kara Peitila	Individual
Bruce & Heidi Pelton	Individual

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Commenter Affiliation</b>
Robert Pope	Individual
Scott Powell	Individual
Cindy Randazzo	Individual
Matthew Sachs	Individual
Kim Saunders	Individual
Rachel Seelig	Individual
Susan Shelton	Individual
Taylor Spangler	Individual
Katie Stern	Individual
Karen Story	Individual
Kent Sullivan	Individual
Jeanne Tate	Individual
Paula Templin	Individual
Susan Tonkin de Vries	Individual
Elizabeth Tupper	Individual
Al Vaskas	Individual
Don & Jane Volta	Individual
Susan Vossler	Individual
Dan & Cass Walker	Individual
Vivian & Robert Weber	Individual
Brad Weed	Individual
Steve Wilhelm	Individual
Bob Willar	Individual
Oksana Willeke	Individual
Scott Willeke	Individual
Macy Zwanzig	Individual
Syd [No last name given]	Individual
Tony [No last name given]	Individual

Source: BERK, 2021.

Across activities, comment themes include but are not limited to:

- Preferences for or opposition to Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, or elements of them (e.g. level of growth and height)
- Increasing affordable housing
- Requiring energy efficiency
- Incorporating public green spaces
- Addressing school capacity and needs
- Mitigating traffic through managing growth, operational improvements, or capital improvements
- Appropriate building heights and transitions to other residential areas
  - › Some requests in particular areas wished to retain lower heights in NW and SW quadrants
  - › Concern about maximum heights east of I-405 as well as support for heights east on I-405
- Requests for more information on traffic, parks, schools, power

Exhibit 21. Key Words DSEIS Comments



## D Service Provider Work Group

Representatives from four service providers with clients in the Station Area joined a virtual roundtable discussion on February 2, 2021 to learn about the Station Area Plan and provide input about how the plan can support client needs. Attendees are noted below. Allison Zike from the City of Kirkland delivered a brief presentation about the Station Area Plan and the planning process, including an overview of the three alternatives presented in the DSEIS. Following this presentation, participants engaged in a roundtable discussion about how their clients use the Station Area and their top concerns and hopes about the outcomes of the Station Area Plan. For details, see the full agenda at the end of this document.

The two meeting objectives were to:

1. Gather input on three draft alternatives from service providers who represent clients who use the Station Area and are experiencing housing insecurity, food insecurity, or low incomes.
2. Build project awareness among service providers.

Attendees included the following service providers and Project Team members:

### – Service Providers

- › **Hopelink Kirkland:** *Cindy Donohue, Center Manager.* Clients mostly use the SA through interchanging on buses to Kirkland or Redmond centers.
- › **New Bethlehem Day Center and Catholic Community Services:** *Amber North, Program Manager.* Amber will be project manager for new shelter for families and women. Clients use the service area near the shelter to do most of their shopping, errands, and connect to other places for services.
- › **Sophia Way:** *Eric Ballentine, Vehicle Outreach & Lead Housing Case Manager.* Clients use the SA to connect to Helen's Place shelter in Bellevue. Transportation and transit are a main focus.
- › **Salt House Church:** *Pastor Ryan March and David Trice, Church councilmember.* Church neighbors LWHS and Kirkland Place. COVID-19 pandemic and resulting remote worship has created a much wider community, but focus is on service and advocacy.

### – Project Team

- › Allison Zike, City of Kirkland
- › Erin Ishizaki, Mithun
- › Julia Tesch, BERK Consulting

## Summary of Input

Each service provider identified their most important theme(s) about the Station Area Plan:

- *Sophia Way*: **Affordability.**
- *Hopelink*: **Affordability and access to services.**
- *Amber*: **Affordability, access, and “small town” feel that includes open spaces.**
- *Salt House*: **Equity and affordability.**

**Transit** is also a main priority for clients:

- “Right now, about 20% of the women [who Helen’s Place serves] have cars. Increasing transit will be a great thing.”
- “The Day Center use can sometimes be more car-dominant – often people who are unsheltered and in Kirkland stay in their cars in safe parking place.... Even if people have cars, they’re not always working cars. They need to be able to park that car and also access the transit.”
- “Many clients who use public transportation have to walk up to 2 miles to get to City Center, and up to half of that has no sidewalk. They’re walking past big trucks, it’s pretty scary, and they may have groceries. Used to have a bus system that came to the center, but that’s been eliminated. Since then, it’s been a nightmare.”

Amber North recommended three projects that could provide additional insight:

- [Lake Washington United Methodist Church Safe Parking program](#). Has a long-term connection to Kirkland and familiarity with the program’s long-term overflow problem, requiring people to park on the street.
- An [affordable housing project](#) being developed in conjunction with commercial development and the Redmond Together Center.
- Homeless Youth Services at [Friends of Youth](#) could provide information about the development of the youth shelter.

## Questions from Attendees

- What are the drivers of the city planning piece in terms of what the City envisions?
  - › **Answer:** Main driver is that we expect the Puget Sound region will continue to grow and a lot of that growth is coming to Kirkland. The biggest driver of the SAP process is that we have a great opportunity to

locate anticipated growth with access to transit with the introduction of the BRT station. If growth will happen, how can we guide it to make sure it fits the community's vision?

- Can you explain where affordable housing fits within the scope of these plans?
  - › **Answer:** We've issued an EIS, which looks at a lot of different elements like housing, land use, transportation, several environmental factors. Then it tests the impacts of each of these elements at different levels of growth. E.g., if we introduce X new housing units, how much affordable housing can we expect? Kirkland currently has inclusionary affordable housing in most zones, which requires a certain number of affordable housing units in new development. In this EIS, we could be more aggressive with that. We have some proposals for different options that could be integrated into the final plan, like including commercial linkage fees or requiring inclusion of more than 10% affordable housing. Want to know: what level of interest do we have in the options we've put out there to get more affordable housing in the community? Do we have support? Do we have other ideas? Where do other people want to see affordable housing?
- 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, where Salt House is located, gets super congested, especially when school lets out. You mentioned a blue and green road. What does that mean?
  - › **Answer:** A blue and green street looks at how to handle stormwater. One concept might be a bioswale integrated into the street that can carry stormwater, create more separation between vehicles and pedestrians, and create more visual interest for pedestrians. We need to look for more creative ways to handle additional stormwater runoff.
  - › **Answer 2:** A regular street except there's more space in the planting/landscape area to handle more stormwater. A nicer experience for walking, biking. A street with a nicer streetscape.
- Can you speak to the addition of larger buildings, parking, and congestion?
  - › **Answer:** This is one of the impacts we're looking for in the EIS. If we have buildings up to 20 stories, there will be more people and potentially more cars. First and foremost: How can we make this the best transit-oriented district by setting up a framework to make it easy for people to get around that doesn't rely on cars? Any new development will need to include mitigation.
- **Follow-up question:** Will street parking go away? Street parking is important for Salt House because it has a small parking lot. Parking needs to be developed. Already tight. If the school didn't allow for parking in their lot,

would be tough.

- › **Answer 1:** In the planning stages of the new shelter, the parking capacity of the people using it includes the street. That was a part of the parking permit plan for the shelter.
- › **Answer 1:** Alternative 3 includes the analysis of a new parking facility as a potential mitigation measure.
- What are mid-block pathways?
  - › **Answer:** Especially north of 85th – where Petco site is, blocks are large. As those areas develop, would look at creating more pedestrian connections to make it easier for people to get around on a more micro level.
- What is happening with Google?
  - › **Answer:** Lee Johnson site is under contract (but nothing yet bought or sold). We would imagine potential for some office. Planning process is looking at total number of office and residents as calculations. Looking at total numbers of people, cars, and traffic that can relate to how many employees might be in an area. The plan for the City doesn't hinge on one company owning it over another.
- What's going into atmosphere, beauty, public art, aesthetic – the feel of the place?
  - › **Answer:** Some Zoning will get to better design of buildings and how they relate to the street and pedestrians. There's been interest in how to incorporate art and inclusive art into the place. Not yet sure how it'll play out – open to ideas.



## E Meetings-in-a-Box

Eric Ballentine, Vehicle Outreach and Lead Housing Case Manager at The Sophia Way, hosted two in-person group sessions and a few one-on-one discussions to gather input from his clients on the NE 85<sup>th</sup> St Station Area Plan (SAP) Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. These meetings-in-a-box took place during the weeks of January 18, 2021 and February 5, 2021.

In total, 26 participants joined either session or a one-on-one discussion. All participants were women experiencing homelessness. About one-third were full-time employed and about two-thirds have received disability or have a disability claim filed. Participants' ages ranged from approximately 30-70 years, with a large proportion ages 55 and older.

### Summary of Input

#### How could the Station Area be safer?

- **Lighting:** both at the station and along pathways/roads to access the station.
- **Accessibility:** Kirkland has a lot of hills. Not as accessible – especially for older women – for people to use public transportation. Often a deterrent. Some people have disabilities but aren't qualified for [King County Metro] Access. People with walkers could use more ramps and support to access sidewalks (e.g., mid-block crosswalks). Transit station curbs are typically especially difficult because they are raised to accommodate the bus.
- **Blue emergency call box:** at the station, as a lot of Sophia Way clients don't have cell phones.
- **Spaces to spend time outside the station:** If there will be high-traffic pedestrian zones nearby, include an area for people to wait that's near the station, if they don't feel safe at the station itself. Ideally, a high area of walkability to hang out while waiting for the bus.

#### What are the key transportation features that should be included in this area?

- **Pedestrian connections** with lighting.
- **Ramps** for people with walkers.
- **Benches with lighting** – take a break while walking.
- **Restrooms** – many neighboring businesses won't let people use the restroom without buying something. For older women, this can be a major issue.

**What are the key housing features that should be included?**

- **Senior community living that's affordable.** A strong sense of community is especially important. Many of Sophia Way's older women clients get along with one another and would like to have affordable living together for seniors.
- **Parking.** Some people work in Seattle. Want a potential park & ride option. With the bus station, will there be more bus routes therefore making housing in Kirkland more accessible? Sophia way gives bus tickets.

**What employment supports should be included in this area?**

- **More jobs in the area.** Entry-level positions, but not necessarily low-paying service jobs.
  - › New Bethlehem is right below Sophia Way. A broad range of people experiencing homelessness – not just older women. There is a need for professional development/growth opportunities.
  - › Walkability to work, access to healthcare needs.
- **Affordable living with a decent wage** to live in the area that you work. Especially important.
- **Jobs to supplement incomes of people with fixed incomes/disability.** Most people on fixed income/disability receive around \$850, more broadly between \$700-\$1100. Need a decent job to supplement income, whether part-time or full-time, combined with affordable housing.

**What are the most important needs for youth in this area?**

- No specific conversation around this, though it can be challenging for youth experiencing homelessness.

**Anything else?**

- **Primary takeaway: Public space.** It's hard to experience homelessness and to be stuck in a shelter all day. People really enjoy having really nice public space areas, whether it's a park, water fountain, or a dog park. Loitering can be an issue sometimes, but don't think this is as big of an issue in Kirkland.

## F Lake Washington High School Student Presentations

Students from two economics classes taught by Ms. Bethany Shoda at Lake Washington High School engaged in a monthlong project to learn about the SAP and to provide input during the comment period. Members of the project team joined eight class sessions (four per class) in December 2020 and January 2021 to teach and support students in the project. During the project, students reviewed project materials, participated in public meetings, interviewed community members, hosted meetings-in-a-box, analyzed the three DSEIS alternatives, and developed their own preferred alternatives.

The project culminated with student presentations of their preferred alternatives to members of the Kirkland City Council and of the Project Team. Councilmembers and Project Team members in attendance at each final presentation are noted in Exhibit 22.

### Exhibit 22. Councilmember and Project Team Attendance at Student Final Presentations

Class Session 1: Thursday, January 21	Class Session 2: Friday, January 22
City of Kirkland Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold	City of Kirkland Councilmember Toby Nixon
City of Kirkland Councilmember Jon Pascal	City of Kirkland Councilmember Neal Black
City of Kirkland Councilmember Kelli Curtis	City of Kirkland Councilmember Amy Falcone
Adam Weinstein, Planning and Building Director, City of Kirkland	Jeremy McMahan, Deputy Planning Director, City of Kirkland
Julia Tesch, Associate, BERK Consulting	Allison Zike, Senior Planner, City of Kirkland
	Julia Tesch, Associate, BERK Consulting

Source: BERK, 2021.

## Summary of Input

Students' presentations demonstrated that they had engaged deeply with project materials. Councilmembers asked students challenging and thoughtful questions, which offered students the opportunity to clarify their ideas and provide additional detail. Students' opinions varied, reflecting the diversity of opinion community members shared at the open house.

Overall, many students supported moderate change, with Alternative 2 receiving the most support. However, all three alternatives received support from different student groups, and yet other groups created custom preferred alternatives that drew from existing alternatives or incorporated original elements.

## Student Presentations

### Student Group 1

- Key takeaways:
  - › Preferred alternative includes mobility and environmental elements from Alternatives 2 and 3, and infrastructure and development elements from Alternative 1.
  - › Emphasis on more bike and walking infrastructure, including for youth and ADA accessibility.
  - › Addition of parks, including dog parks.
  - › Infrastructure should focus on green development and smaller buildings.
- Questions:
  - › Can you describe your concerns about the growth in Alternatives 2 and 3?
    - Answer: Concerns about increase in height of buildings.
  - › When you graduate college, what is your future in the City of Kirkland?
    - Answer: Youth see Kirkland as a stepping-off place to launch their adult lives, potentially outside Kirkland.
  - › Where in the Station Area would be a good location to add parks?
    - Answer: Should be close to houses and communities. People typically visit parks within walking distance of their homes.

### Student Group 2

- Key Takeaways:
  - › Interest in increasing housing diversity.
  - › Need to balance growth with maintaining a small-town feel.
  - › Want to avoid City of Kirkland being a “pass-through” town for other larger destinations like Bellevue and Seattle.
  - › Preferred alternative is Alternative 2.
- Questions:
  - › What (if anything) is good about tall buildings?
    - Answer: More retail space and residential units. Group’s opinion is based in personal preference and experience.
  - › Are you interested in auto infrastructure, or do you prefer alternative

modes of transportation?

- Answer: Don't value driving as much as earlier generations. Priority is to simply reach the destination, rather than caring about the mode of transportation. If there's enough time to reach a destination by foot or bike, would choose that mode.
- › Have you had discussions about the importance of having jobs in Kirkland?
  - Answer: Especially now during the COVID-19 pandemic, many people are out of work. It will take time to establish a new sense of normal. More jobs in Kirkland will lead to more residents and more diversity. It will bring a desirable amount of change.
- › What amenities are missing in Kirkland that you'd like to see here?
  - Answer: A "go-to" place that's the clear space to spend time.
  - Follow-up question: How do we build that kind of place?
  - Answer: Takes some growth and experimenting. Getting more ideas from residents – what do they value in the city? What do people from out-of-town want to see? Could be a tourist attraction where people go to take pictures. Instagram is popular, so consider a park with statues and art for people to spend time and listen to music. An outdoor activity that combines music and photography could gain people's interest.

### Student Group 3

- Key takeaways:
  - › Interviewed a business employee who lives in the Station Area.
  - › Environmental protections and mitigation are important.
  - › Equity is one of the primary goals of the plan.
  - › Alternative 1 does not meet project objectives. Alternatives 2 and 3 do.
  - › A con of Alternative 1 is that it creates housing scarcity [Note – this is an amendment from a misspoken remark during the presentation.]
  - › Preferred alternative: Alternative 2 with addition of environmental protections of Alternative 3
  - › Want to allow for growth near transit without disturbing surrounding areas, increase transit connections, environmental sustainability, and diversity of housing and communities.
- Questions:

- › How did you draw connections between new housing and gentrification?
  - Answer: Personal experience. Have lived in Kirkland for 10 years and seen people leave their homes because new apartment buildings with higher rent have increased housing costs.
- › What are you thinking along the lines of additional environmental regulations?
  - Answer: Liked the ideas of Alternative 2, but also liked the environmental points from Alternative 3. Preferred alternative uses the points from Alternative 2 but incorporates environmental points from Alternative 3 that benefit the area. Specifically, liked the stormwater infrastructure, green building design, intensive green streets.
- › People will need to take the bus to make this work. What can we add to the plan to draw people to the bus station, especially from a student perspective?
  - Teacher answer: Live up north of Kirkland because can't afford to live in Kirkland. Would live in Kirkland if could afford and would take transit if it were available. When commuted into the building before COVID-19, would drive 1 hour into school and 1.5 hour home. Transit stations up north have amenities like coffee shops and waiting places – this is a great amenity as a commuter.
- › Did your group discuss the potential impacts to schools and education as new residents arrive? Currently seeing that in LWSD – have crowding in schools, lack of space.
  - Answer: LWHS has built a new wing, new gym, Rose Hill Elementary has a new wing. Schools are growing capacity, but this will only address growth to date. Lakeview Elementary will probably have more students, which are currently supported by portables.

#### **Student Group 4**

- Key takeaways:
  - › Alt 1: pros include residential housing and office development, but cons include limited street improvement and no low-income/affordable housing.
  - › Alt 2: pros include affordable housing, bike infrastructure and sidewalks, stormwater improvements, and green infrastructure. Cons include a failure to reduce all parking requirements for mixed-use zoning and no residential housing construction.

- › Most people interviewed favored alternative 2.
- › Alternative 3: No one favored.
- › Preferred alternative: Limited version of Alternative 2. Mixed-use structures up to 8 stories that include affordable housing. Infrastructure improvements to sidewalks and bike lanes, trees, green infrastructure.
  - Pros: Accommodates predicted growth, creates affordable housing, implements green infrastructure, and improves sidewalks and bike paths.
  - Cons: Could lead to scarcity in housing or waste money if changes don't adequately address growth.
- › Don't want high rises but do want to accommodate growth.
- Questions:
  - › We often hear “we don't want Kirkland to be another Bellevue.” What is it about Bellevue that is bad?
    - Answer: It's a matter of urbanization. Bellevue isn't bad in and of itself, but Kirkland and Bellevue are different places in terms of their size as a city. Kirkland is more of a suburban area and Bellevue is more of a city, at least in the downtown area. People want Kirkland to remain like a suburban area.
  - › Did you come across the internal conflict of wanting to encourage types of growth – like more affordable housing, that allows workers to live near where they work – and not wanting to see growth? Is there a conflict between avoiding growth but achieving the economic incentive for more affordable housing?
    - Answer: Yes. There's a challenge between balancing keeping an area suburban and accommodating for growth. There will likely be an influx of people into the city, and we need to accommodate them at least to some extent.

### **Student Group 5**

- Key takeaways:
  - › Alt 1: Pros are limited construction work and keeping things like they are. Cons are that it doesn't account for future development, limited bike lanes and walkways, and no stormwater improvement. This alternative does not meet project objectives.
  - › Alt 2: Pros are that it enhances existing bike lanes and walking, improves stormwater, and predicts some growth. Cons include no major

improvement and not enough bike lanes. This alternative meets project objectives.

- A comfortable transformation, with a livable atmosphere. But not too extreme.
- › Alt 3: Pros include addressing predicted growth, inclusion of green buildings, new retail near the transit center, major stormwater improvements. Cons include obscured skyline and lots of construction. This alternative meets project objectives but makes other goals harder to maintain. Kirkland would become more connected but would require high maintenance to keep the City clean.
- › Preferred alternative: Alternative 2. Offers enough development to support Kirkland's future population. Community engagement with others indicates strong support for Alternative 2.
- Questions:
  - › What does an inclusive district mean to you?
    - Answer: An area where everything comes together and everything is all together as one. Different types of people are all included. A mix of everything. Mixed-use buildings, stores, apartments, different types of buildings that meet everyone's needs.
  - › What would be a worthwhile public benefit that developers could provide in exchange for higher buildings?
    - Answer: Affordable housing, allowing people to be closer to their jobs (creates less pollution from commuting, less traffic), mixed-use buildings to create retail, restaurant, market space. That way, a person can live in an area and be completely sustainable without having to drive 30 minutes away to a grocery store.
  - › Does Kirkland have enough places for people your age to spend time?
    - Answer: Kirkland has a good amount of areas. Lots of parks on Lake Washington Avenue, parks in the Juanita area, new complex downtown (don't recall area). Station Area could provide a new desirable area along the lines of the downtown Redmond shopping area.

### Student Group 6

- Key takeaways:
  - › Alternative 2 is the best option for Kirkland.
  - › Pros:



- Supports affordable housing and quality of life for current and upcoming residents. Job and population growth while still preserving the suburban feel.
  - Moderate development with office buildings up to 10 stories.
  - Additional bike routes and sidewalks on key streets to create additional transportation. Provides easier transit to areas near Seattle. Increased transit opportunities can also be fairer for young individuals or people with low incomes. Can make it easier for people to afford housing if they don't need a car – can build additional affordable housing. Incentives for green infrastructure.
  - Reduced parking requirements for certain areas.
  - Stormwater improvements. More trees, stormwater infrastructure for better water quality.
- › Cons: Increased property values, causing a lot of people to have to move out of the area because they won't be able to afford their apartment. A long transition period – a lot of work to be done. In moderate growth, it will take multiple years. People won't want to deal with construction and the traffic issues that go along with constructing bike paths and sidewalks over multiple years.
  - › Better than other alternatives because it encourages better transit for all to encourage more people to move there. Provides youth and people with lower incomes with access.
  - › Alternative 3 would make Kirkland residents very unhappy. Many people moved here because they want to raise families and enjoy a suburban feel. They choose Kirkland over Seattle and Bellevue for this reason. It's important to allow for growth but maintain this feel.
- Questions:
    - › What does the distinction between urban and suburban mean to you?
      - Answer: Types of shops – e.g., big retail chain stores versus local small businesses. Important to stick to local businesses.
    - › Where should growth occur, given that growth is happening?
      - Answer: All around Kirkland – e.g., Redmond, Seattle, Bellevue – there's options for significant growth. Kirkland is already so congested. Don't have a lot of roads, and they're often under construction. Is any growth attainable for Kirkland without making it so overpopulated that it becomes unenjoyable to live there?

## Student Group 7

- Key takeaways:
  - › Alt 1: Pros is that it's inexpensive. Cons include little to no development and that it won't fulfill the project requirements.
  - › Alt 2: Pros include that it maximizes some goals of the project. Gives Kirkland the unique identity it wants. Area can have an increased amount of productivity. Cons: Doesn't meet all the goals of the project and might cause more traffic in the area.
  - › Alt 3: Meets all project goals, as it expands job and housing opportunities. Gives opportunity to not use cars to reduce pollution and increase quality of life. Increased use of transit will provide additional revenues for the city. Sustainable option that uses land effectively. Most desirable option for people to move into the area. Cons include the cost, potential traffic, and limited parking space.
  - › Interview: POC who is a transit rider. Preferred alternative is no action. Does not see buses as a good option for traffic and feels the area is already adequately developed. Buses get stuck in traffic and take time. Need transit that is faster and better for the environment – like rail or subway. Especially true because transit station is not expected to be ready for 10-15 years.<sup>5</sup>
  - › Community engagement discussion with 6 residents: unanimous consensus for alternative 3. Biggest concerns around traffic, parking, and potential tax increases. A growing population in the area needs more space for students to be in schools. Overall, enthusiastic about the changes and growth with alternative 3.
  - › Preferred alternative: Alternative 3. Meets all the project requirements and has greatest development in the City. Need to focus on reducing traffic and not to impact the streets.
- Questions:
  - › What would you think about schools in urban settings, such as a high-rise, as opposed to portables?
    - Answer: I don't think an urban schooling system would be ideal. This would be farthest from what people want and a lot of change. Better to create more schools in the district or to expand existing schools.

---

<sup>5</sup> The BRT will be complete in 2025.

- › Did your group discuss the addition of more families and students in the area?
  - Answer: All the schools in LWSD are always needing to expand. Students are having to go to school on campuses that are under construction. Disruptive to the school environment. Might be easier to add another school outside the Station Area.

### Student Group 8

- Key takeaways:
  - › Preferred Alternative: Alternative 1. Don't want to see Kirkland turn into another Bellevue.
    - Pros include: Modest office development, minor traffic/parking impacts, minor street work, and includes housing/job growth.
    - Cons include: limited landscaping, not enough construction to assist growing population, no stormwater improvements, no additional affordable housing, a limited amount of eco-friendly buildings, and no additional bike/pedestrian routes.
  - › Group discussion: Talked with three youth.
    - Cons from Alternative 2 and 3: Didn't like the ideas of big buildings being constructed. Would change the characteristics of Kirkland – transition from the small community into a big city. But also didn't love that there wouldn't be any development.
    - Liked that Alternative 1 would allow some development, but not too much.
    - Pros of Alternative 2 and 3 include environmental awareness – green buildings, conservation of resources. Loved the ideas of new biking/walking paths because many don't have cars or driver's licenses and some can't afford to take buses.
  - › Interviews: Interviewed two stakeholders.
    - A business owner who preferred Alternative 3 as it creates more jobs and opportunities for people in Kirkland.
    - A renter who preferred Alternative 1 as it creates minimal disruption, minimizes commercialization, and limits construction.
    - Both interviewees agreed that the project is meeting project goals. Both were concerned about the length of the project.
- Questions:

- › Are there specific reasons that people are concerned about big buildings? Is there a certain type of building that people called out?
  - Answer: No mention of a specific building, but many people felt that communities like Bellevue have their own aesthetic and character, and Kirkland has its own too. Concern was about taking in the characteristics of big buildings because it changes how the city works, how we get around, and what kind of shops and businesses come into the area.
- › One difference between Bellevue and Kirkland is that Bellevue can explore an aquatic center (something Kirkland wants too) in part because it has more resources due to taxation. New jobs and new housing and commercial development in the Station Area could contribute to the resources that Kirkland has, bringing it more in line with Bellevue. What does this group think about these kinds of public benefits?
  - Answer: Those public benefits would be nice, but people choose to live in Kirkland because of what Kirkland has. People like that it's smaller, it has more of a homey feel. Would live in Bellevue if wanted those resources. Losing the soul of Kirkland isn't a fair price to pay.

### Student Group 9

- Key takeaways:
  - › Five major community concerns include:
    1. Where will funding come from? What is the necessity of major spending?
    2. Tall buildings blocking views of Lake Washington.
    3. Negative environmental impacts.
    4. Traffic.
    5. Overcrowding in parking in neighborhoods.
  - › Alternative 1:
    - Pros: environmentally friendly, cheap, low building heights.
    - Cons: Rapidly run out of housing, housing prices will increase, traffic will only get worse, lack of improvement to bike lanes and sidewalks.
  - › Alternative 2:
    - Pros: Moderate residential and office development, less parking requirements, additional path and walkways, sidewalks, bike lanes.

- Cons: less parking, less environmentally friendly, and expensive. Concerns around uncertainty about eventual cost.
- › Alternative 3:
  - Pros: Allows the most growth to support TOD, including significant housing production, bike facilities, sidewalks, parking facility, and new environmental standards.
  - Cons: Most expensive, doesn't address traffic, height of buildings, and significant housing production without affordability will attract more outside buyers. This isn't what the current residents of Kirkland wants or needs.
- › Preferred alternative: A mix of Alts and 2. Additions not in either include:
  - Build underground parking garages.
  - Add electric scooters to be more environmentally friendly.
  - Pros: environmentally friendly, little change to development policies, some housing development, some bike lane/sidewalk development. Cons are expensive and more traffic, but costs are inevitable.
  - Helps meet initial goals of development and equity access. Doesn't infringe on traffic and parking access.
- Questions:
  - › What do you think will be the role of cars in Kirkland 20 years from now?
    - Answer: Cars will still be the main option for transportation. It's unrealistic to expect a lot of people to take transit. Cars are so much easier and so much more effective. There are a lot of areas to get to in Kirkland that transit can't access. Most people who use BRT will be the same people who use affordable housing and are limited to the transportation that's available. People who currently have opportunities to use cars will continue to use cars.
  - › What have been your conversation around active transportation? E.g., people who choose to bike or walk instead of using cars.
    - Answer: A lot of the conversations were structured around a theoretical approach around the importance of additional sidewalks and bike lanes. But when you break it down in a practical sense, most people will still choose to travel by car. They might prefer sidewalks when considering other members of the community, but they have more questions around traffic and parking for their own lives.

## **G City Staff Presentations at Virtual Community Organization Meetings**

In the weeks leading up to, and during, the DSEIS public comment period City staff accepted several invitations to present information about the Station Area Plan to various community organizations. Community organization meetings were all held virtually and attended by Senior Planner Allison Zike and/or Planning & Building Deputy Director Jeremy McMahan. Staff presentations generally included a NE 85th St Station Area Plan project introduction, a summary of the three DSEIS alternatives, information about how to provide DSEIS comments or otherwise engage with the project, and responses to questions from the respective membership. Below is a list of community organization meeting presentations and dates that were associated with the DSEIS phase of the project.

- September 21, 2020: North Rose Hill Neighborhood Association
- October 14, 2020: Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods
- November 9, 2020: Moss Bay Neighborhood Association
- November 18, 2020: Highlands Neighborhood Association
- December 1, 2020: Everest Neighborhood Association
- December 16, 2020: Highlands Neighborhood Association (with Washington State Dept. of Transportation and Sound Transit staff)
- January 13, 2021: Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods
- January 18, 2021: North Rose Hill Neighborhood Association
- January 25, 2021: Kirkland Chamber of Commerce
- February 3, 2021: Norkirk Neighborhood Association