

- Another reason it makes sense is that at some point I'd seen a plan that looked like it basically turned my driveway + the driveway we share a border with, into a through street. If you up zoned back to our place all the way across the block, that might still make sense to do something like that, but there's probably plenty I'm not seeing there, and I may also have misread a map I saw 6 months ago.

2. Has there been a traffic study for the 80th/120th intersection? One concern that I had was the suggested traffic mitigation to put a left turn lane at the top of 120th street near the high school. I bike up that street a lot on my way to work and drive through it all the time. People already basically treat that street like it's got a left hand turn lane. It doesn't usually get that crowded now, but with the number of people you're planning to put in, I think we'd need more lanes. Especially given the increase in traffic in both directions. Basically it seems like, since you're upzoning the entire west side of the street, widen it and make it a bigger street, with sidewalks on both sides.

- I'm sure the most vocal opponents of this would love to complain about how this puts high schoolers in danger, they obviously haven't seen how many of them walk in the street now because one side has no sidewalk (not a complaint, I don't mind, I'm from a small town and I even sometimes do it, given covid and the people hanging out on the sidewalk in the area).

3. Given all of the construction that's going to happen, someone brought up a good question around how they'll handle all of the dirt/construction equipment came up. I just watched someone driving a crane up 120th to the high school yesterday morning and it was a pretty tight fit. Sure, semi-drivers pull up next to Lee Johnson all the time, so it's probably not a big deal, but that's often pretty tight, and those drivers likely usually know the area. With this whole thing turned into a construction zone, it seemed like one of the few reasonable suggestions/comments from some of the louder voices.

- Not saying I don't think it should be done. I think it should, and likely you and whoever gets hired to do the work know better than I how to handle it. Just wanted to raise it as a possible issue, since I'll likely be directly affected. I often bike home and get stuck in traffic going north-bound on 120th in the evenings. I can only imagine the nightmare when there's dump trucks and holes in the ground everywhere. But of course with construction comes traffic, and I don't personally think the traffic around 85th is THAT bad.

Anyway I'll stop pestering you there, as i haven't had time to dig into the plans in more detail yet, and you've likely had enough of my overlong e-mail.

I just want to say again, I really appreciate all of the work you and everyone involved as done. I come from a small town that was very anti-growth (it remained one of the last dry towns in our area and was at one point considered as a headquarters for the Women's Temperance League in the 1980's I think?). Suffice to say, I'm glad to see Kirkland is doing what it can to keep up with the massive growth of this area. It's a great community, and I'm excited to see what you all plan for it.

Best Regards,  
-Taylor Spangler

---

**From:** Katie Stern [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 5, 2021 8:53 AM  
**To:** Becca Book  
**Cc:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** Re: 405 / NE 85th Street questions

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Good morning Becca and Allison,

Thank you for responding so quickly to my email! Yes, I would like Allison to include my comments as part of the record; I won't be sending a separate email and ask that she use my original email information. I would also like to be added to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement community email list, if there is one.

I look forward to the BRT project and am hoping my input will assist the team to make this project community inclusive as it brings exciting change to the Kirkland area.

Thank you, see you on the 7th!

Katie Stern

On Monday, January 4, 2021, 10:19:17 AM PST, Becca Book [REDACTED]

Good morning Katie,

Thank you for your message. I am copying Allison Zike, the project manager for the Station Area Plan on the City of Kirkland side. Allison will be accepting official comments on the plan during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement comment period. Please let her know if you would like your comments, below, to be added to the record, or feel free to send her a separate email.

We look forward to discussing your concerns below on Jan 7. We are aware of community concerns surrounding parking in the neighborhoods around the BRT and will be sure to make time to discuss this.

The transportation planners on our team have analyzed the traffic expected due to growth in the area, and we look forward to presenting their findings to you. They did not specifically study the NE 80<sup>th</sup> / 123<sup>rd</sup> AVE intersection, but they have provided recommendations on how to ease traffic in the Station Area as a whole.

Finally, making the area more pedestrian friendly and providing Safe Routes to Schools is an overarching goal of the project team. I am glad to hear your support for this aspect of the project and look forward to discussing further!

**Becca Book**—

LEED AP ND, EcoDistricts AP

[REDACTED]

Seattle | San Francisco | Los Angeles

We are here and connected, with teams working remotely to support all of our clients and ongoing projects. Wishing health and wellness to you, your families, and organizations during this challenging time.

---

**From:** Katie Stern [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 30, 2020 6:09 PM  
**To:** Becca Book [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** 405 / NE 85th Street questions

Hello there,

I signed up for the January 7 zoom meeting and would like the Team to address the following two issues:

1) What is the city's plan to address South Rose Hill neighborhood safety with the increased traffic that will occur on NE 80th St?

The City schematic appears to show additional bus routes that will travel on NE 80th to support the BRT; it also seems likely that BRT riders will drive through the South Rose Hill neighborhood looking for street parking. Currently cars regularly use NE 80th as a way to avoid traffic on NE 85th - with major 85th street construction on the horizon it seems reasonable to expect that even more cars will seek this small, residential street as an alternative route. Housing has boomed in the area adding another layer of traffic to push this small street beyond the traffic capacity that city planners have could have imagined. Two schools are located within this zone and the street still does not have complete sidewalks between the high school and elementary school.

2) The intersection of NE 80th/ 123rd Ave NE/ 124th Ave NE is dangerous today and increased traffic from the BRT project will make this intersection worse. The city needs to install a full traffic light at this intersection.

School kids use this crossing daily and often the view of the crosswalk is obstructed (East bound traffic) by cars waiting to turn left from NE 80th onto 124th NE. It is also extremely difficult to turn left from the end of 123rd onto NE 80th, it is extremely difficult to turn left from 124th Ave NE onto NE 80th. The compound effect of increasing traffic through this intersection due to the BRT and the new Google campus scheduled to be developed on the Lee Johnson parcel escalate the danger of this intersection. It is time to install a traffic light for the safety of our schools kids that cross here daily and the neighborhood residents.

Thank you , I am looking forward to the January 7 meeting.

Sincerely,

Katie Stern

---

**From:** Karen Story [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 12, 2021 7:14 AM  
**To:** Planning Commissioners; Allison Zike  
**Subject:** Re: Station Area Plan: I oppose 10+-story buildings!

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Rodney, thank you for asking me to share my specific concerns. I had kept my initial comments brief, because I know you are all inundated with things to read. These are a few of my concerns about the impact of high rise buildings in Kirkland.

To clarify: I am not opposed to density per se, I care about affordable housing, and I am willing to prioritize the greater good over my own interests. That being said:

The city put a lot of effort into creating the Kirkland 2035 comprehensive plan and vision. Kirkland residents overwhelming said they did not want Kirkland to be another Bellevue with high rises. It would undermine the city's credibility to change the comprehensive plan so drastically, so soon after approving it.

Speaking of Bellevue, has its forest of tall buildings caused housing prices to drop there? According to the internet, no: Bellevue housing prices are 25% higher than Kirkland.

More housing does not result in less competition for housing, because as we increase the number of housing units, we also increase the number of jobs, and thus the number of people who want to live here. So the ratio of houses to people does not necessarily increase.

The theory is that if there is excess housing stock, rents will drop, but I have not seen that happen. Many new apartments have been built in Kirkland in the past few years. I don't know what the current vacancy rate is, but I know that there are empty apartments, and this has not translated to lower rents.

As for those who want to buy houses, I don't believe that building more apartments or condos will cause single-family home or townhome prices to drop. People who want to buy a house will still be competing with others who want to buy a house. "Ground floor units" (houses and townhouses) allow people to have a yard or garden, easy access to fresh air, and more interaction with neighbors for both adults and children. These things are all important for our physical health, mental health, and community fabric, and are strongly desired by many people. I know few people who want to raise a family in a highrise apartment.

I do agree with focusing the highest density around transit, but rather than pick a few spots for 20-story buildings, I'd rather see a modest density increase throughout the city, spreading the load and creating a more people-scale cityscape. I also want developers to be required to build to the zoned density when they redevelop (instead of, for example, putting a single large home on a lot zoned for three units).

Another drawback to tall buildings is that they cause wind funneling and turbulence, which is unpleasant for pedestrians. They also cast large shadows, blocking sunlight for adjacent properties and pedestrians.

Low-rise living is closer to nature (which is critical for our mental well-being) and facilitates a stronger community-oriented social life. Studies show that in taller structures, tenants can become isolated and out of touch with city life below. Children can lose their direct contact with nature, and with other children. High-rises tend to separate people from the street and each other and greatly reduce the number of chance encounters, which are crucial to creating community.

I believe that six-story buildings provide just the right mix of density, housing options, job and retail opportunities, people-friendliness, aesthetics, and community.

On 1/9/2021 7:22 AM, Rodney Rutherford wrote:

Hi Karen, thank you for sharing your opposition to higher buildings.

I would like to learn more about the specific concerns you have with the impacts those higher buildings would create.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

---

**From:** Karen Story [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 9, 2021 6:51:25 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike <[AZike@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:AZike@kirklandwa.gov)>; Planning Commissioners  
<[planningcommissioners@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:planningcommissioners@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Station Area Plan: I oppose 10+-story buildings!

Dear Planning Commissioners and City of Kirkland,

I am strongly opposed to Alternative 3 of the Station Area Plan, and would like to see Alternative 2 scaled back to lower building heights consistent with those allowed elsewhere in Kirkland.

It is my understanding that Kirkland is on track to exceed the Growth Management Act requirements for new housing and jobs, and that higher buildings are not needed to meet these goals.

I do not want to live in a high-rise city like Bellevue.

Sincerely,

Karen Story  
Highlands Neighborhood co-chair

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Kent Sullivan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:29 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** Thank you for your presentation at the Norkirk NA meeting

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hi,

I live in Bridle Trails, near the Kirkland-Bellevue-Redmond border but I attend church in the Norkirk area and somehow ended up on their NA mailing list...

I have studied the Station Area Plan and am concerned that the challenges are not stated strongly enough. The tone of the document overall struck me as "we're doing this – so let's paint as positive a picture as possible". What I see is a site and surrounding area that is VERY challenged, from at least three aspects:

1. **Topography:** The area surrounding the station is *extremely* hilly and the distance between the station area and existing locations that people might want to reach is *psychologically* MUCH further than the maps in the report would suggest. (This is borderline misleading, frankly.)
2. **Existing structures / zoning / development:** The types of existing buildings and their orientation and location with respect to streets do not project a neighborhood feel; the Central Way viaduct and the cliff over which it passes creates a "chasm" that inhospitably separates the area from downtown Kirkland. I realize that up-zoning and redevelopment is part of the long-term plan but the most that can be achieved has the distinct feel of a tiny, sunny island within a vast, sad ocean.
3. **Noise:** You have to yell to be heard anywhere near I-405, not to mention have a coherent thought – any sense of quiet, connecting to nature, etc. seems completely unachievable (but several of the pictures imply—which is, again, borderline misleading).

I frankly can't imagine significant numbers of people wanting to be on foot in the station area, even if just passing through. Bicycling, except perhaps for dedicated commuters, is unrealistic given the challenges I mentioned earlier. (Tongue in cheek—I suppose if a government agency sprang for electric bikes for all of the citizens of Kirkland then maybe I could be proven wrong!) The part of the plan that talks about new trails and etc. is all well and good on paper but the feel this area has does not encourage actually being on foot. (With the exception of a small area around Forbes Lake.)

If you spend any time in this area, you clearly experience that it's a semi-industrial near-wasteland. It is NOT AT ALL like downtown Kirkland, Norkirk, Everest, or what the new urban village in Totem Lake may turn out to be, in large part due to the "scar" that is I-405 passing right through the middle. No amount of adding street trees or benches is going to fix this and the possibility of burying I-405 in a trench seems beyond remote. Downtown Boston is a valid comparison on some levels – the feel that the area around the Big Dig has compared to when the freeway was above ground is much greater than night and day – it's instead more like two different worlds – and the world that Boston has today is simply not a world Kirkland is going to achieve with respect to I-405.

Perhaps outside the scope of this report, but I feel important to state, is that the location chosen for this transit station has a strong feel of overly-hopeful "build it and they will come" in terms of bus lines and riders. For example, are people who live north and work at Microsoft REALLY going to abandon their cars to take a (admittedly, faster) BRT ride down I-405, only to get off that bus miles from the campus, just to get bogged down in the same surface street traffic as everyone else, on another bus? (Not to mention that Metro / ST stubbornly refuse to increase service frequency to anything shorter than 15 minutes. Being on time for the first meeting of the day is often a matter of 5-10 minutes. The feel that transit has in Vancouver, BC, for example, is vastly different, and much of that I think is due to service frequency.)

Thank you,

--Kent

P. S. As I mentioned above, the pictures of other projects used to evoke how the area might appear in the future is borderline misleading because those projects don't appear to have the same challenges. I have seen this technique

repeatedly in development proposals. I have no problem with this approach generally since “a picture is worth a thousand words” but great care needs to be used in selecting pictures that are truly representative and realistic.

---

**From:** teetoo18 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 9, 2021 6:28 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** RE: HNA: Send Station Area Plan comments to Planning Commission before Jan. 14

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I'd like to object to this movement. How do I do this?

Syd

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

----- Original message -----

**From:** Karen Story [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 1/9/21 7:27 AM (GMT-08:00)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** HNA: Send Station Area Plan comments to Planning Commission before Jan. 14

The Planning Commission will be holding a study session on Jan. 14 to discuss the I-405/NE 85th St. Station Area Plan proposed alternatives.

Please review the Station Area Plan (link below) and send your comments to the Commission before Jan. 14. (You can continue to send comments to the city through Feb. 5.)

Alternative 2 proposes buildings up to 10 stories on the east side of 405. Alternative 3 proposes buildings up to 20 stories. There are no proposed density increases in the Highlands.

Read the plan here: <https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Government/Departments/Planning-and-Building/Code-and-Plan-Amendment-Projects/NE-85th-Street-Station-Area-Plan#draftSEIS>.

Send comments to:

[azike@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:azike@kirklandwa.gov) and [PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov)

Note that the Station Area Plan only addresses city-owned land around the I-405/NE 85th St. interchange. The plan does not address the Sound Transit project (BRT stop, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, roundabout at 114th Ave NE and NE 85th St, updated interchange configuration with direct access to 405 express toll lanes, dropoff/pickup).

--

You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "Highlands Neighborhood Association" group.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to [kirklandhighlands+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com](mailto:kirklandhighlands+unsubscribe@googlegroups.com).



To view this discussion on the web visit <https://groups.google.com/d/msgid/kirklandhighlands/95cf64b6-99a6-04c5-5d4e-e2132b486b39%40nwnative.us>.

---

**From:** Kelli Curtis  
**Sent:** Friday, February 19, 2021 1:33 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** FW: NE 85th Street Station Area Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 14, 2021 3:37 PM  
**To:** Penny Sweet <PSweet@kirklandwa.gov>; Jay Arnold <JArnold@kirklandwa.gov>; Neal Black <NBlack@kirklandwa.gov>; Kelli Curtis <KCurtis@kirklandwa.gov>; Amy Falcone <afalcone@kirklandwa.gov>; Toby Nixon <TNixon@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** NE 85th Street Station Area Plan

Honorable Kirkland Council Members,  
Mayor Penny Sweet  
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold  
Council member Neal Black  
Council member Kelli Curtis  
Council Member Amy Falcone  
Council Member Toby Nixon  
Council Member Jon Pascal

I am a new attendee of Salt House Church, 11920 NE 80th St, Kirkland and a Kirkland resident. One of the things that attracted me to worship here is the care and concern for lower-income residents and the opportunity it affords me to do some practical good in the community.

Thank you for inviting our input into the Kirkland NE 85th Street Station Area Plan. As a congregation located in the center of this development, we could choose to voice concerns over a lack of parking, traffic congestion, or buildings too high. However, our faith compels us to prioritize and uphold lower-income residents in Kirkland and to seek the well-being of all, in service of the common good. We believe everyone should have a safe, healthy, affordable place to live. This is why we, Salt House Church, sold our northwest corner of our property in order to become Kirkland Place. Yet, housing remains a dire, urgent need:

- Before the pandemic, there was a severe shortage of affordable housing in Kirkland, particularly for people earning 30% of the median income and below.
- Home prices and rents have risen exponentially and many of our neighbors are being priced out of housing.
- The population experiencing homelessness in our region continues to grow and is more vulnerable than ever, seen in a shortage of over 195,000 homes affordable and available to very low-income households.
- Almost 23,000 people were identified experiencing homelessness during the point in time count in January 2020, representing a 6% increase in overall homelessness.
- Unsheltered homelessness increased by 13% and many more could lose their housing because of loss of income due to the pandemic.

Therefore, I urge you to double the amount of low-income housing included in your development plan for Kirkland NE 85th St.

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your consideration

*Jeanne M Tate*

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Kelli Curtis  
**Sent:** Friday, February 19, 2021 1:31 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** FW: Low-Income Housing

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**From:** Paula Templin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 17, 2021 8:37 PM  
**To:** Penny Sweet <PSweet@kirklandwa.gov>; Jay Arnold <JArnold@kirklandwa.gov>; Neal Black <NBlack@kirklandwa.gov>; Kelli Curtis <KCurtis@kirklandwa.gov>; Amy Falcone <afalcone@kirklandwa.gov>; Toby Nixon <TNixon@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Low-Income Housing

Honorable Kirkland Council Members,  
Mayor Penny Sweet  
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold  
Council member Neal Black  
Council member Kelli Curtis  
Council Member Amy Falcone  
Council Member Toby Nixon  
Council Member Jon Pascal

Hello, my name is Paula Templin. I am a resident of Kirkland and a member of Salt House Church, located at 11920 NE 80th St.

Thank you for inviting our input into the Kirkland NE 85th Street Station Area Plan. As a congregation located in the center of this development, we could choose to voice concerns over a lack of parking, traffic congestion, or buildings too high. However, our faith compels us to prioritize and uphold lower-income residents in Kirkland and to seek the well-being of all, in service of the common good. We believe everyone should have a safe, healthy, affordable place to live. This is why we, Salt House Church, sold our northwest corner of our property in order to become Kirkland Place. Yet, housing remains a dire, urgent need:

- Before the pandemic, there was a severe shortage of affordable housing in Kirkland, particularly for people earning 30% of the median income and below.
- Home prices and rents have risen exponentially and many of our neighbors are being priced out of housing.
- The population experiencing homelessness in our region continues to grow and is more vulnerable than ever, seen in a shortage of over 195,000 homes affordable and available to very low-income households.
- Almost 23,000 people were identified as experiencing homelessness during the point in time count in January 2020, representing a 6% increase in overall homelessness.
- Unsheltered homelessness increased by 13% and many more could lose their housing because of loss of income due to the pandemic.

Therefore, I urge you to double the amount of low-income housing included in your development plan for Kirkland NE 85th St.

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your consideration.

Paula Templin

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Susan Tonkin de Vries [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 10:38 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** NE 85th St Station Area Plan Draft SEIS Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I do not support either Alternative 2 or Alternative 3. Both Alternatives call for development that is completely out of scale for the area. The impacts on neighboring residents would be significant, and the benefits minimal. Something between the No Action Alternative and Alternative 2, but closer to the No Action Alternative, would be worth considering.

My specific comments are as follows.

1. The Draft SEIS does not tell us how much additional growth the GMA is likely to require by 2044, or what fraction of this would be covered by the anticipated growth in the three alternatives. Does the Plan use the Station Area to accommodate all the City's required growth, or is this the "fair share" for the surrounding neighborhoods?
2. Regarding traffic and congestion: It's clear that there will be significant, unavoidable impacts. Impacts related to entering and leaving I-405 (e.g., wait time to enter I-405 north during the evening rush hour) were not analyzed.
3. Regarding air quality: The air quality analysis seems to be limited to greenhouse gas emissions. Will local air quality (e.g., particulates) deteriorate with more congestion?
4. Regarding visual impacts: Alternative 3 feels like a few blocks of downtown Bellevue dropped onto the top of a hill in a low-rise suburban area. The buildings would have to be exceptionally beautiful to be anything other than an eyesore. It would be useful to see massing diagrams (based on a plausible build-out) from street level. For example, how much will westbound views be interrupted / closed off by 300-ft towers? In what area are they visible from street level? I have much less sense of the visual impact of Alternative 2; street level renderings would again help.
5. Regarding benefits to local residents: As far as I can tell, minimal. There will be commercial activity, but it will be aimed at office workers rather than residents. A few local residents will gain employment in the Plan area; many more will continue to commute elsewhere; their commutes will lengthen.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan.

Susan de Vries

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 9, 2021 10:58 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** I-405/NE 85th St. Station Area Plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

The time for action is now. Many residents might not like the increase in density and building height but it is a time for true leadership.

This is needed and long over due

I truly believe density and building height must increase along NE 85th. Building density and height also are needed in the Rosehill and Highlands (where I live) neighborhoods

20 plus stories are needed around the Transit Center if Kirkland is truly committed to providing affordable housing options and a more Pedestrian environment

These moments in history don't occur often, if not acted upon it will forever be an opportunity lost

Thanks, Tony

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 12:06 PM  
**To:** City Council  
**Subject:** Redesign At 85th & 405

Dear City Council,

I have been a resident of Kirkland for over 20 years. I did respond to the survey but felt it a bit misleading and cumbersome. I feel like it was leading in a way to get the response you want. We choose to live in Kirkland because we don't want to live like Seattle. I specifically prefer option #1 as I think that option offers a more controlled growth. We already experience a great increase in traffic during the summer months because Kirkland is a lovely place to be in nice weather. I don't like the idea of being forced out of our cars, forced onto transit etc. or to live in a specific area. I am all for choice and I think that can be done with a slower growth plan.

The other problem that I found with the survey is the implication of "affordable" housing. How "affordable" it would be is only implied--nothing concrete in terms of dollars. This is why I felt the survey is misleading as well as this process. You have made the decision and are now reverse engineering it make the residents feel like we have input.

Please remember you represent the citizens.

Elizabeth Tupper

Sent from Windows Mail



---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 13, 2021 6:14 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** NE 85th St Station Area Plan Draft SEIS Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

I prefer Alternative 2 but with condominium development rather than rental units. I think we should encourage home ownership - it's a community benefit in many ways - and the City of Kirkland should insist that developers recognize that in their plans.

Al Vaskas  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Don Volta [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 3:13 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** Draft SEIS comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street Station Area Plan. As over 20-year Kirkland homeowners in the Central Area we are extremely interested in this development. We hope it will turn out as well as the Kirkland Urban development that we strongly supported and now are the beneficiaries of the development.

In general, we strongly support Alternative 3 because it does the most to offer jobs, housing, retail, and public infrastructure development that we will benefit from, both directly and because of the financial advantages accruing to our community.

Although we favor Alternative 3, we noted that there are considerable advantages in the other alternatives regarding bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure improvements that are of primary interest to us. Overall, however, Alternative 3 provides the most value to bicyclists and pedestrians such as us.

We particularly support the north-south bicycle and pedestrian routes linking 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street with Slater Avenue NE. Currently, Slater Avenue NE is not a designated bike route because it does not have a bike lane and effectively terminates for cyclists at NE 100<sup>th</sup> Street. Here there is access to the 100<sup>th</sup> Street pedestrian/bicycle overpass to the west or NE 100<sup>th</sup> Street to the east to link to 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE or 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. Slater is preferred for north south bicycle travel over both 124<sup>th</sup> and 132<sup>nd</sup> because it is an exceptionally low traffic route even though it is not designated as a bike route. If north south bicycle users could continue through the Study Area directly to 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street, the development would create a major new bicycle transportation corridor on the east side of I405. Note that as shown in all three alternatives, this corridor would not develop because the extremely congested 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE bicycle route is not safe to ride due to traffic, nor is the short section of NE 90<sup>th</sup> Street. We urge you to consider linking Slater Avenue NE directly through the NE 85<sup>th</sup> station area development to 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/NE 80<sup>th</sup> Street.

Here are some other comments:

- Exhibit 3-56, Existing Bicycle Facilities. The bike/pedestrian trail that begins in the small park and ride lot on the SE corner of Kirkland Way and NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street is not shown. The path leads to Slater St./116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. It is shown in Exhibits 3-65, 3-66 and 3-67. This is a commonly used route for cyclists to access the pedestrian/bicycle overpass East over I405 to 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and then east to Rose Hill and Redmond or down 116<sup>th</sup> to Bellevue. Recommend you show this path on Exhibit 3-56. The two other routes shown to access the overpass, Ohde Avenue and Kirkland Avenue, both have more difficult grades and traffic issues.
- Exhibit 3-67, Transportation Network Assumptions, Alternative 3. The bicycle pedestrian routes along NE 85<sup>th</sup> Street up to the transit center are critical for cyclists. The grades on the west to east

- Page 3-154, Pedestrian and Bicycle. Paragraph refers to Exhibit 3-76; should be Exhibit 3-66.

## Don and Jane Volta

\_\_\_\_\_

---

**From:** Susan Vossler [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 7, 2021 9:51 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** NE 85th St Station Area Plan Draft SEIS Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello,  
I took the survey. I must say the question format was somewhat confusing.

I'd like to reiterate my priority for this development.  
City of Kirkland has made a commitment to reducing its emissions. One way to do this is to require that all new construction be 100% electric and net zero energy.

Thank you,  
Susan Vossler

---

**From:** Dan W [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 4, 2021 12:57 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** BRT station area plan comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

We are in favor of alternative 1 and building heights of no more than 6 stories. Also we are in favor of additional affordable housing. Thanks for your attention.

Dan & Cass Walker

---

**From:** Vivian Weber [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 19, 2021 7:50 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Cc:** Vivian Weber; Robert Weber  
**Subject:** NE 85th St. Station Area Plan--Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Attention: Allison Zike, Project Planner

We are long-term Kirkland residents (since 1992) and have the following comments on the proposed Station Area Plan around the I-405/NE 85th Street interchange:

- Require that all new construction be 100% electric and net zero energy. This can be achieved by building to passive-house guidelines (see [The Principles: Passive House Institute U.S. \(phius.org\)](https://www.phius.org)). It is much less expensive to increase insulation and include triple-pane windows during construction.
- Provide aggressive energy retrofit opportunities to existing buildings. All retrofits should replace gas appliances with 100% electric heat pumps and hot water systems.
- Require 50% of the required parking spaces to have EV chargers. Given the 10x decrease in battery cost in the past decade, Electric Vehicle use/ownership will outpace gas vehicles in the next 2 years. Get informed about the growing popularity of TaaS (Transportation as a Service): Driverless Uber/Lyft-type Electric Vehicles will transport Kirkland area residents from their home to the station and board public transportation to Sea-Tac. No need to park their car.
- Consider the Washington STRONG Act (SB5373 & HB1513) and support environmental justice. Give priority to hiring people who have economically suffered most from the COVID-19 pandemic to work in the new construction and retrofit projects.
- Support social justice and mandate that 25% of all housing units be reserved forever for low-income people of color (black & brown). Kirkland is too white. Let's support a community that celebrates age, income, and cultural diversities.

We support a decarbonized future. Pollution from buildings contribute a quarter of WA's greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation accounts for 45% of WA state's total emissions.

Thank-you for extending your comment period and considering our suggestions.

Kind regards,  
Vivian Weber  
Robert Weber

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 1, 2021 9:36 PM  
**To:** Adam Weinstein  
**Cc:** Joel Pfundt; Jon Pascal; Jeremy McMahan; Allison Zike  
**Subject:** RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Thanks for getting back, Adam. No worries.

I agree updated data wouldn't make that much of a difference comparatively speaking. But in my mind, it speaks to bigger issues. And these aren't directed at you, Adam, or anyone in particular. Just observations for consideration. I'm not trying to pick a fight or troll. I'm just profoundly concerned (and scared) about our climate crisis.

1. How dramatic would the differences need to be to change the analysis? I think the fact the numbers are a) 20 years old and it didn't really matter and b) we don't really have a handle on meaningful deltas tells me the city doesn't really have a sustainability plan that's measurable and actionable.
2. EIS's are notoriously bad at gaming alternatives to justify the preferred path. We know the city prefers Alternative 3 and it's hard to argue against the *potential* reductions large scale TOD can bring to both VMT and GHG. Totem Lake, Kirkland Urban, and even the south Kirkland P&R, were billed as multi-model developments aimed at reducing car reliance. Meanwhile VMT in Kirkland keeps climbing. In fact, the DEIS includes an entire section on road design mitigations to maintain LOS.
3. There's a fourth alternative that rarely makes the list in a TOD EIS: Reduce and distribute. Reduce the scope of the project while absorbing the required population growth by distributing it around the city. It may lead to more aggressive missing middle with many mini transit and retail nodes – throughout existing neighborhoods.
  - a. It may mean moving away from an over reliance on large scale TOD projects as population sinks at select transit nodes near freeways (who's construction alone emits large amounts of GHG).
  - b. It's a strategy Claudia Balducci has been advocating as well, "TOD doesn't have to be near freeways...and it doesn't have to be big" And while she admits and begrudges the Bel-Red/Spring Street corridor lacks diversity of typology and affordable housing (she regrets letting the market decide), she feels victorious in at least having it away from 520 and not centered on a major transit hub. (But there's only so much control over WSDOT the city has, in Kirkland's case)

I understand the city wants a big development at 85<sup>th</sup>. There are huge tax revenue implications. We also need to absorb regional population growth and the state has decided on an interchange whether we need it or not.

But there are cities around the globe moving aggressively toward car reduction inside CBDs and beyond. Portland has 32 designated 'mini-centers' focused on distributing and dispersing nodes across neighborhoods instead of over-investing in a few big ones. It's a focus on accessibility for all over just those living in urban growth centers.

Thanks for the attention. I don't envy the tradeoffs you're forced to make.

Brad

---

**From:** [Adam Weinstein](#)  
**Sent:** Saturday, January 30, 2021 8:56 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]

Cc: [Joel Pfundt](#); [Jon Pascal](#); [Jeremy McMahan](#); [Allison Zike](#)

Subject: RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Brad --- Sorry I wasn't able to respond to your message yesterday, but glad Councilmember Pascal did. I'm not sure updated building consumption/emissions factors would dramatically change the comparative GHG analysis in the SEIS (which is primarily intended to facilitate analysis of the three alternatives and selection of a preferred alternative), but our consultant is looking into it, along with your questions about particulates (again, per capita particulate emissions should be reduced under Alternative 3 compared to Alternative 1, regardless of whether the PM is associated with vehicle exhaust or tires).

Also, we forwarded your email to our consultant so you should expect these issues to be addressed in the Final SEIS (no need to send a separate SEIS comment letter). Thanks for flagging these questions.

Adam

**Adam Weinstein, AICP**  
*Director of Planning and Building*

City of Kirkland  
123 5th Avenue  
Kirkland, WA 98033

(425) 587-3227  
[aweinstein@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:aweinstein@kirklandwa.gov)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 2:50 PM  
**To:** Jon Pascal <[JPascal@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPascal@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Adam Weinstein <[AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov)>; Joel Pfundt <[JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: GHG Dataset Dates

Thanks, Jon. Will do.

---

**From:** Jon Pascal <[JPascal@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPascal@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 1:43:36 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Adam Weinstein <[AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov)>; Joel Pfundt <[JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: GHG Dataset Dates

Hi Brad,

Thanks for digging through the DEIS. I am still reviewing and formulating my comments that I intend to share with Adam and staff. Sounds like the deadline for comments got extended later into February, which was good to see and gives everyone more time.

Regarding the County information, I think it is the responsibility of the consultants to know which data to use or not to use, and also to defend their methodology as appropriate or reasonable for the level of analysis required at the EIS stage. You should be sure to submit these comments as part of the EIS so they can be addressed.

Regards,  
Jon



**Jon Pascal**  
Councilmember  
City of Kirkland  
[REDACTED]  
[jpascal@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:jpascal@kirklandwa.gov)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 10:42 PM  
**To:** Adam Weinstein <[AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov)>; Jon Pascal <[JPascal@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPascal@kirklandwa.gov)>; Joel Pfundt <[JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov](mailto:JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: GHG Dataset Dates

Hey Friends,

As I was reviewing [Kirkland's NE 85th St Station Area Plan and Planned Action DEIS](#), (page 3.6) I noticed the GHG emissions [data](#) Fehr and Peers used is nearly 20 years old. I see there's data on [commercial building energy consumption](#) from as early as 2018. And the annual VMT data is from 2006 at 56.5B and in 2019 the state reported was [62.5B](#). Our state has also added another 1.2M people since 2006 as well and those figures are included in their calculations. I think we can all agree the GHG numbers included in that packet are thus misleading. (not that the public scrutinizes such things as I do. 😊)

I reached out to Matt at King County who owns that spreadsheet. He said it was made for an old and dated SEPA process and was never intended to be updated.

I think Fehr and Peers, and/or the city, should use the formulas in the spreadsheet but with updated data. Meanwhile, Jon, maybe you want to lean on someone at the county to get these sheet updated or taken down. It makes me wonder how many projects are being pitched with this old GHG data.

Also, there is no mention of [non-exhaust particulate emissions](#) from motor vehicles. For a project that is so near sensitive waterways and wetlands, it seems the report would want to pay particular attention to this often overlooked dimension. I know there's a proposal for a blue street, but it would be good to talk about why. And it's ironic the blue street will be connecting to a parking garage as part of the alternative 3 plan...even as the plan greenwashes the benefits of TOD.

People like to look at EV's as the GHG savior (which they have potential to help), but few people know that with the increased torque comes more particulate matter from tires. The WSDOT EIS also gave little mention of this and claimed the interchange would do little to increase particulate matter or increase traffic volume. And yet, the new interchange (if built) will be three layers of vehicle traffic where today there are two. Moreover, improved interchange flow to and from 85<sup>th</sup> may induce demand thus increase volumes from nearby arterials. (which the Kirkland DEIS admits at 3.6.4)

"However, even with some combination of these potential mitigation measures, queueing would likely still be an issue throughout the Study Area and on the I-405 off ramps, which would also influence safety. Therefore, significant unavoidable adverse impacts are expected for auto, freight, and safety."

With the city's refreshed commitment to sustainability, and a new focus on equity and justice, it would be good to see more attention put on true GHG, the underexplored effects of non-exhaust particulate emissions, and a spotlight on transportation equity and justice for those who live and work (or will) near the freeway. The current

document greenwashes much of this away by focusing on the benefits of TOD in alternative 3 and the cities ATP and sustainability plans, but gives little attention (outside of 3.6.4) to the realities of a dominant car dependent region with considerable increases in population.

Happy to chat face to face if it helps. And happy to help or nudge anyway or anywhere I can.

Brad

---

**From:** [Kuharic, Matt](#)

**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 4:45 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Hi Brad,

Apologies for the delayed response. I agree that the data in the reference County developed spreadsheet is out of date and there is more recent data and information available from other sources.

The County has not updated the spreadsheet because when it was first developed it was to support potential requirements of GHG emissions mitigation through the SEPA process, but because those potential requirements never were adopted, and because only disclosure of GHG emissions through SEPA is required, resources and time have not been spent to update the original spreadsheet.

Please let me know how I can be of assistance.

Sincerely, Matt

--

**Matt Kuharic**

**Senior Climate Program Manager**

**King County's Department of Natural Resources and Parks Director's Office**

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/climate>

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] l)

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 10:24 AM

**To:** Kuharic, Matt <[Matt.Kuharic@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Matt.Kuharic@kingcounty.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Ping. Let me know if there's someone else I should be asking.

Thanks, Matt.

Brad

---

**From:** [Brad Weed](#)

**Sent:** Sunday, January 10, 2021 4:16 PM

**To:** [matt.kuharic@kingcounty.gov](mailto:matt.kuharic@kingcounty.gov)

**Subject:** GHG Dataset Dates

Hey Matt,

I'm analyzing [Kirkland's NE 85th St Station Area Plan and Planned Action DEIS](#) as part of [Kirkland Greenways](#). Fehr and Peers link to your data for their Lifetime GHG Emissions of the Study Area Studied Alternatives (Exhibit 1-16 in the DEIS above).

I'm wondering why [the data you use](#) is so old. There have been numerous updates to the [EIA data alone](#) since 2003. But some of your data is even older, including Typical Housing stock from 2001.

I'm wondering if Fehr and Peers are using the right data or if maybe you've updated the spreadsheet but not your notes? Surely the data has changed in 20 years, yes?

Anyway, I'd love your thoughts and perspective.

Thanks!  
Brad

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Joel Pfundt  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 6:22 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike; Jeremy McMahan  
**Subject:** FW: GHG Dataset Dates

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

FYI...

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 10:43 PM  
**To:** Adam Weinstein <AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>; Joel Pfundt <JPfundt@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: GHG Dataset Dates

Hey Friends,

As I was reviewing [Kirkland's NE 85th St Station Area Plan and Planned Action DEIS](#), (page 3.6) I noticed the GHG emissions [data](#) Fehr and Peers used is nearly 20 years old. I see there's data on [commercial building energy consumption](#) from as early as 2018. And the annual VMT data is from 2006 at 56.5B and in 2019 the state reported was [62.5B](#). Our state has also added another 1.2M people since 2006 as well and those figures are included in their calculations. I think we can all agree the GHG numbers included in that packet are thus misleading. (not that the public scrutinizes such things as I do. 😊)

I reached out to Matt at King County who owns that spreadsheet. He said it was made for an old and dated SEPA process and was never intended to be updated.

I think Fehr and Peers, and/or the city, should use the formulas in the spreadsheet but with updated data. Meanwhile, Jon, maybe you want to lean on someone at the county to get these sheet updated or taken down. It makes me wonder how many projects are being pitched with this old GHG data.

Also, there is no mention of [non-exhaust particulate emissions](#) from motor vehicles. For a project that is so near sensitive waterways and wetlands, it seems the report would want to pay particular attention to this often overlooked dimension. I know there's a proposal for a blue street, but it would be good to talk about why. And it's ironic the blue street will be connecting to a parking garage as part of the alternative 3 plan...even as the plan greenwashes the benefits of TOD.

People like to look at EV's as the GHG savior (which they have potential to help), but few people know that with the increased torque comes more particulate matter from tires. The WSDOT EIS also gave little mention of this and claimed the interchange would do little to increase particulate matter or increase traffic volume. And yet, the new interchange (if built) will be three layers of vehicle traffic where today there are two. Moreover, improved interchange flow to and from 85<sup>th</sup> may induce demand thus increase volumes from nearby arterials. (which the Kirkland DEIS admits at 3.6.4)

“However, even with some combination of these potential mitigation measures, queueing would likely still be an issue throughout the Study Area and on the I-405 off ramps, which would also influence safety. Therefore, significant unavoidable adverse impacts are expected for auto, freight, and safety.”

With the city’s refreshed commitment to sustainability, and a new focus on equity and justice, it would be good to see more attention put on true GHG, the underexplored effects of non-exhaust particulate emissions, and a spotlight on transportation equity and justice for those who live and work (or will) near the freeway. The current document greenwashes much of this away by focusing on the benefits of TOD in alternative 3 and the cities ATP and sustainability plans, but gives little attention (outside of 3.6.4) to the realities of a dominant car dependent region with considerable increases in population.

Happy to chat face to face if it helps. And happy to help or nudge anyway or anywhere I can.

Brad

---

**From:** [Kuharic, Matt](#)  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 4:45 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Hi Brad,

Apologies for the delayed response. I agree that the data in the reference County developed spreadsheet is out of date and there is more recent data and information available from other sources.

The County has not updated the spreadsheet because when it was first developed it was to support potential requirements of GHG emissions mitigation through the SEPA process, but because those potential requirements never were adopted, and because only disclosure of GHG emissions through SEPA is required, resources and time have not been spent to update the original spreadsheet.

Please let me know how I can be of assistance.

Sincerely, Matt

--  
**Matt Kuharic**  
Senior Climate Program Manager  
King County's Department of Natural Resources and Parks Director's Office  
<http://www.kingcounty.gov/climate>  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2021 10:24 AM  
**To:** Kuharic, Matt <[Matt.Kuharic@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Matt.Kuharic@kingcounty.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: GHG Dataset Dates

Ping. Let me know if there’s someone else I should be asking.

Thanks, Matt.

Brad

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 10, 2021 4:16 PM  
**To:** [matt.kuharic@kingcounty.gov](mailto:matt.kuharic@kingcounty.gov)  
**Subject:** GHG Dataset Dates

Hey Matt,

I'm analyzing [Kirkland's NE 85th St Station Area Plan and Planned Action DEIS](#) as part of [Kirkland Greenways](#). Fehr and Peers link to your data for their Lifetime GHG Emissions of the Study Area Studied Alternatives (Exhibit 1-16 in the DEIS above).

I'm wondering why [the data you use](#) is so old. There have been numerous updates to the [EIA data alone](#) since 2003. But some of your data is even older, including Typical Housing stock from 2001.

I'm wondering if Fehr and Peers are using the right data or if maybe you've updated the spreadsheet but not your notes? Surely the data has changed in 20 years, yes?

Anyway, I'd love your thoughts and perspective.

Thanks!  
Brad

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

---

**From:** Steve Wilhelm [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 13, 2021 6:46 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** NE 85th St Station Area Plan Draft SEIS Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello,

We live at [REDACTED] just west of Lake Washington High School.

While the thought of all that development along 85<sup>th</sup> is a bit unnerving, I can see the virtue in terms of concentrating transit. Please do make sure all construction in the plan is 100 percent electric and net zero energy, and that existing buildings in the area be provided a strong aggressive energy retrofit and electrification program.

Thank you,

Steve Wilhelm

---

**From:** Bob Willar [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 11:49 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** Proposed NE 85th St. Rezoning

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am writing as a resident of the Everest Neighborhood in Kirkland to express some concerns about the proposed NE 85th Street rezoning of a portion our neighborhood. Keeping long-standing policies and practices in mind, having 45 or 85-foot-tall structures immediately adjacent to residential properties is definitely detrimental to those residential properties and our neighborhood. It is an intrusion into the neighborhood in a way that land use polices expressly say are not to occur.

Many residents came to Kirkland precisely because of its charm, character, and sense of community. This character must be preserved or we cease to be Kirkland. Big buildings do not a City make – residents and community do. Having 45 or 85-foot-tall structures immediately adjacent to residential properties is definitely detrimental to residents and to our community.

It is difficult to understand what the motivation for Alternatives 2 and 3 is. Kirkland is already in compliance with GMA goals for population growth and density. The curve for jobs growth is approaching where it should be for GMA compliance.

Have we considered what kind of City we want to be in the future? If we want to preserve Kirkland's intimate and neighborly character, as called for in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, how does building tall buildings outside core urban areas such as Downtown and Totem Lake advance that agenda? Do we want to be another Redmond or Bellevue? If we did, then most of us would not have chosen Kirkland as a place to live.

What exactly would we accomplish with Alternatives 2 or 3? We are already on track to meet or exceed our Growth Management Act goals under current zoning. Larger structures might make sense east of 405, along NE8th – they make no sense in the Everest Neighborhood.

The Comprehensive Plan states that streets are important Open Spaces for residents. Are not yards and gardens also important Open Spaces for residents? Such Open Spaces are important for more than just the people who live on those lots. What will happen to the sense of space if tall buildings create forbidding canyons in our Neighborhoods? People make communities, not buildings. The current fashion for high-rise single-occupant condos and apartments may be a transient fad.

Do we want our residents fleeing to other areas to live and gain space, just as many of us fled places like Seattle and Bellevue? Kirkland does not have to be all things to all people – people who want to live in places like Seattle and Bellevue can do so. Do not recreate such places here in Kirkland.

Kirkland has provided space for many single-occupant condos and apartments. Do we need more, or is the demand what it appears to be – for single-family detached homes.



Sincerely,

Bob Willar

---

**From:** Oksana Willeke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 15, 2021 9:47 AM  
**To:** Allison Zike; City Council; Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** NE 85th Street Station Area Plan Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear city of Kirkland team,

As a resident of the Everest Neighborhood to express some concerns about the proposed rezoning of a portion of our neighborhood.

What exactly would we accomplish with Alternatives 2 or 3? We are already on track to meet or exceed our Growth Management Act goals under current zoning. Larger structures might make sense east of 405, along NE8th – they make no sense in the Everest Neighborhood.

The Comprehensive Plan states that streets are important Open Spaces for residents. Are not yards and gardens also important Open Spaces for residents? Such Open Spaces are important for more than just the people who live on those lots. What will happen to the sense of space if tall buildings create forbidding canyons in our Neighborhoods?

People make communities, not buildings. The current fashion for high-rise single-occupant condos and apartments may be a transient fad. Do we want our residents fleeing to other areas to live and gain space, just as many of us fled places like Seattle and Bellevue? Kirkland does not have to be all things to all people – people who want to live in places like Seattle and Bellevue can do so. Please do not recreate such places here in Kirkland.

Thank you for understanding and your work!

Sincerely,

Oksana Willeke  
Kirkland Everest Neighborhood Resident

---

**From:** Scott Willeke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 14, 2021 9:41 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike; City Council; Planning Commissioners  
**Subject:** NE 85th Street Station Area Plan Feedback

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am writing as a resident of the Everest Neighborhood to express some concerns about the proposed rezoning of a portion of our neighborhood, specifically having 45 or 85-foot-tall structures immediately adjacent to residential properties. I have already completed the DSEIS Survey but felt compelled to write to you as well.

Many residents including us, came to Kirkland precisely because of its charm, character, and sense of community. This character must be preserved or we cease to be Kirkland. Big buildings do not a City make – residents and community do. Having 45 or 85-foot-tall structures immediately adjacent to residential properties is definitely detrimental to residents and to our community.

It is difficult to understand what the motivation for Alternatives 2 and 3 is. Kirkland is already in compliance with GMA goals for population growth and density. The curve for jobs growth is approaching where it should be for GMA compliance.

If we want to preserve Kirkland's intimate and neighborly character, as called for in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, how does building tall buildings outside core urban areas such as Downtown and Totem Lake advance that agenda? Do we want to be another Redmond or Bellevue? I do not, if I did then I would not have chosen Kirkland as a place to live.

What exactly would we accomplish with Alternatives 2 or 3? We are already on track to meet or exceed our Growth Management Act goals under current zoning. Larger structures might make sense east of 405, along NE8th – they make no sense in the Everest Neighborhood.

The Comprehensive Plan states that streets are important Open Spaces for residents. Are not yards and gardens also important Open Spaces for residents? Such Open Spaces are important for more than just the people who live on those lots. What will happen to the sense of space if tall buildings create forbidding canyons in our Neighborhoods?

Sincerely,

Scott Willeke  
Kirkland Everest Neighborhood Resident



**Washington State  
Department of Transportation**

Office of Urban Mobility and Access  
2901 3rd Avenue, #500  
Seattle, WA 98121-3014

206-464-1220 / FAX: 206-464-1189  
TTY: 1-800-833-6388  
[www.wsdot.wa.gov](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov)

February 18, 2021

Allison Zike, AICP  
Senior Planner  
City of Kirkland

Re: NE 85th Street Station Area Plan Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

Dear Ms. Zike,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NE 85th Street Station Area Plan Draft SEIS. This letter provides the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)'s comments, representing the perspective from WSDOT's Urban Mobility and Access Office (I-405/SR 167 Megaprogram and Regional Transit Coordination Division).

WSDOT supports the City's work to develop a Station Area Plan (SAP) to advance the City's 2035 Comprehensive Plan vision and support a vibrant, equitable, and sustainable Transit-Oriented Community adjacent to the regional transit investments in the growing Downtown Kirkland and the NE 85th Street Corridor. We see high functioning communities and transportation systems as codependent. While promoting community goals, the SAP can establish a framework that can make the state transportation system more equitable and more sustainable. As the SAP evolves, we see opportunity to:

- Partner and proactively remove barriers to add housing, employment, and services within existing developed areas.
- Refresh our collective thinking on parking to explore the tremendous public cost of parking and the benefits of such strategies as shared parking and parking maximums rather than minimums in zoning code.
- Prioritize transportation investments that ensure equitable access to high-quality employment, education, healthy food, health care services, safe housing, arts and culture offerings, and social opportunities to achieve optimal health outcomes.
- Implement a clear delineation of road and street type.
- To improve access to transit, prioritize the safety and convenience of active transportation with facilities that invite all ages and abilities use active modes.

As the city works towards these larger goals that complement statewide goals—such as goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles traveled per capita, and improve equity—we want to work together as strong partners to find solutions to any challenges that may arise along the way. For example, exhibits 3.74 and 3.76 in the Draft SEIS show queuing is forecasted in the year 2044 along NE 85th Street under Alternatives 2 and 3 at the 120th, 122nd and 124th intersections. If those forecasts bore out, there is a risk that this queuing could back up onto the off-ramp from I-405. Queues that result in stopped vehicles on an off-ramp causing conflicts with vehicles moving at freeway speeds is a serious safety performance issue. As the City moves forward with the Final



SEIS and SAP, WSDOT requests that the City provide a more detailed quantitative analysis on the operational transportation effects of all of the SAP alternatives, particularly for the general purpose and express toll lane ramp terminal intersections at the redesigned I-405/NE 85th Street interchange. We also request that the City and WSDOT continue to work together proactively to ensure land development supports multimodal transportation and all safety issues are addressed. The City's attention to improving the proximity between people's daily destinations and their homes—building a complete 20-minute community in the 85th Station Area—would go a long way toward mitigating those potential risks in the later years of the forecast horizon.

WSDOT sets level of service standards for highways of statewide significance (HSS) based on RCW 47.06.140(2). For this SEIS, HSS facilities include I-405 and any associated ramps in the study area. WSDOT maintains that any operational or other impacts from the proposed action to HSS facilities (I-405 ramp terminals) would need to be mitigated. WSDOT requests that the City further identify and quantify additional mitigation projects and/or Transportation Demand Management strategies that could be implemented to address these adverse impacts under Alternatives 2 and 3.

With appropriate avoidance or mitigation for adverse transportation operational effects, we see the strongest potential for benefits from Alternative 3, the creation of a SAP and Form Based Code to allow further intensified development close to the station offering jobs and housing in taller buildings, transitioning to mid-rise and low rise development further from the station, as well as investment in additional bike/pedestrian routes, more intensive green streets, a green-blue street, and green building design.

WSDOT has been coordinating closely with the City and Sound Transit throughout the development of the I-405, NE 85th Street Interchange and Bus Rapid Transit Station Project. The project has been designed through a collaborative stakeholder process to meet the agencies' shared goals of transit connectivity, active transportation mobility and connectivity, and vehicular operations while remaining compatible with Kirkland's vision and agency master plans. WSDOT looks forward to continued coordination with the City as we work with Sound Transit to deliver the project.

Sincerely,



Lisa Hodgson, P.E.  
I-405/SR 167  
Program Administrator

Dylan Counts  
Director  
Regional Transit Coordination  
Division

DC: dh

---

**From:** Kelli Curtis  
**Sent:** Friday, February 19, 2021 1:33 PM  
**To:** Allison Zike  
**Subject:** FW: Concerning the 85th St Transit and Redevelopment proposal

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**From:** Macy Zwanzig [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 8, 2021 10:42 AM  
**To:** Penny Sweet <PSweet@kirklandwa.gov>; Jay Arnold <JArnold@kirklandwa.gov>; Neal Black <NBlack@kirklandwa.gov>; Kelli Curtis <KCurtis@kirklandwa.gov>; Amy Falcone <afalcone@kirklandwa.gov>; Toby Nixon <TNixon@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>  
**Subject:** Concerning the 85th St Transit and Redevelopment proposal

Honorable Kirkland Council Members,  
Mayor Penny Sweet  
Deputy Mayor Jay Arnold  
Council Member Neal Black  
Council Member Kelli Curtis  
Council Member Amy Falcone  
Council Member Toby Nixon  
Council Member Jon Pascal

I am currently a member at Salt House Church (11920 NE 80th St, Kirkland) and am a high school teacher at Redmond High School and a member of the church council. Thank you for inviting our input into the Kirkland NE 85th Street Station Area Plan. As a congregation located in the center of this development, we could choose to voice concerns over a lack of parking, traffic congestion, or buildings too high. However, our faith compels us to prioritize and uphold lower-income residents in Kirkland and to seek the well-being of all, in service of the common good. We believe everyone should have a safe, healthy, affordable place to live. This is why we, Salt House Church, sold our northwest corner of our property in order to become Kirkland Place. Yet, housing remains a dire, urgent need:

- Before the pandemic, there was a severe shortage of affordable housing in Kirkland, particularly for people earning 30% of the median income and below.
- Home prices and rents have risen exponentially and many of our neighbors are being priced out of housing.
- The population experiencing homelessness in our region continues to grow and is more vulnerable than ever, seen in a shortage of over 195,000 homes affordable and available to very low-income households.
- Almost 23,000 people were identified experiencing homelessness during the point in time count in January 2020, representing a 6% increase in overall homelessness.
- Unsheltered homelessness increased by 13% and many more could lose their housing because of loss of income due to the pandemic.

Therefore, I urge you to double the amount of low-income housing included in your development plan for Kirkland NE 85th St.

I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you for your consideration.

Macy Zwanzig

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.