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SECTION 5.0 – FINAL EIS ADDENDUM

This Final EIS on the Southern Gateway Subarea Plan should be read in conjunction with the Draft EIS. The Final EIS reviews public comments on the Draft and supplements the Draft with corrections and additional text.

5.1 Summary of Comments on Draft EIS and Responses

The City issued the Draft EIS on the Gateway Subarea Plan on January 16, 2013. A public hearing on the Plan, the zoning regulations and design guidelines, and the Draft EIS was held on January 30, 2013. The comment period on the Draft EIS remained open until February 20, 2013. Table 5.1.1 summarizes the comments received, responds to the comments, and directs the reader to the relevant section of the document when revisions have been made. Where comments express opinion or do not raise specific environmental concerns, responses indicate that the comment has been noted. Where comments are repetitive, readers are directed to previous responses given to earlier comments. The written comments are reprinted in their entirety in Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Author/ Speaker</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Jill Seidel (Speaker)</td>
<td>A. My property on 150th used to be zoned mixed use, then commercial, and now it is going to be zoned mixed use again. Why? B. On the graphic used in the presentation, this property is shown as pavement and trees.</td>
<td>A. Please contact City staff to discuss the history of zoning on your property. B. The graphics used in the Subarea Plan are conceptual only, and are meant to give readers a feel for potential development &amp; improvements. Graphics in the plan should not be construed as development proposals. Check proposed zoning code sections for actual development regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Matthew Damon (Speaker)</td>
<td>A. Doing something with the Elks property is valuable to community, but the size of the development proposed is overwhelming on such a small parcel of land. B. 145th is a narrow corridor; too narrow for traffic. C. Opening the 35th corridor is dangerous. D. Hills on 147th are steep; People will be stranded at the bottom of the hill in inclement weather. E. Concern with people walking. F. In favor of gateway treatment, but tone it down; it’s taking away from the purpose of Lake Forest Park. We’re a residential community.</td>
<td>A. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see Sections 4.1 and 4.13 of the EIS, which discuss land use and bulk impacts and mitigation strategies. B. The 145th St. corridor provides width to allow for two adequate travel lanes (one each direction) with a pavement width exceeding 24 feet. One lane each direction can accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes in the corridor. An additional lane is added at the Bothell Way intersection to increase capacity at that point. As new development occurs, traffic analysis will be needed to ensure that this roadway and others have adequate capacity to serve the new development, given the existing traffic on the roadways. C. The 35th Avenue connection will need to be designed to accommodate pedestrians and to slow vehicular speeds. The roadway will be designed with traffic-calming features that accommodate these two goals. See traffic-calming mitigation discussion in Section 4.2.2 of the EIS. D. Traffic at the bottom of the hill (along Lake Washington) is not expected to increase dramatically. Directional signage will stress Bothell Way NE as the preferred route for through-traffic and other neighborhood streets for local access only. See clarification regarding truck traffic and signage mitigation strategies in Section 5.2.2. E. Several of the streets in the neighborhood are not outfitted with sidewalks or separated pedestrian facilities. To accommodate pedestrians safely, a separated pedestrian pathway is proposed along 37th Avenue between 147th and 153rd. Sidewalks along side streets closest to Bothell Way will also accompany redevelopment. F. Your comment has been noted. There are no specific proposals for gateway treatment at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Howard Springer (Speaker)</td>
<td>A. 147th/37th is unsafe now and not capable of handling more traffic (37th has 1 ½ lanes and less when people park). 147th is steep and has to be closed in the winter. Streets can’t handle more traffic associated with 2600</td>
<td>A. The 147th St. and 37th Ave. corridors provide enough width to allow for two adequate travel lanes (one each direction) with pavement width exceeding 24 feet. One lane each direction can accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes in the corridors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. EIS doesn’t address why we are doing this. Heard that it is because City wants economic development. B. Community doesn’t have an incentive to vote for more density. City wants more density. C. At 145th, there are three corners governed by 2 other jurisdictions. There are still drug deals across the street. Lake City is a rough neighborhood. Need to coordinate with the Seattle Police Department. D. Nothing about whether any of it will be subsidized housing. E. Not convinced that 600 square feet of open space will this be big enough to serve a project of that scope.

A. The EIS addresses the intent of the plan in Section 1.1. These goals include housing options, livable neighborhoods, aesthetics for the southern entry to the city, and increased retail services. See also Section 5.2.1 of the Final EIS. B. Your comment has been noted. Several of the goals in the plan may translate to higher densities—including the goals to create more diversified housing opportunities. C. Noted. Coordination with the Cities of Seattle and Shoreline will be necessary. See also response 3C above. D. Subsidized housing is not specifically called out in the Subarea Plan. The goals of the Subarea Plan are to create more housing choices, whether they be rental, ownership, subsidized, or a combination thereof. To date, additional subsidized housing has not been proposed. E. In addition to the proposed public plaza open space, the proposed zoning regulations require open space at the rate of 100 square feet per dwelling unit and 1% of commercial building area. In the areas proposed for mixed use,
development at build out under the Subarea Plan will result in 67% more open space than under future development under the City’s current Comprehensive Plan.

5. January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing)  Larry Holland (Speaker)  A. The Elks Development doesn’t address traffic. There will be more traffic and backups at 153rd.  B. Don’t need sidewalk from 145th to 153rd. Doesn’t think that there will be enough foot traffic in the neighborhood to warrant sidewalks. People can use Bothell Way.  C. The cost of lighted sidewalks could be millions of dollars. Who is going to pay for it? Developers? Can we afford it? Keep cost in mind.

A. Traffic impacts are addressed in Section 4.2 of the EIS. Future development throughout the Subarea will result in impacts to the streets that connect to Bothell Way NE. Proposals for future development on the Elks site (or any other site) will need to provide proposal specific traffic analysis to ensure that local streets are not impacted beyond their demonstrated capacity. See Section 4.2 of the Draft EIS and Section 5.2.2 of the Final EIS for other mitigation strategies.  B. Comment noted. While Bothell Way does not provide a pedestrian-friendly environment, future development in the neighborhood will result in the need for additional and safer travel options for pedestrians.  C. At this time, most improvements would be developer provided. Requirements that are included in the new zoning standards and design guidelines will result in improvements that are included in the plan. Some improvements would have to be City-funded (e.g. 37th pedestrian path). At a later date, the City may choose to fund or seek funding for improvements in grants or loans. Additional taxation to fund improvements is not proposed.

6. January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing)  Jean Patterson (Speaker)  A. Objecting to 5-7 story buildings; maybe 3-5 stories would be more acceptable.  B. Objects to use of sidewalk at 35th Avenue as mitigation for traffic problems at 145th and 147th.  C. Traffic counts came from two different sources. One is traffic counts from WSDOT on Bothell Way at 165th. The other is the turning movements from 2008. Using counts from two different years mitigates how much traffic is out there right now.  D. Objects to pathway. Put pedestrians on Bothell Way.  E. Objects to low level lighting. There are different descriptions for low-level lighting. Be more specific.

A. Comment noted.  B. The Subarea Plan contains some features that also act as mitigation strategies. The 35th Avenue connection is one of these—it helps to contain traffic from redevelopment on the Elks site from impacting existing neighborhood streets. It also has a secondary benefit of lessening the impact on the intersection of Bothell Way NE/NE 145th.  C. Traffic volumes on Bothell Way were collected from the traffic camera at 165th, as noted. Turning movements were counted in April of 2012. These two data collections provided the basis for the existing conditions section of the EIS (Section 3.2). For the analysis of traffic associated with future development under the Subarea Plan, forecasts are developed by using trip generation rates to assign the number of vehicle trips to each dwelling unit, square foot of commercial space, or other use (medical, institutional, etc.). These rates are based on national studies and are published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE). The latest version of this manual was published in 2008.  D. Comment noted. Also, see response at comment no. 5B.  E. The Subarea Plan contains illustrations of low-level lighting for use along the pedestrian path. See page 24 of the Plan.

7. January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing)  Alice Alden (Speaker)  A. 1,700 square foot building lot per unit is too small.  B. Too much traffic on 37th, where there’s a school bus stop. There’s not good sight lines and speeds.

A. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see Section 4.1 of this EIS, which discusses land use impacts and mitigation strategies.  B. The Plan includes implementation measures which include traffic calming on
are too fast. Would like speed bumps on 37th; We need speed control and parking regulations to stop people from parking boats for 24 hours.

|   | January 30, 2013 | John Greene (Speaker) | A. The Elks development will put traffic on streets south of 145th. Questions the sufficiency of the EIS because it doesn’t address this. Traffic will be exacerbated by development going in south of 145th in Lake City.  
B. Cedar Park (at 135th and 37th) will see impacts. There is already illegal activity there.  
C. Traffic problems at 145th intersection are only going to get worse (not better). Putting buildings too close to the property lines will limit the City’s ability to expand this intersection.  
D. 25-year standard for stormwater won’t be enough. Standards are going to be changing.  
E. Assumption that mass transit will take up slack because roads will get more crowded is incorrect. Trend is to reduce service because of budget concerns.  
F. Concurrency, having improvements before the development, doesn’t happen. Burden to put in improvements will fall to the residents through increased taxes. | A. The traffic modeling performed for the EIS does not reflect that project traffic would distribute to the local streets south of 145th St. Based on the traffic analysis, it is anticipated that the project traffic would flow to Bothell Way NE and have insignificant impact to other streets south of 145th St. On Bothell Way (SR 522), the EIS traffic analysis shows that during the pm peak hour in the year 2030, 67 more vehicles will travel southbound through the intersection of 145th/Bothell Way, an increase of 5% over current conditions. The pm commuter hours are the worst of the day; the additional trips in the am peak would be that amount or less. These numbers are relatively insignificant compared to the trips that are already on the roadway.  
B. Cedar Park is a 2-acre community park located exactly ½ mile south of the Subarea in Seattle. Locations within ¼ mile are typically considered within walking distance. Some residents from the Gateway area may choose to walk to Cedar Park, although Little Brook Park is located within ¼ mile of the Gateway. In addition, provision of the plaza open space with the Transition area will provide an even closer open space option for Gateway residents.  
C. Improvements related to the NE 145th/Bothell Way intersection will need to be assessed and designed as a function of new development. Long-term understanding of right-of-way needs is critical to the design of the intersection.  
D. Developments within the subarea will be required to comply with Ecology’s stormwater management manual in effect at the time of development (or a manual adopted by the city that Ecology deems technically equivalent). It is highly likely that the version of Ecology’s stormwater manual in effect at the time of development will be at least as stringent as the current Ecology stormwater manual. The current manual requires that flow control be provided for series of storms, from storms as common as the 2-year storm and up to and including the 25-year storm. As such, flow control should be provided for 2-year storms as well as 25-year storms.  
E. The EIS acknowledges the need for additional travel options, but does not assign a percentage of commuter trips to transit.  
F. Under the State Growth Management Act, “Concurrency” requires needed improvements at development or a financial plan for providing the improvement within 6 years of development. The 6-year structure is tied to expenditures on the City’s Capital Improvement Program, which need to be obligated within that time period. State law would prevent the City from ignoring this capital financing requirement. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Author/ Speaker</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.          | January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing) | Peter Connick (Speaker) | A. EIS ignores what goes on in Seattle and multifamily development in Lake City Way. 5-7 stories across from my house has an impact, the EIS is ignoring what goes on in Seattle and the high density housing that already affects the intersection.  
B. The EIS doesn’t address traffic associated with Elks Club events.  
C. There are speed bumps to the south on 35th, and it’s still not safe.  
D. Amount of pedestrian traffic is so much that Walgreen’s put up a fence around the property to keep people out.  
E. If you put in 70’ multifamily dwelling, and not taking into account what’s already there, doesn’t give a realistic estimate.  
F. Doesn’t want a 70’ high building across the street. | A. See response 8A above. Also, the proposed zoning standards and design guidelines address bulk and height impacts with setbacks, transition areas. 7 stories will only be achievable in the SG-Corridor zone closest to Bothell Way.  
B. The EIS assumes that the Elks property will redevelop—either under the Subarea Plan or under the current Comprehensive Plan and Zoning designations. Because the site will be fully redeveloped and operations on the site today will be replaced with code-compliant uses, current operations on the site are not relevant to how future uses will operate.  
C. Comment noted. There are many ways to address cut-through traffic. Effective treatments should provide a safe pedestrian environment. Strategies are discussed in Section 4.2.2 of the EIS.  
D. Comment noted. See response 3C above.  
E. Comment noted. Buildings directly north of 145th will typically be 35’ set back 10’ from the property line. In the SG-Transition Zone, buildings that are setback at least 100’ may be 55’ tall. In the SG-Corridor Zone, heights of 55’ to 75’ allowed closer to Bothell Way NE.  
F. Comment noted. See responses A and E above. |
| 10.         | January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing) | Betsy Piano (Speaker) | A. Things are going to change. Lots of apartments have been developed. Traffic impacts haven’t been so bad. We can control how development happens with planning.  
B. We need economic development so that we have a better tax base. People just drive by the area because there’s no reason to stop (need redevelopment).  
C. Townhouses can be positive for retirees, an opportunity for the city. | A. Comment noted.  
B. Comment noted.  
C. Comment noted. |
| 11.         | January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing) | Andy Bates (Speaker) | A. We need to take a proactive stance. Without following a plan, we will look like Lake City Way.  
B. Encourages City Council and Planning Commission to come up with specific traffic mitigation to address concerns.  
C. Keep environment at front and center.  
D. Concerned about incentives to go to 7 stories.  
E. There is a market for smaller denser housing without huge yards. Adding this into the mix of house units available is important. | A. Comment noted.  
B. Sections 4.2.2 and 5.2.2 addresses a range of traffic mitigation strategies available to the City as future development occurs. Required mitigation must be tied to the specific impacts of a given development. This is particularly true in the area of SR 522, where traffic volumes are changing continually due to the tolling of SR 520.  
C. Comment noted. The City has environmental regulations in place that protect critical areas. Further development of Low Impact Development (LID) strategies is called for in the plan to help ensure that future development is more sustainable in its impact on the natural environment.  
D. Comment noted. The intent of the Subarea Plan is to encourage |
redevelopment along Bothell Way. The Plan does require 1,000 square feet of open space or fee in lieu of this amount as an incentive for allowing buildings up to 7 stories.

E. Comment noted.

I2. January 30, 2013 (Public Hearing) Frankie Craig (Speaker) 35th Avenue connector is a poor idea. 500 more cars on the street weekly is a huge impact.

The intent of the 35th Avenue connection is to collect incoming and outgoing traffic associated with the potential development on the Elks site and surrounding parcels. This will help prevent traffic from impacting other existing local streets (e.g. 37th). In addition, the expected increase in traffic volume along the 37th Ave. NE corridor due to project development would be minor (estimated at less than 60 Average Daily Trips).

I3. January 30, 2013 Andre Kahr A. I object to the 5-7 stories height proposed. I would be more incline (sic) to agree with a 3-5 stories limit.

B. I object to the recommendations under the described “improvements to Bothell way (sic) at 145th and 154rd”. They recommend the extension of 35th between 145 (sic) and 147th to help mitigate impacts to the 145th and 147th Bothell Way intersections, by channeling traffic thru lake Washington Heights and Watercrest and Lake Highlands along 37th to 153rd. I do not view this as an improvement, as it would create an even bigger traffic problem at 153 (sic) and Bothell way (sic). Where are the suggested improvement (sic) to help mitigate the impact on 153rd and Bothell way (sic) intersection?

C. I object to the construction of a “safe path” from 145th to 153rd along 37th. It is being used as a mitigation tool to deal with the added traffic from future development at the Elks and or Boyer developments.

D. I object to the installation of “low level” lights in Lake Washington Heights and or (sic) Watercrest and Lake Highland neighborhoods.

A. Comment noted.

B. The intent of extending 35th between 145th and 147th is to collect incoming and outgoing traffic associated with the potential development on the Elks site and surrounding parcels. This roadway will help to keep traffic from using existing local streets (particularly 37th Avenue). The Subarea Plan contains some features that also act as mitigation strategies. The 35th Avenue connection is one of these. It helps to contain traffic from redevelopment on the Elks site from impacting existing neighborhood streets. It has a secondary benefit of lessening the impact on the Bothell Way NE intersections of with NE 145th and 147th. No traffic is proposed to be routed onto 37th Avenue between 145th and 153rd. The expected increase in traffic volume along the 37th Ave. NE corridor due to project development would be minor (estimated at less than 60 Average Daily Trips).

C. The intent of the pathway is to allow residents to walk safely through the neighborhood without having to travel on Bothell Way. This is a part of the plan to provide a more pedestrian friendly neighborhood, as opposed to mitigation for development.

D. Comment noted. Low-level (bollard type) lighting will help to create a safer and more pleasant pedestrian environment along 37th Avenue NE. The low-lighting would have less impact than standard street lights. The pathway and accompanying lighting is not proposed within private developments or on private property, but solely within public right-of-way.

NOTE: Comments 14 through 57 were written on a form letter, summarized in comment 13 above. Responses to these comments, labeled A through D above, are referenced in response to comments 14 through 57 below. In cases where additional substantive comments were written on the form letter, these comments are summarized below, and responded to accordingly. For complete comment letters, please see Appendix F.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Patria Lebo</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. I am very concerned with the impact of increased water run off would have on the hillside. There are a number of underground springs on the hill. Afraid the impermeable roof surfaces and parking lots will cause us problems. F. More traffic back up will be unacceptable. G. I object to any increase in traffic. H. Housing prices in this area carry a premium for the view. Don’t do anything to obstruct/diminish them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>William T. Lebo</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. All of the residents in the path of the proposed development paid a premium price for their homes due to the views and nature of the property. Nothing should be done which devalues them. There is no need for the increased height. 3-5 stories is more consistent with the overall character of the area. F. Traffic during rush hour is already excessive—the toll on 520 has exacerbated this. It is not uncommon to have to wait through 2-3 light cycles at 153-Bothell Way—routing even more traffic will make this even worse. G. More traffic is unacceptable—We have a quiet neighborhood—Please don’t ruin it. H. Any lights must not interfere with existing views. See response 13 above. See response 13 above. E. On property values, see response 17H above. On height, seven stories are only permitted within the SG-Corridor zone adjacent to Bothell Way between 145&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and 147&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;. The other areas proposed for rezoning, including proposed SG-Corridor, SG-Transition, and SG-Single Family zones, allow building heights in the 3-5 story range, which provides a transition to the existing single family neighborhood. F. The EIS acknowledges that there are existing traffic problems at the major intersections with Bothell Way. Transportation improvements that will be required of new development, particularly at affected intersections, will help to eliminate current congestion and timing problems. See Sections 3.2, 4.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS for further discussion. G. Comment noted. See response 18F above. H. Agreed. The Subarea Plan calls for pedestrian-level bollard lights that will not impact views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Myra Gamburg</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. [Building height] depends on how height is mitigated next to existing residential area. F. The issues here are infringing on private property, fear that property values will decrease and would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See response 13 above. E. Noted. See response 18E above. Also note that the zoning and design guidelines provide setbacks and other regulations to control impacts. F. No infringement on private property is proposed. G. See response 13D above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
establish a precedent for extending into other streets. G. I respect mitigation of this issue and support residents’ concerns.

H. My particular concern is flood control, (adequate mitigation from new development and traffic).

H. Without knowing the location of the existing flooding problem, this particular problem cannot be directly addressed. However, since development within the subarea will comply with Ecology’s flow control requirement, it is unlikely that development within the subarea will exacerbate any existing flooding problems. See Section 4.5 of the EIS for further discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
taxes, while at the same time reducing property value and size.
H. I object to any fixture or structure that reduces property value by obstructing views. Views for which we pay higher taxes.

**H. Comment noted. See response 17H above.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Frank Craig</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. Too many people in an area that is not designed for such high density. F. Whole neighborhood from Bothell Wy (sic) to lake will be adversely affected due to high volumes of traffic access to neighborhood is already poor without added traffic volume. G. If “safe path” is primarily to funnel onto 37th, I strongly object. 153rd light is already difficult as is. H. What is “low level” if lights interfere with view I am against lighting. See response 13 above. E. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see Section 4.1 of this EIS, which discusses land use impacts and mitigation strategies. F. The analysis does not conclude that the whole neighborhood will be affected. Efforts to redirect traffic from impacting neighborhood streets are included in the Subarea Plan as well as in the mitigation strategies in 4.2.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS. G. The safe path is for pedestrians and will not increase traffic at 153rd. The provision of safe and friendly pedestrian amenities will actually reduce traffic impacts. H. See response 13D above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>William L. McKinney</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. The more stories you build the more people will most likely be driving their cars to work and the traffic on Bothell Way is already horrendous! Especially during rush hour in the mornings. F. 37th is a residential street and putting a lot of traffic on will create problems going in and out of properties. What consideration is being thought of for children’s safety? G. This will devalue people’s property by no longer making it seem like a neighborhood. H. How can low level lights help safe driving or the safety of pedestrians using the streets or sidewalks? See response 13 above. E. The EIS acknowledges and presents the range of population and vehicle trips associated with future development under both the proposed Subarea Plan and the existing Comprehensive Plan already in place. See Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the EIS for further discussion on impacts and mitigation. F. Traffic analysis indicates that existing volume is light on this roadway. The increase in traffic volume along the 37th Ave. NE corridor due to project development would be minor (estimated at less than 60 ADT). The combined volumes would not approach a condition creating inadequate gaps for driveway access. See also response 24C above. G. See response 17H above. H. See response 24G above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Pamela Sandberg Harmon</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. Too much of an increase in the # of people in a small area with 5-7 stories. F. I object to the rerouting of traffic from 145th to 153rd along 37th. G. Will increase traffic, increase theft, decrease parking. H. This is view property. We don’t want any lighting See response 13 above. E. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see Section 4.1 of this EIS, which discusses land use impacts and mitigation strategies. F. Comment noted. Traffic is not proposed to be routed onto 37th; additional traffic will mainly affect the intersections with Bothell Way. See comments 12 and 13B above. G. Traffic comment noted. New developments will be required to accommodate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or light poles taking away from our view. parking on site. See new Sections 5.2.3, 5.2.4, and 5.2.5 regarding police services.

H. See response 18H above.


32. January 30, 2013 Charles Goggio, Jr. See comment 13 above. Also:
E. I prefer 3 story limit.
F. NE 153rd traffic signal use is already poorly timed favors Bothell Way traffic.
G. I moved to this area to avoid sidewalks and traffic other than local.
H. No need for additional street lighting if traffic remains at present levels.

See response 13 above.
E. Comment noted.
F. Existing intersection operation and needed mitigation are discussed in EIS sections 3.2, 4.2.2, and 5.2.2. It should be noted that when local streets intersect with a State regional facility such as SR 522 (Bothell Way), traffic lights must favor traffic on the highway, although some adjustments can be made.
G. Comment noted.
H. Low level pedestrian lighting is associated with the pedestrian pathway along 37th, not with traffic congestion.


34. January 30, 2013 Adam Stoecker See comment 13 above. See response 13 above.


38. January 30, 2013 Margaret Metzgar See comment 13 above. Also:
E. This would depend on if you were considering 5-7 stories on the Elks property or the Boyer Property. Because I live near the Boyer Property I already feel like we live in a ‘Fish Bowl’ and need to keep curtains closed day and night to avoid the “peepers” from the 3 story building. A 5-7 would make me feel as if I have no privacy I would like to block anything more than 3 story I moved into this house to have a view not to be the view.
F. I have lived in fear for my daughter and myself and all of the dog walkers that walk down 37th as is – we have requested speed bump or anything that would contain the traffic already speeding down the 37th I can’t imagine anyone adding more traffic by choice.

See response 13 above.
E. Proposed SG-Corridor zoning is proposed on both the Elks property and the Boyer property. Both will allow mixed use buildings up to 5 stories. The SG design guidelines that are proposed require building design and setbacks to protect privacy in adjacent residential properties.
F. See response 7B above
G. Comment noted.
H. See comment 18H above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response to Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 39.           | January 30,   | Ryan Cassady         | Bad decision!!!!
G. I have very mixed feeling about a “safe path” down 37th part of me would like a sidewalk to 153rd when I walk to the bus. But the other part says I would rather see a “safe path” down Lake City Way.
H. One of the beauties of this neighborhood is it is dark enough that you are able to see the stars and the lights reflecting on the lake. I am concerned that street lights would detract from that. | See response 13 above.  
E. The afternoon/evening sun would be blocked.  
F. Additional residential traffic would further impact the traffic congestion at the nearby access point to Lake City Way.  
G. Possible parking concerns also need to be considered. |
| 40.           | January 30,   | Shauna Pearson       | See comment 13 above.                                                  | See response 13 above. |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
| 41.           | January 30,   | Skyler Riley, Rainin’ Ribs | See comment 13 above.                                                  | See response 13 above. |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
| 42.           | January 30,   | Dave [Illegible]     | See comment 13 above. All:  
E. You want bout (sic) you cannot take care of the speeding cars on 37th Ave NE | See response 13 above.  
E. See response 7B above. |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
| 43.           | January 30,   | Irene Kane           | See comment 13 above.                                                  | See response 13 above. |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
| 44.           | January 30,   | Richard Wood         | See comment 13 above. All:  
E. I don’t want it at all.  
Comment noted. | See response 13 above.  
Comment noted. |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
| 45.           | January 30,   | Elton J. Peer        | See comment 13 above. All:  
E. Traffic is bad enough as it is!  
Comment noted. Sections 4.2.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS discuss traffic mitigation. | See response 13 above.  
E. Comment noted.  
Sections 4.2.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS discuss traffic mitigation. |
| 46.           | January 30,   | Laura Cox            | See comment 13 above. All:  
E. Yes, I object to 7 story building.  
E. Comment noted. | See response 13 above.  
E. Comment noted. |
<p>|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |
|               | 2013          |                      |                                                                        |                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Author/ Speaker</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Janet McKinney</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: F. The traffic on Lake City Way is always awful. G. This is not an arterial – it is a residential area. It is not desirable for this area to be an arterial, will destroy this nice neighborhood.</td>
<td>See response 13 above. F. Comment noted. G. No arterial is proposed. See response 7B above. See Sections 4.2.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS, which discusses options for mitigation of traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Elisabeth J. Godlewski</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. I feel this is too many people for our community. F. I feel this wouldn’t be efficient or advisable due to the fact this is a residential area with children and pets, a major traffic accident happening. G. This would be unadvisable for our neighborhood. H. We don’t need these. A waste of tax payers’ money.</td>
<td>See response 13 above. E. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see Section 4.1 of this EIS, which discusses land use impacts and mitigation strategies. F. See response 24G above. G. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see response 13C above and Section 4.2.1 of this EIS, which discusses transportation impacts. H. Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Joan Caine</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. This will create extreme increases in traffic on the adjoining residential streets – a safety issue.</td>
<td>E. Traffic analysis indicates that project-generated traffic would have impacts only on streets immediately adjacent to the project site, with only minor impacts to other residential streets in the project area. The extension of 35th Avenue is expected to collect project-related traffic between 145th and 147th streets, and provide for adequate public safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Alice Alden</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: I object to this project. E. This is a totally objectable (sic) imposition on our existing neighborhood. F. If these neighbors had wanted a sidewalk, it would have been installed when the plat was built.</td>
<td>See response 13 above. E. Your comment has been noted, although the comment is not specific enough to respond to. Please see the Chapter 4 of the EIS, which discusses impacts and mitigation strategies. F. Most residents had little say in original plat improvements that occurred, especially 40 or more years ago. In addition, many of the plats were constructed during the 1950s and 1960s, during the heyday of suburban design focused around the automobile. Planning and implementation of new regulations is needed to accommodate a greater range of transportation options, particularly for pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Author/Speaker</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>January 30, 2013</td>
<td>Larry &amp; Marilyn Holland</td>
<td>See comment 13 above. Also: E. By vectoring increased traffic from Elks property thru neighborhood property onto 37th &amp; then 153rd there will be a tremendous impact on the residents east of Bothell Way. People trying to access Bothell Way from 151st-153rd at 37th will be backed up and potentially have to wait several lights to make it. To spend all this money for road work, sidewalks, lighting etc. to lighten the load at 145th temporarily &amp; then route them onto Bothell Way 8 blocks later at 153rd makes no sense. F. This will depreciate the value of our homes &amp; then KC &amp; LFP will want to raise our taxes to pay for it. The process of zoning &amp; allowing building permits is partly determined &amp; must include parking &amp; the ability of the infrastructure to accommodate the increased cars &amp; traffic. I do not believe this is a viable plan, rather derived all by the desire to increase tax revenue for the City of LFP. G. The pedestrian pathway is too expensive for the little foot traffic there is in this area--</td>
<td>See response 13 above. E. Traffic will not be routed on to 37th, and signage will encourage drivers to use the nearest access to Bothell Way. The traffic analysis indicates that additional volume loaded onto the 37th Ave. NE corridor. Analysis also indicates that there would be an incremental degradation of level of service at the 153rd St. intersection with Bothell Way NE. The delay for the westbound movement in the worst operation period (PM peak hour) is expected to increase by approximately 24 seconds per vehicle. Delay for this movement could be mitigated with more generous allotment of green time to this movement in signal timing plans, with the addition of a dedicated right-turn lane, or with other potential mitigation. F. Value of homes: See Response 17H. Taxes to pay for improvements: See Response SC. Parking: New developments will be required to provide parking on site. Ability of Infrastructure to handle traffic: See section 4.2 and 5.2.2 of the EIS which discusses traffic increases and mitigation strategies. G. While a specific cost has not been attributed to the pedestrian pathway, the Subarea Plan provides this alternative pedestrian route to give residents choices in getting around the neighborhood in a way that avoids additional vehicles on the local streets. As growth occurs, with or without the plan, the need for pedestrian connections, particularly in a neighborhood that has no pedestrian facilities, will be important to quality of life and reducing traffic and parking on roadways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>February 2, 2013</td>
<td>Jeff &amp; Judy Altman, Co-Chair CSC</td>
<td>I would like to add my strong support to the Southern Gateway project and the EIS. As you know, the Legacy 100-Year Vision for Lake Forest Park was adopted by City Council in 2008. It is a framework for green infrastructure made up of four interrelated systems: connections, habitat, natural drainage, and people places. By including open space and by insisting on pervious surfaces wherever applicable in the plan, the Southern Gateway project will help satisfy the requirements of the Legacy. Doing nothing and allowing the Elks property to develop without City guidelines negates the Legacy Vision. Further, Lake Forest Park will be much poorer for the lack of proper regulation.</td>
<td>Your comments are noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment No.</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Author/Speaker</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 59.         | February 12, 2013 | City of Lake Forest Park Planning Commission | A. The neighborhood signs designating the truck route through the neighborhood (147th/37th/153rd) are obsolete and should be replaced with new signage that restricts trucks from dangerous slopes and curves in the neighborhood east of Bothell Way.  
B. The intent of new 35th roadway is to collect traffic from new development and keep it from using existing local street system. Language in EIS on 35th as new connector should be toned down.  
C. Safety is an issue on Bothell Way even if WSDOT’s accident data does not reveal it. Speeds need to be 35 mph as in Seattle; the City needs to start talking to WSDOT to get speeds lowered.  
D. A right-turn lane from 153rd onto Bothell Way northbound should be included in the mitigation.  
E. Remove mitigation that encourages bike use of new pedestrian pathway between 147th and 153rd.  
F. The shadow analysis in the Aesthetics section should show the 7 story buildings and their effects on access to sunlight.  
G. Add new bullet to page 1-1—part of the goal of the plan is to provide diversified housing alternatives.  
H. Safety is a concern. The EIS should address need for increased police protection. | A. While the truck route signs were addressed in the draft EIS, additional signage as mitigation is added to Section 5.2.2 of the EIS.  
B. References to this purpose are included throughout the responses to comments in this table.  
C. Safety concerns are noted. The probability of “close misses” or accidents that almost occur is noted and would not appear in WSDOT’s traffic data. Coordination with WSDOT on Bothell Way speeds has been added to the mitigation in Section 5.2.2 of this EIS.  
D. A right-turn lane at 153rd to reduce queuing on the local street is a potential mitigation strategy that has been added to section 5.2.2.  
E. This mitigation has been removed. Bicycle traffic should be accommodated on roadways as they are redesigned with new development.  
F. The seven-story zone would only significantly affect the new transition and SG-SFR zones on the Elks site. Where it is close to the RS-7200 and 5 story zone (north of 147th Street), the required setbacks make it a very similar situation to Section A’s diagram in EIS section 4.13. See new graphic added to Section 5.2.6 of the EIS.  
G. This bullet has been added to Section 5.2.1 of the EIS.  
H. See new EIS sections 5.2.3 through 5.2.5, which address police services. |
| 60.         | February 13, 2013 | James Barrows | I would encourage consideration of inclusion of a pedestrian pathway/sidewalk from the intersection of 38th Ave NE with SR522 north to NE 162nd. This would provide a safer pedestrian access to the sidewalk on SR522 and the transit stop at NE 153rd. The addition of the sidewalk on 38th Ave would connect with existing sidewalk system on 39th Ave and the Town Center. To enhance livability and economic viability, it would be good to have an intermodal connection with the future rail transit station planned at NE 145th and I-5. | These are excellent planning strategies, although a little beyond the scope of this Subarea Plan. It is recommended that the City look at a long term pedestrian plan when next updating its non-motorized plan, which addresses pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. In addition, the City will be updating the Transportation Element of its Comprehensive Plan in the next two years. These considerations can be considered in the update to the overall city plan. |
see a small bus making a loop to the Gateway area and Town Center connecting with the rail station.

61. **February 18, 2013**  
Dan Machut  

The EIS addresses stormwater management. Any development will reduce run-off. The EIS does not include any analytical data that indicates any particular pollutant is present in any particular area. There has however been discussion of including in the regulation particular treatment technologies to treat oil and/or particulates. It is not appropriate for the city to include within the city ordinance any particular technology to address any particular pollutant. Any technology that is included in the municipal code may become outdated, but still preclude as yet unknown better technologies. It would be appropriate to include a requirement that developers and companies identify particular pollutants that may be present and include BMPs from the state’s master manual or alternate technology to address those pollutants in their permit applications.

Development within the subarea must comply with Ecology’s stormwater management manual. Ecology’s stormwater management manual does not routinely require oil/water separators. Instead, Ecology’s manual volume V has a treatment facility selection flow chart that guides the designer to determine if basic treatment, enhanced treatment phosphorus control or oil/water separators are required for their particular development. For example, Ecology’s manual states that oil/water separators are required for projects that have “high-use sites. High-use sites are those that typically generate high concentrations of oil due to high traffic turnover or the frequent transfer of oil.” We concur that developers should identify particular pollutants that may be present and include best management practices (BMPs) in their design to remove those pollutants. Ecology’s stormwater management manual should provide a reasonable basis for that determination.

62. **February 19, 2013**  
Karen Walter, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division  

A. Lake Washington shoreline restoration - The subarea plan provides a potential opportunity for the City to work with the private property owners along the Lake Washington shoreline to enhance their shorelines to benefit juvenile salmon as described on page B-14 of the City's Shoreline Restoration Plan (which is referenced on page 4-29 of the DEIS). It may be easier to complete demonstrative shoreline projects with willing property owners that trigger others to do the same.

B. Sc'he'tla Creek - Culverts under Beach Drive and SR 522, and possibly the B-G Trail are likely fish passage barriers. Additional information would be needed to make these determinations. We recommend using WDFW’s barrier assessment methodology and replace existing fish passage barriers as part of the City’s CIP program.

C. Stormwater retrofits and improvements - The City should implement the mitigation

A. Comments noted. Consideration of Lake Washington restoration projects are addressed in the City’s draft Shoreline Master Program, which is in the final stages of review and adoption.

B. The Subarea Plan notes the importance of Sc'he'tla Creek to the natural environment. Fish passage barriers along Sc'he'tla Creek can be inventoried and assessed using the recommended methodology. The City may wish to address this as part of surface water improvements in its Capital Facilities Plan.

C. Noted. Work on implementing Low Impact Development (LID) strategies will continue as a follow up to plan adoption.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 63. | February 20, 2013 | Mansour Samadpour | A. While I am in favor of the new height proposals, I think a 3-5 story limit is more suitable.  
B. My primary concern is the increased densities will compound the already heavy traffic and delays at stoplights at 145th & 153rd and Bothell Way.  
Routing traffic off Bothell Way onto 35th or 37th will not be an improvement and will compound the problem at 153rd.  
C. The “safe path” along 37th and the installation of low level lighting will change the character of a quiet residential neighborhood. The safe path seems more appropriate along Bothell Way. |
|     |            |                    | A. Comment noted.  
B. See response 13B above.  
C. See responses 13C and 13D above. |
| 64. | February 20, 2013 | Jean Patterson     | A. Public meetings were held early in the process, but once the preferred alternative was developed, multiple meetings should have occurred.  
B. Traffic is a major concern and is still not being dealt with. The EIS passes the buck to future studies by individual developers.  
C. The signers of the petition (see below) reject the proposed density in the Subarea Plan. It needs to be scaled down in order to deal with traffic impacts and infrastructure. |
|     |            |                    | A. Comment noted. The City has held numerous meetings—public open houses and planning commission meetings, on-site meetings, and meetings with residents in homes. Many have occurred during the development of the proposed alternative (Subarea Plan).  
B. The EIS addresses traffic concerns and makes numerous recommendations for mitigation. The EIS also recognizes that a) the Subarea Plan accommodates growth over a period of 20 years; b) that development improvements must be tied to new development proposals; and c) that conditions continue to change on Bothell Way due to the SR 520 bridge tolling and other growth; and d) the best mitigation strategies will be developed in individual traffic analyses that can accurately define the impacts of proposed development.  
C. Comments noted. The City’s current Comprehensive Plan for the area would allow for moderate growth. The impacts of this alternative are addressed throughout Chapter 4 of the EIS. |
| 65. | February 20, 2013 | Various – 117 signatures | Petition:  
A. Opposing 90-120 units at the Elks site, 7-story mixed use building.  
B. The proposed development will overload our existing infrastructure and roads. |
|     |            |                    | A. Comments noted. The proposed zoning on the eastern half of the Elks site allows lower density than the existing zoning (14 units/acre as opposed to 48 units/acre respectively). Therefore, some areas under the Subarea Plan will allow development at lower densities than developments which could occur under current zoning.  
B. The comments regarding infrastructure are not specific enough to respond to. Please see Chapters 4 and 5 of this EIS, which discusses impacts and needed mitigation strategies for the transportation system, water and sewer, stormwater, and parks and trails. |
| 66. | February 20, 2013 | Peter              | A. We vigorously oppose the rezoning of |
|     |            |                    | A. Your comment has been noted. |
Connick and Ann M. Mahony

properties to 5-7 stories and request additional study and public comment before the EIS is accepted. The proposed zoning ignores “great attention to natural surroundings,” fails to recognize the high-density development immediately to the south, and fails to consider the impact of increased crime and the demand for police services.

B. The EIS does not adequately address excessive high density development, increased crime and police resources; the EIS ignores certain realities south of 145th.

C. In addition to police services, projected income and revenue, home prices, and realistic projection of elder housing ownership with no parking in front, 1700 square foot homes with walk up to living area, etc., should be studied further.

B. The area to the south of the Southern Gateway Subarea includes a mix of residential and commercial uses. Higher density development in the Lake City area has been underway for many years, and this area is a densely developed part of Seattle. As noted in this comment, this area has a fair share of criminal activity that continues to be a concern to residents. In fact, the undesirable elements along Lake City Way are in part what led the City of Lake Forest Park to engage in planning for the Southern Gateway area. The redevelopment of vacant, underutilized, and adult uses into mixed use buildings focused on retail, office and residential uses will improve undesirable activity in the area. The transportation section of the EIS addresses the traffic that is already on Bothell Way, and see response 8A regarding additional traffic expected to be added southbound. To address the need for police services, please see new EIS sections 5.2.3 through 5.2.5.

C. Projected revenue associated with redevelopment into mixed use structures was studied during the planning process. Please see the Subarea Plan appendices A and B, which present an economic analysis and feasibility study. Senior housing and walk ups are not included in the housing mix; however a range of single family and multifamily units are included. This range helps the City meet its growth management obligations to provide a range of housing types and affordability options for residents.

67. February 20, 2013 Linda Dimitroff See comment 13 above. See response 13 above.

68. February 20, 2013 Carol Bowler See comment 13 above. See response 13 above.

69. February 20, 2013 Charles Goggio, Jr. A. Parcel 7663700170 was sold to LFP South Gateway LLC. Is this parcel owned by the City? B. Heights along Bothell Way should be limited to 3 stories rather than 5; and 5 stories rather than 7. C. Vehicular access to and from properties on Bothell Way NE should be direct from Bothell Way. D. The land available for significant development is insufficient unless parking garage space is provided. E. There is adequate access to the Burke-Gilman Trail for local residents. F. Development of the 37th pathway is not a proper addition to the neighborhood. Should be provided on Bothell Way. The pathway will intrude on private property. G. Vehicular traffic will increase significantly over time along 37th Avenue to gain access to 153rd.

A. This parcel is owned by a private party. B. Comments noted. C. Vehicular access to and from redeveloped parcels will require special attention during the development approval process. Access must be provided in a safe and effective manner that does not create additional impacts onto Bothell Way or negatively impact local streets without mitigation to ensure that the circulation system continues to flow freely. This, in part, was some of the purpose of the 35th Avenue extension between 145th and 147th Streets. D. Land availability is limited in the Bothell Way area. The additional height allowance (to 5 stories or 7 stories) allows for parking to be accommodated on lower floors of structures (behind required retail). E. Additional access to the Burke-Gilman Trail was considered during the initial public planning process and rejected by community representatives. EIS mitigation strategies call for additional wayfinding signage to help trail users locate trail access points. F. See response 5B above.
H. Access to services, transit, and pedestrian friendliness are adequate.
I. Development of mixed use areas should be funded by developers. Non-commercial elements will be expensive and don’t want taxes raised to pay for the implementation of this plan.

G. The expected increase in traffic volume along the 37th Ave. NE corridor due to project development would be minor (estimated at less than 60 Average Daily Trips).
H. Comment noted.
I. Development of mixed use buildings will be private enterprises. See response 5C regarding the funding of public improvements.

70. February 20, 2013  Myra Gamburg
A. The neighborhood is no longer merely presenting ideas and suggestions for some speculative future as they did on the Maker maps and questionnaires, but is now reacting to the zoning for the developer’s possible plan whose density threatens problems, including those associated with an increased flood of traffic through the neighborhood.
B. It is our homes and property that will be affected.

71. February 20, 2013  Richard Saunders
I believe the Plan is the result of a tremendous amount of work by staff and volunteers and included a significant, perhaps unprecedented, effort within our City to engage the community around planning its future. It is important that the Southern Gateway has been a focus for significant planning and development potential in the LFP Comprehensive Plan, the 100 Year Legacy Plan, and elsewhere. While not perfect, the plan overall does a very good job of balancing the City’s responsibility to perform planning with the community’s need for improvements to under or poorly developed areas.

The DEIS is a large document that covers a huge range of topics, often using technical language to describe situations and solutions. This makes it a valuable tool for Planning but difficult for community members to understand environmental impacts. I believe the EIS does a very good job of enumerating the issues that need to be monitored by the City when and if development occurs. It is critical that the City always use the EIS, in conjunction with the zoning and design guidelines, to monitor and manage future development.

Your comments are noted.
5.2 Final EIS – Additional Information and Amendments to the Draft EIS

5.2.1 The Southern Gateway Subarea Plan and Planning Process (Revision)

The following additional bullet is added to reflect the community’s vision (DEIS page 1-1):

- Diversified housing alternatives;

5.2.2 Land and Shoreline Use – Alternative Impacts Analysis (Revision)

Table 4.1.2 is revised to reflect achievable densities under the Subarea Plan (DEIS page 4-4):
Table 4.1.2 – Comparative Residential and Commercial Growth under the Subarea Plan and Comprehensive Plan (Revision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Land Use Classification</th>
<th>Gross Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
<th>Residential Density Achieved</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Commercial Floor Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subarea Plan (Proposed Alternative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (SR 7.2)</td>
<td>Single Family High</td>
<td>73.04</td>
<td>62.14</td>
<td>4 du/ac</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily (RM 900)</td>
<td>Multifamily Low</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>15 du/ac</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG C (5 Stories)</td>
<td>Multifamily High</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>30 du/ac</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Gateway</td>
<td>Corridor Commercial</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>137,008</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.44</td>
<td>92.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,471 - 1,667 du</td>
<td>2,621 - 2,914</td>
<td>185,121 - 430,483 sq ft</td>
<td>529 - 1,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive Plan (No Action Alternative)

| Alternative             | Land Use Classification | Gross Area (Acres) | Net Acres | Residential Density Achieved | Dwelling Units | Population | Commercial Floor Area (sq ft) | Employees |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|                               |                |            |                               |           |
| Single Family High      | Single Family High      | 73.04              | 62.14     | 4 du/ac                       | 255            | 577        | N/A                           | N/A       |
| Multifamily Low         | Multifamily Low         | 2.50               | 2.50      | 15 du/ac                      | 38             | 72         | N/A                           | N/A       |
| Multifamily High        | Multifamily High        | 19.84              | 18.81     | 30 du/ac                      | 564            | 993        | N/A                           | N/A       |
| Corridor Commercial     | Corridor Commercial     | 10.06              | 9.13      | N/A                           | 857            | 1,642      | 137,008                       | 274       |
| TOTALS                 |                         | 105.44             | 92.58     |                               | 1,471 - 1,667 du | 2,621 - 2,914 | 185,121 - 430,483 sq ft | 529 - 1,231 |

Sources: City of Lake Forest Park, 2012; King County Assessor Data, 2012; King County, 2007; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010.

Notes and assumptions:
- Gross acreage does not include rights-of-way.
- Net acres are defined by gross acreage minus critical area lands and buffers.
- Residential densities and household size are derived from King County’s Buildable Lands Report, 2007.
5.2.3 Transportation – Mitigation (Revision)

The following mitigation strategies are revised or added (DEIS Section 4.2.2):

The data produced by the alternatives analysis confirms that the transportation system improvements included in the Proposed Alternative generally help to compensate for the added trip loading anticipated with future growth. The proposed improvements of the Plan have been developed during subarea planning efforts, which sought to identify and incorporate effective transportation mitigation improvements that also function to help mitigate traffic impacts. The central elements of the assumed mitigation improvements within the Subarea Plan are: *(DEIS page 4-15)*

- Currently, there is a designated truck route from NE 147th Street to 35th Avenue NE to NE 148th Street to 37th Avenue NE. In the Subarea Plan, this route is designated as a pedestrian pathway. The truck route designation should be removed–studied to eliminate conflicts, provide a quality pedestrian environment, and further protect residential neighborhoods. The City should consider replacing signage currently designating the truck route with new signage that encourages through-traffic to utilize Bothell Way NE and discourages use of local roads. *(DEIS page 4-16)*

- When new development is proposed, additional traffic analyses for the development should devote special attention to queuing on NE 145th, NE 147th and, in particular, NE 153rd Streets. The southbound left-turn movement at 147th Street will require mitigation. The addition of a designated right-turn lane at NE 153rd Street could improve queuing, as could adjustment to the timing of the signal. Conditions on development should include periodic monitoring of traffic and queuing on these streets. *(DEIS page 4-16)*

- The City should begin long-range discussions with WSDOT regarding speeds and safety on Bothell Way.

The following non-motorized mitigation strategy is deleted (DEIS Section 4.2.2):

- Ensure that bicycles are accommodated in the planned pedestrian pathway between NE 147th and NE 153rd Streets. *(DEIS page 4-18)*
5.2.4 Police Services – Affected Environment (New Section)

The following new section supplements Section 3.10 of the DEIS:

Police services are provided by the City of Lake Forest Park Police Department. The department operates out of Lake Forest Park City Hall, and maintains 18 commissioned officers. The City also has a Crime Watch Program with an active citizen volunteer force of about 33, which helps the City maintain a focus on preventing crime. In 2012, the ratio of officers to citizens was 1.3 officers per 1,000 citizens (City of Lake Forest Park Police Department 2012a).

In 2011, the Lake Forest Park Police patrol responded to 8,264 calls, a decrease of 18 percent from 2009. Approximately ¼ of these calls were traffic infractions. There were also responses to 5 robberies, 3 rape/sexual assaults, 44 assaults/fights, 17 vehicle thefts, and 88 burglaries, citywide; 128 of these cases were assigned to detectives for further investigation. The average response time for the calls was four minutes (City of Lake Forest Park Police Department 2012b).

To the south of the Gateway area is the Lake City neighborhood within the City of Seattle. Adult businesses along Lake City Way, similar to Déjà Vu in the Gateway area, may be associated with unwanted or criminal behavior. Seattle Police Department 2011 data reports 76 crimes in the Lincoln 1 beat, which covers the area up NE 145th St (the Gateway’s southern boundary). This level is the same in 2009 and 2010 and is typical of other beats in the City of Seattle.

5.2.5 Police Services – Alternative Impacts Analysis (New Section)

The following new section supplements Section 4.10 of the DEIS:

The use of crime data to characterize neighborhood livability is cautioned. More data does not necessarily equate to more crime, but may correlate with more reporting of crimes. The quality of the neighborhood, type of land use, surrounding areas, vacant lots, poor lighting, among many other factors, can influence environmental safety. In this sense, redevelopment that encourages “more eyes on the street,” higher pedestrian activity, and fewer poorly lit and vacant areas can be as safe as or safer than low-level development characterized by less activity. These elements that encourage a more vibrant neighborhood also create a climate that is less attractive to anti-social behavior.
During a public Planning Commission session on the Subarea Plan, the Police Chief at the time, Chief Peterson, provided this assessment of the Plan for the area:

Chief Peterson said that the Gateway Project will be great for cleaning up the south end of the city. Lake Forest Park does not have the frequency of crime as other cities, because 1) Seattle police are not present in the area south of 145th Street, and 2) our city is seen as environmentally friendly and strong on community participation. We want to maintain our identity as a “showcase of peace.” A mix of retail will clean up the area, and a nice restaurant with a bar is better than Déjà Vu. It’s a constant battle to keep drug deals, prostitution, and crime out. Well lit, vibrant, appealing construction, business and housing that attracts people in positive ways will help the situation. On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night, one car stays in the Gateway area, but other neighborhoods need patrol as well. He went on to indicate that redevelopment in the Gateway area can reduce the drug deals, tagging, gangs, etc. more than if you don’t do anything (City of Lake Forest Park Planning Commission 2012).

The Subarea Plan encourages higher density development along Bothell Way NE, which will make the area more likely to redevelop within the 20-year planning timeframe. Future development under the Subarea Plan encourages more pedestrian activity, complete use of sites, higher redevelopment potential for vacant sites, and reduction in the use of underutilized parking lots.

5.2.6 Police Services – Mitigation (New Section)

The following new section supplements Section 4.10 of the DEIS:

Design guidelines that are proposed to be adopted with the Subarea Plan require the use of crime prevention site design techniques, known as Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). These are addressed in Section B.9 of the SG Corridor and Transition Zone Design Guidelines and Section B.7 of the SG Single Family Residential Zone Design Guidelines, available on the City’s project website.

In 2012, the City had a ratio of 1.3 officers per 1,000 population. Under the Comprehensive Plan Alternative, future growth projection in the subarea is 1,642. Under the Subarea Plan, the population range is between 2,621 and 2,914. Under either plan, the projected population growth will contribute to the City’s overall growth during the next 20
years. One or more additional officers may be needed over time for the City to maintain its current level of service ratio.

### 5.2.7 Aesthetics – Alternative Impacts Analysis (Revision)

Figure 4.13.2a is replaced with the following graphic:
Figure 4.13.2b is replaced with the following graphic:

**A**
**EAST-WEST SECTION AT 35TH OR 37TH AVE NE LOOKING NORTH**

Figure 4.13.2c is replaced with the following graphic:

**B**
**EAST-WEST SECTION AT EASTERN BOUNDARY OF SHERIDAN MARKET AREA LOOKING NORTH**
Figure 4.13.2d is replaced with the following graphic:

![Figure 4.13.2d Diagram]

EAST-WEST SECTION AT EASTERN BOUNDARY OF ELKS SITE LOOKING NORTH

Figure 4.13.2e is replaced with the following graphic:

![Figure 4.13.2e Diagram]

EAST-WEST SECTION THROUGH ELKS SITE LOOKING NORTH

* This zone boundary does not exist in the No Action alternative. The 30' space between buildings is greater than that required in the RS-7200 zone and slightly less than in the RM-900 zone.
The following new Figure 4.13.2f and text supplement Section 4.13.1 of the DEIS:

**Figure 4.13.2f – Shadow Impacts of 7-Story Buildings**

Figure 4.13.2f shows the shadow impacts (or lack thereof) of the 7-story buildings on neighboring residences. The 7-story buildings are setback far enough from property lines to avoid additional impact on single family homes.

**5.2.8 Appendix A – Bibliography (Revision)**

The following sources are added to the Bibliography for the Public Services Section:


**5.2.9 Appendix F – Public Comments on the Draft EIS (New Appendix)**