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Dear Reader and Interested Citizen:

This draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), prepared for the City of Lynnwood by independent consultants, evaluates the significant environmental impacts of the proposed Lynnwood General Policy Plan for the Comprehensive Plan. The City is developing this plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A.

As part of the planning process, the City has developed three land use plan alternatives -- existing trends, moderate growth and high growth. This draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) examines the impacts that each plan alternative will have on the natural environment, transportation system, housing stock, capital facilities, utilities and parks. The DEIS has been prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) of 1971 (RCW 43.21C).

Completion of the General Policy Plan will represent the first phase of work relating to the Growth Management Act (GMA). This phase consists of a General Policy Plan and future Land Use Plan. The second phase follows with completion of the Comprehensive Plan containing more specific plans, projects and programs relating to land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities, utilities and parks, recreation and open space. The General Policy Plan and Comprehensive Plan are intended to guide future decisions and public investments relating to the physical and built environments for the next 20 years. Next year, the City will complete the third phase which will involve the adoption of new zoning and subdivision regulations to implement the policies, goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Comments are invited and will be received until Thursday, June 23. All comments will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in a capacity outlined under SEPA. During the comment period, several community meetings will be held. These meetings are intended to provide additional information on the DEIS and its content as well as the City's planning process. Comments on the DEIS will be welcomed at these
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FACT SHEET

Title: Lynnwood General Policy Plan for the Growth Management Comprehensive Plan

Description of Proposal: The proposal includes the adoption of a General Policy Plan for the Comprehensive Plan to guide future land use decisions and public investments over the next 20 years.

Alternatives: Three plan alternatives are analyzed in this DEIS:

Existing Trends (No Action) This alternative assumes that the current Comprehensive Plan, the Lynnwood Policy Plan and existing zoning and subdivision regulations would continue in effect and be applied to future land use decisions according to existing trends. This alternative does not include any significant improvements to the parks, public facilities or transportation systems. The aforementioned plans and regulations would be updated to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

Moderate Growth The basis of this alternative is to preserve and enhance existing residential areas and focus moderate growth into five designated Activity Centers. This alternative includes additional land and improvements for parks, recreation, open space and schools at a level of service greater than current standards. Additional improvements to the transportation system would be planned to support future growth with an emphasis on multi-modal transportation and circulation.

High Growth This alternative is similar to the Moderate Growth Alternative in that existing residential areas are planned at approximately current densities and commercial areas are planned for continued economic growth. Greater intensification of new residential and commercial uses would be concentrated in the Subregional Center, one of the five Activity Centers. This alternative also includes additional land and improvements for parks, recreation, open space and schools at a level of service greater than current standards. Improvements to the transportation system would be planned to support future growth with an emphasis on multi-modal transportation. However, implementation of this alternative assumes the operation of a regional high-capacity transit system with at least one transit station located in the Subregional Center.
Location: The incorporated limits of the City of Lynnwood, Snohomish County, Washington. The city is bounded generally by 164th Street SW to the North; 217th Street SW to the South; Interstate 5 and State Route 525 to the East; and Olympic View Drive and 76th Avenue West to the West.

Proponent: City of Lynnwood Planning Department
20519 60th Avenue West
Lynnwood, WA 98037

Implementation Date: The target date for adoption of the General Policy Plan is July 1, 1994.
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Public Meetings (cont.) Subsequent neighborhood meetings to discuss the DEIS and General Policy Plan will be held on June 7th, 1994 for residents & businesses located east of Hwy. 99 and June 8th, 1994 for residents & businesses located west of Hwy 99.

- The June 7th (east) meeting will be held from 7-9 PM in the City Council Chambers, 19100 44th Avenue West.
- The June 8th (west) meeting will be held from 7-9 PM at the Edmonds School District Administration Bldg. located at 20420 68th Avenue West in Lynnwood.
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I. SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This Chapter provides a brief summary of information contained in the Draft EIS for the Lynnwood General Policy Plan. It describes Lynnwood’s phased approach to developing and adopting a new comprehensive plan meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), and its strategy for integrating environmental review with its comprehensive planning program.

The summary will briefly describe the City’s proposal to initially adopt a General Policy Plan and Land Use Plan, and the plan alternatives being considered. It will identify the significant impacts that will likely be associated with plan adoption, identify or suggest measures to mitigate those impacts, and identify any unavoidable adverse environmental impacts.

The summary is intended to be brief and selective. The reader should consult individual sections of the Draft EIS for detailed information concerning specific environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of this environmental impact statement (EIS) is to provide information to citizens and public officials regarding the environmental implications of a new comprehensive plan being prepared by the City of Lynnwood. The comprehensive plan is being prepared in response to the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) and other on-going regional planning programs.

The comprehensive plan is being developed in phases. Adoption of a General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Plan will represent completion of the first phase, and is the primary subject of this EIS. The adopted General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Plan will provide a foundation for the second phase, which will involve completion of more specific plan elements and programs relating to land use; housing; transportation; capital facilities; utilities; and parks, recreation and open space. This second phase will culminate in the adoption of the new comprehensive plan. A third phase will involve reviewing and amending the City’s development regulations and developing other programs to ensure that the comprehensive plan is implemented. This EIS will serve as a basic reference as phases two and three are pursued, to ensure that environmental impacts and values are fully considered. Additional environmental analysis will occur as appropriate throughout the planning and implementation process.

The proposed General Policy Plan will establish overall goals, objectives and policies to guide future growth and development within the community. The proposed goals and objectives are listed in Chapter II of this EIS. These goals and objectives may be refined or revised, and more detailed policies will be developed based upon the analysis contained in this EIS, public and agency comments on the Draft EIS, and public input obtained through meetings and hearings.
Adoption of a Future Land Use Plan will, in conjunction with adopted goals, objectives and policies, establish the allowed and encouraged location, intensity and general nature of future development and redevelopment within Lynnwood. Three alternative Land Use Plans have been developed for consideration by the community and local decision-makers. Much of the analysis in this EIS is devoted to evaluating and comparing the likely environmental impacts of the three alternatives. The Lynnwood City Council may ultimately approve one of these alternatives, or a Land Use Plan that combines some features of two or all three of the alternatives.

The Land Use Plan Alternatives

The three alternative Land Use Plans are presented as Figures 5, 6 and 7 in Chapter II, below. The three comprehensive plan land use alternatives have many similarities in the way land uses and intensities are designated and arranged. Most of these similarities are related to existing development patterns that are deemed desirable under any future scenario and therefore are not proposed to be substantially altered. While much of the analysis in this EIS focuses on differences between the alternatives, it is useful to understand those aspects the alternatives hold in common.

All three alternatives designate the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors primarily for commercial uses. Additional significant commercial designations occur in the Lynnwood Triangle (bounded by 196th Street SW, 44th Avenue West and I-5) and Alderwood Mall areas.

Limited light industrial areas are designated west of 60th Avenue West along 212th Street SW and in the vicinity of 60th Avenue West and 212th Street SW.

Most of the remaining areas of the City are designated for residential uses, with various institutional and open space uses interspersed. Large areas in the northeast and northwest portions of the City are designated for single-family use, and a smaller single-family area is designated in the south. Most multi-family residential areas are located between the commercial and single-family residential areas.

Beyond these common goals, objectives and general land use patterns, the three alternative plan concepts provide for differing densities, land use intensities, development approaches and mixes of uses.

Current Trends (No Action) Alternative

The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative (Figure 5) assumes that the 1989 Comprehensive Plan, the Lynnwood Policy Plan and current adopted zoning would remain in effect and be applied to future land development according to existing trends. This alternative would also involve updating current plans, policies and regulations to reflect annexations and plans for capital facilities, housing and transportation to meet the minimum requirements of the Growth Management Act.

Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, up to approximately 1,173 additional dwelling units could be added in coming years. This would bring Lynnwood's total housing stock up to 13,766 dwelling units, an increase of about nine percent over 1992. Population could increase by about 2,765 persons to a total of 31,878. Most of this growth would occur
on vacant or underdeveloped land in the City's existing residential areas west of 36th Avenue West and north of 196th Street SW. A relatively small portion of this residential growth (about fifteen percent) would occur in areas that, under the other plan alternatives, would be designated as Activity Centers (see Figure 4).

Non-residential development could increase from the current 14 million square feet to approximately 16.25 million square feet (an increase of about sixteen percent) under the Current Trends Alternative. Of this 2.25 million square feet increase, most (approximately 1.5 million square feet) would be built within the Subregional Activity Center. The remaining 0.75 million square feet of additional space would be built in other parts of the community. Employment could grow by as much as nineteen percent under the Current Trends Alternative, from 21,717 jobs in 1990 to an estimated 25,808 under build-out conditions. Most employment growth would occur in existing commercial areas.

**Moderate Growth Alternative**

The basis of the Moderate Growth Alternative (Figure 6) is to preserve and enhance existing residential areas and focus moderate growth within five activity centers. Three types of activity centers would be established: governmental/educational activity centers, commercial activity centers and a park and recreation activity center. The location of these centers is illustrated by Figure 4 in Chapter II.

Two governmental/education activity centers would be designated; one in the Edmonds Community College area and one in the area of Lynnwood City Hall. The area of Wilcox Park/Scriber Lake and Scriber High School would be designated a park and recreation activity center.

Two commercial activity centers are proposed, one along the Highway 99 corridor extending from the north to the south city limits, the other in the Alderwood Mall/44th Avenue West/I-5 area. This second commercial center, known as the Subregional Activity Center, is a key element in the Moderate Growth Alternative's strategy for coordinating growth and transportation needs. The Moderate Growth Alternative would allow and encourage intensification of existing land uses and a more diverse mixture of uses in this area in order to promote conditions under which viable alternatives to single-occupant vehicle (SOV) use could develop over time. Increased intensity could make it more feasible to provide improved public transit service to the area, thus making it more practical for people to travel to the area by bus or rail. Diversifying the mix of land uses, to include high density residential, office and retail commercial could provide some opportunities for people to walk to work and shopping, and make it easier to accomplish multiple shopping or business tasks within the Subregional Activity Center on foot. Intensifying uses and encouraging high density residential development within the Subregional Activity Center could also reduce pressure on other portions of the community, especially residential areas, to accept significant new development at higher densities.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, up to 1,773 new single-family and multi-family dwelling units could be added in coming years (compared to 1,173 added units under the Current Trends Alternative). This would bring Lynnwood's total housing stock up to approximately 14,326 dwelling units, an increase of about fourteen percent over 1992. Population could increase by an estimated 3,977 persons, to a total of approximately 33,090.
Approximately one-third of these new dwelling units and about one-fourth of the new residents would be located in the Subregional Activity Center, with the remainder locating on currently undeveloped or underdeveloped properties distributed throughout the rest of the community.

Non-residential development could increase from the existing 14 million square feet to approximately 19 million square feet under the Moderate Growth Alternative, an increase of about 36 percent (compared to a projected increase of sixteen percent under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative). Of this five million-square-foot increase over existing conditions, approximately three-fifths (three million square feet) would occur in the Subregional Activity Center, with the remaining two million square feet occurring primarily within the Highway 99 corridor and the other designated activity centers. Total employment could grow from 21,717 jobs in 1990 to an estimated 35,500 under build-out conditions, an increase of over sixty percent. Approximately two-thirds of these new jobs would occur within the Subregional Activity Center.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, the City would plan for the acquisition and improvement of additional park, recreation and open space lands. Additional improvements to the area's transportation system would be planned to accommodate future growth, with an emphasis on multiple modes of transportation and circulation. Attention to urban design techniques that encourage functional and appearance improvements, and enhance the livability of the community, would also be emphasized.

High Growth Alternative

The High Growth Alternative (Figure 7) is very similar to the Moderate Growth Alternative with the exception that it would encourage and accommodate significantly higher land use intensities and residential densities within the Subregional Center. The High Growth Alternative's treatment of the remainder of the community is virtually identical to the Moderate Growth Alternative.

Land use intensities and residential densities within the Subregional Center would be increased sufficient to accommodate population and employment growth allocations adopted by Snohomish County as targets for the Lynnwood area (see discussion of the Snohomish Countywide Planning Policies in Chapter III under the heading Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies).

Under the High Growth Alternative, approximately 4,000 more dwelling units, 6,750 more residents and 4,500 more jobs could be accommodated within the Subregional Activity Center than under the Moderate Growth Alternative. Total population for the City could reach 39,843 at build-out, compared to 33,090 under the Moderate Growth Alternative and 31,878 under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. This would represent a 37 percent increase over Lynnwood's 1992 population. Employment could reach 40,527 compared to 35,500 under Moderate Growth and 25,808 under Current Trends. This would represent an 84 percent increase over 1990 employment. Achieving such commercial intensification and residential densities could depend on the approval and construction of two regional high capacity transit stations; one at the existing park-and-ride lot at 44th Avenue and I-5, and the other in the Alderwood Mall area.
As with the Moderate Growth Alternative, under the High Growth Alternative the City would plan for the acquisition and improvement of additional park, recreation and open space lands. Additional improvements to the area’s transportation system would be planned to accommodate future growth, with an emphasis on multiple modes of transportation (e.g., transit, pedestrian, carpooling, bicycling, SOV’s etc.). In addition, the High Growth Alternative assumes the approval, construction and operation of a regional high capacity transit (HCT) system with at least one transit station located within the Subregional Center. Attention to urban design techniques that encourage alternative modes of transportation and enhance the livability of the community would also be emphasized.

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS**

The Proposed Action, would not, in itself, directly affect the environment. The General Policy Plan and Land Use Map will, however, provide a basic framework that will guide future planning, growth and the use of land in the City of Lynnwood over the next 20 years. It will guide future City actions and decisions that will influence the use of land, such as implementing new development regulations or investing in public facilities. It will also influence the actions and decisions of private parties relating to their land use and development options.

Future development projects permitted or encouraged under the General Policy Plan and new comprehensive plan will have environmental impacts. These impacts could be short-term (e.g., construction-related) or long-term (e.g., operation-related) in nature. These potential impacts and mitigating measures are discussed within individual sections of this Draft EIS and summarized below. Future development projects having potentially significant adverse environmental impacts will be subject to project-level environmental review under the provisions of SEPA and City requirements.

**Earth**

**Significant Impacts**

New development and redevelopment allowed under the three alternatives would require excavation and disturbance of soils, covering of soils with impervious surfaces, increased exposure of soils to erosion and minor modifications to local topography. Adverse impacts are generally greater for more intensive land use patterns; thus, the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would likely have the lowest potential, and the High Growth Alternative the greatest potential for adverse impacts. Differences would likely be minor, however.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Lynnwood’s adopted Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO), stormwater design/planning regulations, and SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and mitigate significant adverse impacts.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Some minor increase in soil erosion and topographic modifications are likely unavoidable under any of the alternatives.
Air Quality

Significant Impacts

Construction activities allowed under the three alternatives would result in dust and exhaust emissions. Growth in the number of housing units within the community will likely result in increased use of fireplaces and wood stoves, resulting in increased wood smoke emissions. These impacts will generally be greatest for the High Growth Alternative and lowest for the Current Trends (No Growth) Alternative.

The most significant air quality impacts will be related to increased vehicular traffic and congestion. Traffic and congestion are projected to increase substantially under all three land use alternatives. The High Growth Alternative has the highest potential for increased vehicular traffic and congestion within Lynnwood, and the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative the lowest. However, the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives could result in fewer vehicle miles traveled within the larger region.

Mitigation Measures

Construction-related dust and other emissions are regulated by the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency. Existing federal and state regulations governing wood stoves and residential wood burning have resulted in reduced emissions.

The Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives offer opportunities for decreasing reliance on single-occupant vehicles (SOVs), and thus could result in an overall reduction in travel-related air emissions over the mid-to-long term.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future residential, commercial and industrial development and associated vehicle traffic will likely result in decreased air quality under any of the alternatives.

Water Resources

Significant Impacts

Urbanization generally results in the clearing of vegetated areas, increased soil erosion during and after clearing, site preparation and construction operations, an increase in human activity levels, loss of stream and wetland buffers, alteration of stream courses and loss of habitat, and an increase in impervious area. All of these activities give rise to nonpoint pollution of surface and groundwater, and would be common to all the land use alternatives.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Lynnwood's adopted Sensitive Areas Ordinance, Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Management Plan and SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and reduce potential water quality risks associated with future development. The City currently requires that new developments meet stormwater requirements contained

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

While increases in stormwater runoff and pollutant loadings within the stormwater system are unavoidable, impacts to receiving waters can be held to non-significant levels through proper stormwater management.

**Plants and Animals**

**Significant Impacts**

Future growth and development will reduce the amount and alter the characteristics of land available for plant and animal habitat. Any degradation in surface water quality within the area's wetlands, lakes and streams would adversely affect a broad range of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife.

**Mitigation Measures**

Lynnwood's existing Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO) provides a relatively high degree of protection to the most important habitat areas. Current stormwater management practices and implementation of a new stormwater ordinance planned for adoption in 1994 will protect surface water bodies from deterioration. SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and reduce specific plant and animal habitat impacts associated with future development.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Native vegetation and wildlife habitat will be lost as a result of population growth and development under any of the alternatives. Reduced and fragmented habitat will cause a decrease in wildlife populations.

**Energy**

**Significant Impacts**

All three alternatives will result in increased local consumption of energy from all readily available sources. The High Growth Alternative would result in the greatest increase in the local (within Lynnwood) consumption of energy, and the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would result in the smallest increase. From a regional perspective, it is likely that the level of impact among the alternatives would be reversed, with the High Growth Alternative having the lowest overall impact. This would be due to per-housing-unit and per-job energy efficiencies related to increased development intensity and the potential for more efficient alternatives to single-occupant vehicle (SOV) dependence.
Mitigation Measures

Measures to increase the viability of alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use will be the most effective means of reducing future energy consumption. The potential for implementing such measures is greater under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives than under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Energy consumption will increase as the community grows under any of the alternatives.

Land Use

Significant Impacts

Under all three land use alternatives, much of the currently undeveloped and underdeveloped land within Lynnwood would be developed over the next twenty years. Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, future development would be similar in mix, scale and intensity to development that has occurred in recent years. Approximately 1,173 additional housing units could be built over the next twenty years, roughly forty percent of which would be single-family and sixty percent multi-family housing. Up to 2.25 million square feet of additional non-residential buildings could be built, an increase of about 16 percent over existing conditions.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, future development within designated "Activity Centers" would be substantially more intensive than under the Current Trends Alternative. Future development outside the Activity Centers would be similar to, but slightly more intensive than under Current Trends. Approximately 1,773 additional dwelling units could be built over the next twenty years, roughly one-third of which would be single-family and two-thirds multi-family housing. Up to five million square feet of additional non-residential buildings could be built, an increase of about 35 percent over existing conditions. About eighty percent of this additional non-residential development would occur within the designated Activity Centers.

Under the High Growth Alternative, future development within designated "Activity Centers" would be substantially more intensive than under the Moderate Growth Alternative. Future development outside the Activity Centers would be the same as under Moderate Growth. Approximately 6,073 additional dwelling units could be built over the next twenty years, roughly ten percent of which would be single-family and ninety percent multi-family housing. Nearly all of the multi-family housing (over ninety percent) would be developed within the Subregional Activity Center in multi-story buildings that might also house non-residential uses. Over eight million square feet of additional non-residential buildings could be built, an increase of about sixty percent over existing conditions. Over ninety percent of this additional non-residential development would occur within the designated Activity Centers.

The substantial increase in development and land use intensity under the Moderate Growth Alternative and the High Growth Alternative is the most notable land use impact associated with the proposed land use alternatives. While most of the added growth would be focused within the Activity Centers under both alternatives, considerably more non-residential development capacity would exist outside the Activity Centers, as well.
With the considerable increase in development capacity would come additional opportunities for land use incompatibilities. Such impacts would be most likely near boundaries separating the commercial Activity Centers and non-center commercial areas from single family neighborhoods. Existing buffers of moderate density multi-family development, institutional and open space uses will provide some protection from such incompatibilities.

Mitigation Measures

Focusing most future growth and development toward the proposed Activity Centers will reduce the geographic extent of potential land use conflicts and incompatibilities. Proposed goals and objectives, and the land use designations of the alternative land use plans, will provide considerable protection to established residential neighborhoods. The potential for land use incompatibilities between adjacent uses and adjacent districts should be addressed through development and design standards and guidelines, buffering requirements and/or transitional uses and standards.

The City should consider ways to ensure that adequate parks, open spaces, sidewalks and other urban amenities, as well as adequate streets and utilities, are available as development occurs. The proposed General Policy Plan goals and objectives listed in Chapter II of this EIS provide a basis for promoting the provision of adequate facilities concurrent with development.

Lynnwood should continue to work toward completion and implementation of the Highway 99 Streetscape Improvement Guidelines, and then build upon this experience to develop guidelines appropriate to the other Activity Centers.

Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans and Planning Requirements

The City of Lynnwood is working toward compliance with the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) and consistency with the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County (CPP).

While the three land use alternatives being considered by the City are generally consistent with the goals of GMA, the Moderate Growth Alternative and especially High Growth Alternative provide greater support to the anti-sprawl, natural resource preservation, transportation and housing goals than does the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.

Neither the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative nor the Moderate Growth Alternative would achieve the population growth target adopted under the Countywide Planning Policies. The High Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 39,843 residents, essentially matching the CPP target of 39,840. Neither the Current Trends nor the Moderate Growth Alternative would achieve the employment growth target adopted under the Countywide Planning Policies. The High Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 40,527 jobs, about 600 more than the CPP target of 39,930.

The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative is generally inconsistent with Countywide Planning Policies calling for the establishment of a hierarchy of centers, supporting transit, supporting greater efficiency in the utilization of infrastructure, and supporting the co-location of jobs and housing to reduce transportation needs. The Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives are consistent with these policies and would support the countywide policy of reversing the
trend of increased population growth in rural areas, by accommodating more growth within Lynnwood. The High Growth Alternative generally provides greater support for these policies than does the Moderate Growth Alternative.

Population, Housing and Employment

Significant Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, Lynnwood’s population could increase by approximately 2,750 over the next twenty years, to a total population of about 31,900 residents. Population growth under the Moderate Growth Alternative could be approximately 4,000, for a total population of about 33,000. Population growth under the High Growth Alternative could be approximately 10,700, for a total projected population in the year 2012 of nearly 40,000.

The number of dwelling units in Lynnwood could increase from about 13,000 in 1992 to about 13,800 in 2012 under the Current Trends Alternative, about 14,300 under the Moderate Growth Alternative and about 18,600 under the High Growth Alternative. The number of new single-family homes built over the next twenty years would be similar under the three alternatives (about 500 to 600), while the number of multi-family dwelling units would vary widely (from about 700 under Current Trends, to about 1,150 under Moderate Growth, to about 5,500 under the High Growth Alternative).

The number of jobs in Lynnwood could increase from about 21,700 in 1992 to about 25,800 in 2012 under the Current Trends Alternative, about 35,500 under the Moderate Growth Alternative and about 40,500 under the High Growth Alternative.

Population pressures and employment growth will drive much of the development that will occur in Lynnwood over the next twenty years. The impacts, mitigation measures and unavoidable adverse impacts of such development on the natural and built environment are evaluated by this EIS.

Parks and Recreation

Significant Impacts

Population and employment growth under all of the alternatives would result in increased pressure on existing parks and open spaces, and increased demand for recreation services. If no new parks were acquired and developed, by the year 2012 there would be a shortage of parks and open space within the community. Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, this deficit would range from about 25 to 50 acres. The deficit would range from about 40 to 60 acres under the Moderate Growth Alternative and about 100 to 130 acres under the High Growth Alternative.

Mitigation

The projected deficits in park and open space land could be mitigated through the acquisition and development or preservation of appropriate property. Acquiring 50 to 60 acres needed under the Current Trends of Moderate Growth Alternatives would be a challenge but is
realistically achievable. Acquiring and developing 130 acres needed under the High Growth Alternative would be more problematic, due not only to the greater cost but also the increased scarcity of land that would likely accompany this alternative.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Community growth under any of the Alternatives will place increased demands on park and recreational facilities and create a need for additional facilities and recreation programs.

**Historic and Cultural Resources**

**Significant Impacts**

Future development under any of the alternatives could impact known or unidentified historic sites or cultural artifacts.

**Mitigation Measures**

The General Policy Plan and the comprehensive plan should encourage the recognition integration of the City's historic and cultural resources with future growth and development. Specific procedures for identifying and protecting previously unidentified resources should be established.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Lack of information relating to the full range or specific location of significant historic sites or cultural artifacts may result in the unknowing disturbance or destruction of resources.

**Noise**

**Significant Impacts**

Future development and population growth within the City of Lynnwood under any of the land use alternatives will increase noise levels. Major sources of noise include temporary construction (e.g., grading, clearing, and building activities) and increased vehicles on local and regional roadways.

**Mitigating Measures**

Environmental noise levels for most non-traffic and non-construction-related activities are regulated by City ordinance.

Specific roads could be designated as appropriate for use as truck routes. This would help reduce traffic noise impacts to residential areas and other sensitive land uses. Promoting the use of public transit, high occupancy vehicles and other transportation management techniques would help reduce overall traffic impacts, including traffic noise.

For construction activities, regulations or permit conditions prohibiting or limiting noisy operations during quiet times of the day would help minimize construction noise impacts.
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Noise levels in the area will increase as a result of future population growth, development, and traffic.

Transportation

Significant Impacts

Vehicular traffic and demands on the community’s street system will increase under all three comprehensive plan alternatives. Eleven of 23 Lynnwood intersections where a principal arterial meets another arterial currently operate at or above design capacity. Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, 20 of the 23 intersections would operate at or above capacity by the year 2012. Under both the Moderate Growth Alternative and the High Growth Alternative, 21 intersections would operate at or above capacity by that time. This assumes that only currently funded transportation improvements plus the new I-5 interchange at 196th Street SW will be completed. It also assumes that the percentage of trips made by travel modes other than single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) will increase from the current level (estimated at 3 percent) to the 7.5 percent level targeted under regional transit plans.

Increased traffic congestion, if not mitigated, will also adversely affect any public transit systems or transportation alternatives that compete with SOVs for street use. Pedestrian and bicycle use of streets for both transportation and recreational purposes will also be adversely affected due to increased conflicts with motorized vehicles.

The three alternatives differ in the extent to which they would encourage or establish other conditions which may benefit public transit. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would continue Lynnwood’s relatively low density development patterns. Such land use patterns are difficult and inefficient to serve with public transit, and significant improvements in public transit and ridership would be unlikely over the life of the comprehensive plan.

The Moderate Growth Alternative would provide for increased development intensities within two commercial and two institutional activity centers. A mixture of higher density residential, retail and office development would be encouraged within the commercial activity centers, particularly in the Subregional Center proposed for the Alderwood Mall/Lynnwood Triangle area. As these areas develop, they would create an environment under which public transit and other alternatives to SOVs could become more efficient and successful.

The High Growth Alternative would provide for even higher development intensities within the Subregional Center. As with the Moderate Growth Alternative, the environment for successful transit and other non-SOV travel modes would be enhanced as these areas develop over the life of the comprehensive plan.

Mitigation

The development of a comprehensive analysis and strategy for managing the community’s transportation needs is underway but incomplete. Completion of a comprehensive transportation plan is essential to the community’s ability to adequately plan for the future.
under any of the land use plan alternatives. The City should not make a final and irreversible commitment to any land use alternative prior to substantially completing this effort.

There are two basic strategies for mitigating the increased traffic congestion that will accompany community growth under all three alternatives. One strategy is to increase the capacity of the existing street network. The other strategy is to reduce the volume of vehicles placing demands upon the system, particularly within peak travel periods. A successful approach to addressing current problems and mitigating the traffic effects of future growth will most likely depend on a combination of substantial capacity expansion and aggressive demand reduction strategies.

The development patterns, land use mix and intensity of development proposed for Activity Centers under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives would be expected to facilitate the implementation of strategies for reducing overall demand for single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Travel demands will increase substantially under each of the alternatives. This will likely lead to increased arterial congestion and longer travel times even if an aggressive program of transportation system capacity improvements and demand management is developed and implemented.

**Public Services and Utilities**

**Significant Impacts**

Future community growth and development under any of the land use alternatives would result in increased demand for virtually all public services and programs. These services include public safety (police, fire and emergency medical services), schools and educational services, public utilities (sewer, water, storm drainage) and other governmental services (solid waste collection and disposal, street and public facility design, construction and maintenance, recreation programs, development regulation and inspection, and general government administration).

**Mitigation Measures**

Several of the proposed General Policy Plan goals and objectives would aim to manage community growth and development in a manner that ensures adequate public facilities and services are available to serve the needs of new development at the time that development occurs. This linkage of growth to facility and service adequacy is often referred to by the term "concurrency" (facilities and services are provided "concurrent" with growth). As the comprehensive plan is further developed and detailed plan elements relating to utilities and capital facilities are prepared, strategies for ensuring the timely provision of public facilities and services should be emphasized.
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Increase development and community growth will increase demands placed upon the entire range of public utilities and services needed within urban areas.
Proposed Action
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this environmental impact statement (EIS) is to provide information to citizens and public officials regarding the environmental implications of a new comprehensive plan being prepared by the City of Lynnwood. The comprehensive plan is being prepared in response to the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) and other on-going regional planning programs.

This Chapter describes Lynnwood's geographic and historic setting, and describes the ongoing process to develop the new comprehensive plan. Overall community goals and objectives guiding the planning process are described, as are three alternative proposals for future land use and development within the current City boundaries. Subsequent chapters will evaluate the environmental implications of the proposed goals, objectives and land use alternatives, and suggest measures that might be taken to mitigate any likely adverse impacts. It is intended that the information presented here will be used to help make the new plan an accurate and useful reflection of the desires and aspirations of the community.

Location and General Description

Lynnwood is located in the southwestern portion of Snohomish County (see Figure 1, Location Map). The current city limits extend generally to 164th Street SW on the north, 217th Street SW on the south, Interstate 5 and State Route 525 on the east, and Olympic View Drive and 76th Avenue W on the west (see Figure 2, Lynnwood City Limits). The City currently covers approximately 7.2 square miles.

Lynnwood's location along the Interstate 5 corridor, approximately mid-way between Seattle and Everett, has greatly influenced its development as the commercial and retail center of south Snohomish County. Approximately 1135 acres, or roughly 25 percent of Lynnwood's land area is currently developed for commercial (mostly retail) uses (Lynnwood Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Master Plan, 1991, Table III-1). Commercial uses dominate the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors, the Lynnwood Triangle area and the Alderwood Mall area. These areas account for most of the community's 14 million square feet of non-residential building space, and the majority of Lynnwood's approximately 28,000 jobs.

The remainder of the community is largely devoted to residential development with various institutional uses (schools, churches, parks, etc.) interspersed. Approximately 2470 acres or 59 percent of the land area is in residential use (ibid.). The community's largest residential areas lie north of 196th and to the east and west of Highway 99. A smaller area of residential development also lies in the southeast portion of the City. The City's official April 1, 1993 population was 29,580 (OFM, 1993).

Historical Development

Prior to 1900 the area that is now Lynnwood was lightly populated by Native Americans and, after about 1850, a handful of scattered homesteaders of European descent. Early pioneer settlement of what was known as Cedar Valley centered around the area that is now the
boundary between Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace, in the vicinity of Hall's Lake. As Seattle grew, the region's population began to fan out. With the advent of the Interurban freight and commuter railway between Seattle and Everett in the early 1900's, the area became more accessible and the community of Seattle Heights began to take shape around the Interurban station east of Hall's Lake.

About this same time most of the virgin forest of south Snohomish County was being logged by the Puget Mill Company. By 1917, Puget Mill had developed a plan to dispose of much of its logged land. A 30 acre "demonstration farm" was developed next to the Interurban station near what is now the Alderwood Mall. Potential "agriculturists" traveled to the demonstration farm, where they could learn about the benefits of farming the area dubbed Alderwood Manor. Puget Mill subdivided the surrounding area into five acre "ranchettes" and in the following years the area thrived as one of the most successful chicken and egg producing areas in the country. A substantial business and residential community grew up adjacent to the demonstration farm and Interurban station, and chicken farming remained an important part of the local economy until Alderwood Mall was built in the 1970's.

A new phase of the community's development occurred with the construction of Pacific Highway (Highway 99) in 1927. Businesses catering to motorists began to appear along the highway, centered on its intersection with the Edmonds-Alderwood Road (196th Street SW). The pace of development increased during World War II, and by the end of the war a thriving business community and surrounding residential areas had become firmly established. Following the construction of Interstate 5, the community's commercial center began shifting to the east along 196th Street SW and 44th Avenue W, the principal freeway access roads. More recently, the Alderwood Mall and surrounding area has developed as another important commercial center.

The City of Lynnwood incorporated in 1959 with a population of 6,000. The City initially encompassed an area of approximately three square miles, roughly centered around the intersection of Highway 99 and 196th Street SW. Over the years the city has grown to a population of about 30,000, covering approximately seven square miles (OFM, 1993) and incorporating the communities of Cedar Valley, Seattle Heights and Alderwood Manor. The geographic growth of the City is illustrated by Figure 3.

The Existing Comprehensive plan

Lynnwood's first Comprehensive plan, comprising text and maps, was adopted in 1967. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map was amended several times over the following fifteen years, most significantly in the mid-1970's to incorporate plans for Alderwood Mall. In 1983 a new Plan Map was adopted, reflecting all previous amendments plus some minor new amendments.

Few amendments were made to the text of the Comprehensive plan in the two decades following its adoption. Then, in 1989 the City adopted the Lynnwood Policy Plan. The Policy Plan provides more specific guidance and predictability regarding the location, timing and conditions under which development of the community is to occur than was provided under the 1967 Plan. The Policy Plan has been refined since 1989 through the adoption of amendments relating to specific subject matters. Ordinance No. 1780, adopted in October, 1990, modified and added policies relating to transportation planning, impact mitigation and promotion of high
capacity transit (HCT). In 1991 the Comprehensive Land Use Map and the Policy Plan were amended to incorporate applicable provisions of Snohomish County's Paine Field Area Comprehensive plan, in connection with a major annexation (Ordinance No. 1829). Housing affordability policies were added to the Policy Plan under Ordinance No. 1882.

The Lynnwood Policy Plan established a series of overall, city-wide goals, as well as more specific goals and policies for residential development, commercial development, transportation, parks and recreation, open space, urban design and for plan implementation.

Residential goals and policies support the continued development of single-family neighborhoods at densities of approximately four dwelling units per acre, but also recognize the need to provide for increased single-family densities under certain circumstances (such as along arterials or through clustering where warranted to preserve important natural features or other amenities). The plan also recognizes the role played by multi-family housing in providing affordable living options, and establishes policies encouraging high standards of design and construction to ensure a quality living environment and minimize impacts on neighboring areas. The use of multi-family development as a buffer between commercial and single-family residential areas is supported, but only where such areas are determined clearly suitable for residential living. The plan favors duplex development for designated multi-family areas near established single-family neighborhoods. Additional residential policies address housing costs, specialized housing needs, manufactured housing, non-residential uses in residential neighborhoods, border (buffering and separation) issues, and special considerations for siting residential development along arterial streets.

The Comprehensive plan's commercial goals and policies recognize and support Lynnwood's continued role as the commercial and retail center of south Snohomish County by reserving suitable land for future commercial development needs. The Plan also suggests a strategy of increasing the density of development in existing commercial areas as the preferred method of commercial expansion, prior to consuming undeveloped land. The Plan supports mixed commercial/residential development in certain commercial areas. Small-scale neighborhood commercial centers are recognized as desirable if carefully sited and properly controlled. Additional commercial development policies address issues of site development, automobile and pedestrian accessibility, parking, and visual impacts. The Plan recognizes the important role played, and special challenges created by strip commercial development. It also recognizes the limited potential for additional industrial and manufacturing development within the city, and suggests strategies for protecting what industrial land currently exists and improving its compatibility with adjacent uses.

Transportation goals and policies emphasize a strategy of supporting high capacity transit (HCT) and other alternatives to the continued expansion of street and arterial capacity. The strategy is seen as important not only to providing an efficient transportation system, but also to protecting residential and other areas from the impacts of heavy traffic. The Plan encourages the development of transit-supportive land uses and intensities in the vicinity of planned transit stations, and the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle access. Policies also address the mitigation of traffic impacts on neighborhoods, access and parking standards to help preserve the capacity of arterials, streetscape design, and support for transportation system management (TSM) measures by employers and landlords to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles (SOV's).
Goals and policies for parks and recreation seek to plan for and set aside sufficient park land for future needs. The Plan recognizes the importance of acquiring land not only for active recreation needs, but also to preserve land with significant environmental, historical and cultural features. The importance of natural corridors and a trail system linking parks, schools, community facilities, commercial areas and neighborhoods is recognized. Open space policies encourage the long-term preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, such as steep slopes and wetlands, through public acquisition, clustering development and proper management of stream corridors and stormwater drainage.

Urban design goals and policies call for the development of design standards on both a citywide basis and for specific districts having unique characteristics or high visibility. View protection, establishing positive gateways to the community and preserving the community's cultural and historic heritage are emphasized. The Lynnwood Policy Plan also includes goals and policies for implementing the Plan, thus providing guidance to decision-makers on the application of policies to specific situations.

**Functional and Capital Facilities Plans**

In addition to the Comprehensive plan, the City of Lynnwood has adopted detailed plans for providing municipal water service, wastewater treatment, surface water management, and parks and recreation facilities. These functional plans provide specific guidance for developing and maintaining sewer, water and stormwater systems and recreational facilities needed to serve the community as it now exists and as it continues to develop. These plans are generally consistent with the current Comprehensive plan, but will need to be reviewed and possibly updated following adoption of a revised Comprehensive plan. The existing functional plans and their dates of adoption are:


The City has recently adopted a six year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for 1993-1998. The CIP establishes priorities and identifies likely funding sources for implementing the facility improvements and acquisitions recommended by the various functional plans or identified through other means. Under the Growth Management Act, an important function of a CIP is to demonstrate that the facilities needed to serve planned development can be financed concurrent with the community's growth.
THE PLANNING PROCESS

State and Regional Planning Context

The Washington State Growth Management Act (Ch. 36.70A. RCW) establishes the basic requirements for local comprehensive plans. Local comprehensive plans must be consistent with thirteen statewide goals relating to such issues as environmental protection, transportation, housing, sprawl, natural resource protection, economic development and public participation (36.70A.020 RCW). Local plans must include a land use element, a housing element, a capital facilities element, a utilities element and a transportation element (36.70A.070 RCW). Cities and counties may choose to include additional elements in their plans as well (36.70A.080 RCW). Local governments were also required to designate and regulate the development of specified resource lands and environmentally critical areas by September 1, 1991, and to review these designations and regulations as they adopt their GMA required comprehensive plans (37.70A. 060 and 170 RCW).

Local comprehensive plans must be coordinated with the plans of other cities or counties sharing a common border or related regional issues (36.70A.100 RCW). In Snohomish County, the primary mechanism for ensuring the coordination of local comprehensive plans is a set of Countywide Planning Policies developed by Snohomish County Tomorrow in 1992 and adopted by the County Council in 1993. Comprehensive plans for cities within Snohomish County, and the County’s own plan, are to be consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies.

Finally, local plans must be consistent with the growth management and transportation provisions of Vision 2020. Vision 2020 is a growth strategy and transportation plan for King, Kitsap, Snohomish and Pierce Counties adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council. Consistency with the Growth Management Act, the Countywide Planning Policies and Vision 2020 is discussed in detail in Chapter II of this EIS, under the heading Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies.

Recent Lynnwood Planning Programs

Highway 99 Task Force

The Highway 99 Task Force formed in 1987 as a cooperative effort between Lynnwood, Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace, Snohomish County and property owners along the highway between 164th and 205th Streets. The original goal of the Task Force was to develop a comprehensive, long range plan, based on community input, to stimulate and promote economic development along the business corridor. In January, 1990 the Task Force issued a Baseline Report expressing its vision for the Highway 99 corridor, presenting information on existing and projected conditions, and making recommendations for future improvements. The purpose of the Report was to "serve as a basis for development of a Highway 99 Master Plan: a united single zoning plan for the study area" (Baseline Report, p.1).

In November of 1990 an Interlocal Agreement was signed by Snohomish County and the Cities of Lynnwood and Edmonds to hire a consultant to prepare a plan for landscaping and other streetscape features along Highway 99. A new Task Force/Advisory Committee was formed in July 1992, to provide input and guidance to the planning effort. A draft "Highway 99
The "Streetscapes Guidelines" document was prepared in 1993 and is currently being reviewed and revised. When completed, the Guidelines will be considered for adoption by the three jurisdictions involved.

**Lynnwood Legacy**

In April 1991, the City of Lynnwood, the Snohomish County Transportation Authority (SNO-TRAN), and Community Transit (the area's transit provider) entered into an agreement to conduct a collaborative planning project that came to be known as the *Lynnwood Legacy*. The purpose of this planning effort was to evaluate the opportunities created by the potential siting in Lynnwood of one or two transit stations as part of the proposed Puget Sound regional transit system, and to develop strategies to take best advantage of those opportunities. A Steering Committee consisting of local government officials and citizen leaders, assisted by a consulting team and advised by a Citizen Advisory Committee and staff Technical Support Team, developed a "vision" for the future of Lynnwood's commercial and retail core. This vision foresees the development of "activity centers" in the vicinity of two future transit stations, one located in the vicinity of Alderwood Mall and the other located at the existing 44th Avenue park-and-ride lot.

The transit stations (whose general location and functions were suggested by the *Lynnwood Station Area Planning Study*, December 1988) would accommodate either a regional rail system or an expanded regional bus transit system. They would provide convenient connection to an enhanced local bus system and other transportation modes (pedestrian, bicycle, private automobile).

The 44th Avenue station would be oriented toward commuters, relying largely on a feeder bus system to transport commuters to the station. The surrounding activity center would be characterized by a mix of commercial, retail and residential activities at higher densities than currently exist in these areas. Commuter parking lots located at the periphery of the center (approximately one-quarter mile from the transit station) would provide some opportunity for a park-and-ride function.

The Alderwood Mall area station would function as a destination station serving an emerging commercial center. Two concepts for station area location and development are suggested by the *Lynnwood Legacy* report. In Alternative A, the transit station is located on the west side of I-5 north of the proposed 196th/I-5 interchange. It would have a direct connection to the east side of the freeway via a pedestrian overpass. In Alternative B, the transit station is located in the northwest corner of the Alderwood Mall property, resulting in a closer tie between existing commercial and residential areas and the transit facility. Both alternatives envision and support increased commercial and retail development intensities. The Alderwood Mall activity center would have less of a residential component than the 44th Avenue activity center.

In addition to developing the overall concepts for activity centers served by the planned regional transit system, the *Lynnwood Legacy* report suggests a number of land use, transportation, housing, open space and urban design goals and recommendations intended to help achieve its vision of the future (*Lynnwood Legacy*, pp.86-95). The Lynnwood City Council has formally recognized the results of the *Lynnwood Legacy* planning project and directed that its recommendations be included in the City's comprehensive planning process (City of Lynnwood Resolution No. 93-10, May 24, 1993).
Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance

In response to the GMA requirement for designation and regulation of the development of "critical areas," the City of Lynnwood adopted an Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance in 1992. This ordinance establishes development requirements for specified critical areas that supplement the requirements of other City land use and development codes. Specified critical areas include wetlands, streams, fish and wildlife habitat areas, areas of potential geologic instability and flood hazard areas.

It has been determined that there are no agricultural, forest or mineral resource lands eligible for designation under GMA within the City of Lynnwood.

The Comprehensive plan

The City of Lynnwood formally initiated its process of developing a new comprehensive plan in 1991. A non-scientific survey was mailed out city-wide in September soliciting opinions regarding the community's image, community and municipal services, land and economic development, housing, and development regulations and controls. A city-wide meeting was held in December 1991, with invitations going out to all Lynnwood households and businesses. Citizens were introduced to the planning process and the Growth Management Act, and a "visioning" exercise was conducted to gain an understanding of meeting participants' desires for the future of their community. A series of neighborhood meetings was held in February and March of 1992 to focus on issues of concern, opportunities for improvement, and to formulate goals and objectives for the City.

The information obtained through these citizen involvement programs was used to begin developing draft planning goals and objectives. Several joint Planning Commission/City Council meetings were held in 1992 and 1993 to discuss specific elements of the comprehensive plan, planning requirements and Countywide Planning Policies. Data and analysis of existing conditions and draft goals and objectives were presented to the Council and Commission by staff. A second series of neighborhood meetings was held in June of 1993 to present the planning and land use concepts and proposals that had been developed through this process. Additional joint Planning Commission/City Council meetings have been and will be held during the first half of 1994 to discuss policies, plans and key issues. Additional public meetings are planned for June, 1994.

Integrating SEPA and the Comprehensive Planning Process

The City of Lynnwood has developed a strategy for coordinating the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) with development of its new comprehensive plan. The intent of the strategy is to better integrate environmental information with the development of plan concepts and policies, and with public involvement. This strategy is founded on provisions in the SEPA rules as well as recommendations of the Department of Ecology and Department of Community Development for coordinating SEPA compliance with GMA planning.

An integrated approach is intended to permit environmental analysis to occur in measured steps and to make sure that adequate information is available to decision-makers throughout
the planning process. It will also enable interested citizens to identify concerns and evaluate environmental trade-offs at identified points in the process.

This Draft EIS evaluates three alternative land use concepts or visions, together with a set of proposed community goals and objectives that are intended to form the basis of a General Policy Plan. It compares the anticipated environmental impacts associated with these goals, objectives and land use alternatives, and identifies a range of possible impact mitigation measures and implementation strategies. The GMA, Vision 2020, and Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies (see the Relationship to Existing Land Use Plans and Planning Requirements subsection of Chapter III) provide the general policy framework for this analysis.

Using the information in the Draft EIS, together with citizen and agency comments on the document, the City will then define a preferred alternative. At the same time, it will develop specific policies for the various elements of the preferred plan (e.g., land use, housing, capital facilities) and a detailed land use map. The preferred alternative may be a combination and refinement of the broad concepts articulated in the initial plan visions, and analyzed in this Draft EIS.

The Final EIS will describe the preferred alternative. In the event the preferred alternative is substantially different than the alternatives analyzed by the Draft EIS, additional environmental analysis and opportunity to comment may be appropriate. In any event, the Final EIS will respond to comments from agencies and citizens on the Draft EIS.

Following adoption by the Lynnwood City Council, the General Policy Plan and Land Use Map will provide the bases for developing more detailed comprehensive plan elements and new land use regulations for the community. Together with these new plan elements and regulations, the Policy Plan will be used by the Lynnwood Planning Commission, City Council, Mayor, various agencies, and private property owners as a guide in making decisions about land use, infrastructure, and other issues for the City of Lynnwood.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

The City of Lynnwood proposes to adopt a new comprehensive plan to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act and the long range planning needs of the City. The Plan currently being developed and considered will apply only to land within the Lynnwood city limits. Growth management planning for the unincorporated areas adjacent to Lynnwood will be resolved in coordination with Snohomish County and other affected jurisdictions.

Development of the comprehensive plan is occurring in phases. Adoption of a General Policy Plan and Land Use Plan will represents completion of the first phase. The development of more detailed plan elements and implementation programs will follow. Each stage of the comprehensive planning process will be subject to appropriate environmental review under the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act.

Three alternative approaches to managing growth within Lynnwood have been developed for consideration by the community and local decision-makers. The following sections present the overall goals, objectives and land use concepts that are common to all three land use alternatives, as well as a description of those features that distinguish the land use alternatives.
from one another. The "alternatives" will be compared in terms of environmental impact throughout this EIS.

Features Common to All Alternatives

Overall Goals and Objectives

In addition to the legal requirements of the Growth Management Act and the guidance provided by Vision 2020, the Countywide Planning Policies and other recent planning efforts, a preliminary set of overall goals and objectives has been proposed to guide the development of Lynnwood's new comprehensive plan. These preliminary goals and objectives are common to the three alternative land use concepts under consideration by the City, and are proposed to form the basis of the General Policy Plan and subsequent plan elements. Goals and objectives are organized by plan element — that is, within categories corresponding to the five plan elements mandated by the Growth Management Act and an optional Open Space and Recreation Element.

Land Use

GOAL: Provide a balanced pattern of land uses that will preserve and enhance neighborhoods, promote economic development, encourage redevelopment at appropriate locations, properly control land development and uses, and protect environmentally sensitive areas.

Objective 1: Establish a growth management system that will regulate development and redevelopment of land so that proper mitigation of related impacts occurs, and adequate public facilities and services are provided.

Objective 2: Zone an adequate supply and mix of developable residential, commercial and industrial land to accommodate projected housing and employment needs.

Objective 3: Facilitate the development of residential uses ranging from larger lot, single family units to higher density multi-family units, in areas of compatible development, to provide a variety of housing choices, to accommodate residential growth, and to ensure housing affordability for current and future residents.

Objective 4: Establish zoning categories and regulations to allow the following residential land use categories as described in the Comprehensive Plan:

Single Family 1 (SF-1): Detached single family at a maximum density of 5 du/acre

Single Family 2 (SF-2): Single family at a maximum density of 8 du/acre

Multi-Family 1 (MF-1): Multi-family at a maximum density of 12 du/acre

Multi-Family 2 (MF-2): Multi-family at a maximum density of 20 du/acre
Business Technical (BT): Offices for business, personal and professional services; research and development, small scale fabrication; and related storage, wholesale and retail

Light Industrial (LI): Light manufacturing and fabrication, and warehouses

Institutional (I): Public and semi-public uses and facilities

Recreation & Open Space (RO): Public Parks and designated open space

Activity Center Overlay: Utilize development incentives to encourage more intense development and mixed uses in the subregional center

Objective 11: Encourage land uses which foster safe, cohesive neighborhoods and enhance the sense of community identity.

Objective 12: Promote infill commercial development and redevelopment with opportunities for new residential development in specific locations within the Highway 99 activity center while improving the visual character and image.

Objective 13: Promote development of commercial, residential, institutional and open space uses in the Subregional Center to provide economic and redevelopment opportunities, support multi-model transportation use, and ensure quality urban design.

Objective 14: Provide a land use environment which is complementary to the needs of the Edmonds Community College activity center, the neighborhood, the vicinity, and the City.

Objective 15: Provide a land use environment for the Civic Center which encourages the development of government offices and services and other complementary uses, in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding area and the City.

Objective 16: Provide a land use environment for the Park Central activity center to be an area of high quality cultural, educational and recreational activities and facilities, in a manner that is compatible with the surrounding residences and businesses and the City.

Objective 17: Establish plans, policies and regulations to improve the function and appearance of existing and new development and enhance the livability and image of the City.

Objective 18: Pursue a planning process to evaluate the effects of expanding the City’s boundaries, determine the proper sequence and locations of annexations, establish consistent land use and development regulations, and evaluate the extension of public facilities and services.
Objective 19: Coordinate land use plans, strategies, and information with the appropriate jurisdictions and agencies.

Objective 20: Monitor, evaluate, and update land use regulations, standards, and programs to ensure effective performance.

**Housing**

**GOAL:** Provide sufficient availability and a variety of opportunities for appropriate safe, decent, and affordable housing in strong, cohesive neighborhoods to meet the needs of present and future residents of Lynnwood.

Objective 1: Establish policies, programs, capital projects and regulations that will protect, enhance, and revitalize existing neighborhoods and housing stock.

Objective 2: Establish regulations and incentives that encourage quality residential development and promote a variety of housing types and opportunities.

Objective 3: Provide regulations, incentives and opportunities for the housing types, locations and densities needed for each of the Activity Centers.

Objective 4: Meet the needs of lower income households by providing for affordable housing opportunities.

Objective 5: Plan to meet the Snohomish County Fair Share affordable housing allocation targets for the City of Lynnwood.

Objective 6: Provide for adequate housing opportunities for special needs populations.

Objective 7: Coordinate housing plans, strategies and information with the appropriate jurisdictions and agencies.

Objective 8: Monitor, evaluate and update housing regulations, standards and programs to ensure effective performance.

**Transportation**

**GOAL:** Provide for a multi-modal transportation system that will serve the community and region in a safe, efficient, cost effective, and aesthetic manner while minimizing adverse impacts to neighborhoods, businesses, and the natural environment.

Objective 1: Enhance and improve the entire transportation network including the intercity and local street systems, to provide a full array of transportation alternatives by developing a comprehensive roadway construction program that will improve on overall traffic flow and circulation.

Objective 2: Identify currently deficient and unsafe traffic conditions and develop solutions to correct the deficiencies.
Objective 3: Establish levels of service (LOS) for the arterial system as minimum standards for roadway design and planning, land development permitting and maintenance.

Objective 4: Maintain a six-year Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) that is updated annually and is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the 6 year capital Facilities Plan (CFP).

Objective 5: Work with the local transit agency and the Regional Transit Authority to increase transit service and provide an efficient transit system that offers transit opportunities for intercity and regional travel.

Objective 6: Continue to implement programs aimed at the reduction of transportation related energy consumption and air pollution by meeting the trip reduction goals mandated by the City's adopted Commute Trip Reduction Ordinance.

Objective 7: Adopt and implement a comprehensive land use and transportation program of development regulations, design standards, and traffic circulation that will protect and enhance the existing neighborhoods and businesses, while establishing land use and urban patterns that support public transportation, yet recognize regional transportation responsibilities, and promote its development land use.

Objective 8: Provide a local and regional integrated non-motorized transportation system of sidewalks, trails and bicycle lanes to link neighborhoods, businesses, parks, schools and activity centers for safe and adequate pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

Objective 9: Promote parking management so as to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, and to improve parking accessibility for short-term parking users and retail customers.

Objective 10: Identify transportation improvements and implementation strategies to encourage redevelopment at appropriate locations and for the Activity Center Plans.

Objective 11: Ensure that transportation facilities are maintained in a manner that will optimize safety, traffic flow and the life of the facility.

Objective 12: Coordinate Transportation plans and programs with other jurisdictions, agencies, and districts.

Objective 13: Monitor, evaluate and update plans, standards, programs and projects for transportation facilities to ensure effective performance.

Capital Facilities

Goal: Provide Capital Facilities to properly serve the community in a manner that enhances quality of life and economic opportunities, optimizes the use and protection of existing facilities and provides for future needs.
Objective 1: Identify currently deficient service areas and facilities, and develop solutions to correct the deficiencies.

Objective 2: Establish levels of service (LOS) for water, sewer and stormwater systems as minimum standards for facility design and planning, land development permitting, and operation and maintenance.

Objective 3: Maintain a 6 year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) of public improvements that is updated annually and adopted biennially and is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Objective 4: Ensure that existing capital facilities are maintained and operated in a manner that will optimize the use and the life of the facility.

Objective 5: Identify capital facility improvements and implementation strategies to encourage redevelopment at appropriate locations and for the Activity Center plans.

Objective 6: Achieve consistency in capital facilities planning and development with appropriate jurisdictions and service providers.

Objective 7: Facilitate efficient and equitable siting of essential public facilities through cooperative and coordinated planning with appropriate agencies and affected jurisdictions.

Objective 8: Monitor, evaluate and update standards, programs and projects for capital facilities to ensure effective performance.

Utilities

Goal: Ensure that power and telecommunications utility service needs are met for the existing and future population and businesses.

Objective 1: Consult with utility providers whenever modifications to City land use plans and development regulations are considered, and as utility providers develop, update or modify their own functional plans, to ensure consistency between land use and utility plans.

Objective 2: Coordinate the City's and utilities' capital facilities plans to ensure the timely provision of adequate services and to identify opportunities for greater efficiency in public facility and utility system development.

Objective 3: Develop standards and criteria to ensure that utility system expansion and reconstruction is accomplished in a manner that is sensitive to the natural environment and complements the aesthetic character of the urban environment.
Parks, Recreation And Open Space

GOAL: Provide a superior and balanced system of parks, trails, open space, and cultural and recreational opportunities to serve the current and future residents and visitors of Lynnwood.

Objective 1: Provide a quality and diverse park system to properly serve the needs of the community.

Objective 2: Provide a minimum level of service (LOS) standard of a total of 10 acres/1,000 persons for all parks and open space. Five acres/1,000 persons of the total will be planned and developed for "core" parks (pocket, neighborhood, and community parks).

Objective 3: Develop a classification system for parks and open space that specifies the type of facilities and typical improvements for each classification.

Objective 4: Prepare a master acquisition and development list of potential parks and open space and establish priorities for implementation in the Capital Improvements Plan.

Objective 5: Provide quality facilities and programs for an abundance of cultural, educational, and recreational opportunities.

Objective 6: Provide a system of open space and natural areas that complements and enhances the natural and manmade environments.

Objective 7: Identify, protect and preserve significant historical artifacts, facilities, and sites.

Objective 8: Provide a connecting system of trails for commuter, recreational, and general circulation purposes.

Objective 9: Identify parks and open space sites, related improvements and implementation strategies for the Activity Centers plans.

Objective 10: Coordinate recreation and open space plans, strategies, and information with appropriate jurisdictions and agencies.

Objective 11: Manage and maintain parks, open space, and recreational facilities to optimize use and protect public investment.

Objective 12: Monitor, evaluate, and update recreation and open space plans and programs to ensure effective performance.
Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

The three comprehensive plan land use alternatives under consideration have many similarities in the way land uses and intensities are designated by their respective proposed Land Use Maps. Most of these similarities are related to existing development patterns that are deemed desirable under any future scenario and therefore are not proposed to be significantly altered. While much of the analysis in this EIS focuses on differences between the alternatives, it is useful to understand those aspects the alternatives hold in common.

All three alternatives designate the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors primarily for commercial uses. Additional significant commercial designations occur in the Lynnwood Triangle (bounded by 196th Street SW, 44th Avenue West and I-5) and Alderwood Mall areas.

Limited light industrial areas are designated west of 60th Avenue West along 212th Street SW and in the vicinity of 60th Avenue West and 212th Street SW.

Most of the remaining areas of the City are designated for residential uses, with various institutional and open space uses interspersed. Large areas in the northeast and northwest portions of the City are designated for single-family use, and a smaller single-family area is designated in the south. Most multi-family residential areas are located between the commercial and single-family residential areas.

Features that Distinguish the Three Alternatives

Beyond these common goals, objectives and general land use patterns, the three alternative plan concepts provide for differing densities, land use intensities, development approaches and mixes of uses. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative provides for limited economic and residential growth. Two key underlying objectives of the Moderate Growth Alternative are to support regional growth management policies encouraging existing urban areas to absorb a greater share of forecast regional growth and to support the development of high capacity transit (HCT) systems. It would support these objectives, while at the same time seeking to protect existing residential areas from incompatible development, by accommodating a moderate level of economic and residential growth focused largely within five designated "activity centers" (see Figure 4). The High Growth Alternative seeks to more aggressively support regional growth management policies by encouraging significantly higher levels of development within the activity centers, and would support and be dependent upon the development of HCT systems to accommodate increased transportation needs.

Land Use Plan Alternatives

Figures 5, 6 and 7 illustrate the location of various land uses and intensities under the three alternatives. Tables 1 and 2 provide information on the general nature and intensity of uses included within these designations. The Tables are arranged in a manner to allow comparison between Lynnwood's existing Comprehensive plan land use designations (Current Trends - No Action) and the new designations being considered under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives. The Tables also indicate the amount of acreage within the City that would be dedicated to each land use designation under each alternative. Table 3 provides estimates for the number of dwelling units and residents that could exist in Lynnwood when the community is totally developed under the three alternatives. The estimated amount of non-
residential building space and the number of jobs that would be expected to exist under "build-out" conditions are also presented. The following discussion will refer to and explain the information presented in these Figures and Tables.

**Current Trends (No Action) Alternative**

The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative (Figure 5) assumes that the 1989 Comprehensive Plan, the Lynnwood Policy Plan and current adopted zoning would remain in effect and be applied to future land development according to existing trends. This alternative would also

**Table 1**

Residential Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 du/acre (0 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density</td>
<td>Single Family 1 (SF1)</td>
<td>(same as Moderate Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 du/acre (2,075 acres)</td>
<td>5 du/acre (1,910 acres)</td>
<td>(1,910 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>Single Family 2 (SF2)</td>
<td>(same as Moderate Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 du/acre (&lt; 1 acre)</td>
<td>8 du/acre (244 acres)</td>
<td>(244 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family 1 (MF1)</td>
<td>Multiple Family 2 (MF2)</td>
<td>(same as Moderate Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du/acre varies (476 acres)</td>
<td>20 du/acre (348 acres)</td>
<td>(289 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Family 3 (MF3)
60 du/acre (69 acres)

Notes:  
1. Dwelling units per acre.  
2. Determined case-by-case based on existing infrastructure, surrounding zoning and land uses, and environmental impacts.  
3. Increased density available in Subregional Activity Center through bonuses based on location and performance standards.

Source: Lynnwood Planning Dept.
### Table 2
Mixed Use and Non-residential Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use</strong></td>
<td>Mixed Use (MU) Multiple family, office and retail uses permitted in Subregional Activity Center (22 acres)</td>
<td>Mixed Use (MU) (Same as Moderate Growth) (57 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Business</td>
<td>Local Commercial (LC) Personal and professional services, convenience and comparison goods for the local community (72 acres)</td>
<td>Local Commercial (LC) (Same as Moderate Growth) (70 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer goods within a convenient distance of households (33 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office and Service</strong></td>
<td>Office Commercial (OC) Offices for business, financial and administrative uses, professional services and hotels – subordinate/ complementary uses (e.g., retail, personal services, eating establishments) also permitted (165 acres)</td>
<td>Office Commercial (OC) (Same as Moderate Growth) (163 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office buildings of unrestricted height/size for business/professional concerns and complementary uses – may be used as buffer between business/residential areas if scale/uses appropriate (53 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Commercial</td>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC) Personal and professional services and sale of convenience and comparison goods for the region, including local and surrounding communities (720 acres)</td>
<td>Regional Commercial (RC) (Same as Moderate Growth) (690 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Uses and intensities similar to those found in a traditional central business district (CBD) – excludes most uses involving outdoor sales (467 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Commercial</strong></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly auto-oriented commercial uses and some outdoor and light industrial type uses (281 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Technical (BT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices for personal and professional services, research and development, small scale fabrication, related storage, retail and wholesale uses (63 acres)</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Commercial</strong></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned commercial development of contiguous parcels under multiple ownership, with high degree of coordination/control (153 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Recreation</strong></td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial recreational facilities serving local and regional needs (4 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Industrial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light manufacturing and wholesaling operations involving little retail activity (199 acres)</td>
<td>Light Industrial (LI) Light manufacturing and fabrication, and warehouses (62 acres)</td>
<td>Light Industrial (LI) (Same as Moderate Growth) (62 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Lynnwood General Policy Plan Draft EIS_  
_Description of the Proposed Action_
### Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends (No Growth)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial (cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Technical Park</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial parks, business parks, and compatible professional and business offices, wholesale, manufacturing and research/development uses (68 acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public and Open Space Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Private Open Space</td>
<td>Recreation/Open Space (RO)</td>
<td>Recreation/Open Space (RO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, parks, municipal buildings and other public and private uses with large amounts of landscaped or unbuilt area (570 acres)</td>
<td>Parks and designated open space (331 acres)</td>
<td>(Same as Moderate Growth) (328 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Institutional (I)</td>
<td>Institutional (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and semi-public facilities, including schools, libraries, city hall, hospitals (307 acres)</td>
<td>(Same as Moderate Growth) (307 acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Dept.
# Table 3

**Projected Levels of Growth and Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>13,766</td>
<td>14,326</td>
<td>18636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>29,113</td>
<td>31,878</td>
<td>33,090</td>
<td>39,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential*</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>21,717</td>
<td>25,808</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>40,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregional Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>6,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>10,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential*</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>10,697</td>
<td>16,940</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remainder of City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>11,283</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>12,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>26,432</td>
<td>28,825</td>
<td>29,277</td>
<td>29,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential*</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13,747</td>
<td>15,111</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>18,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In millions of square feet.
Note: Figures not adjusted for future park land acquisition.

Source: Lynnwood Planning Dept., City of Lynnwood Plan Alternatives Totals Analysis, January 19, 1994

Involving updating current plans, policies and regulations to reflect annexations and plans for capital facilities, housing and transportation to meet the minimum requirements of the Growth Management Act.

The existing Comprehensive Plan designates four types of residential land use: Low Density (2 dwelling units/acre), Medium Density (4 dwelling units/acre), High Density (12 dwelling units/acre) and Multiple Family (density determined case-by-case)(see Table 1). The Plan establishes six types of commercial use: Neighborhood Business, Office and Service, Urban Commercial, General Commercial, Planned Commercial and Commercial Recreation (see
Table 2). The current Plan also established two industrial land use categories (Light Industrial and Business/Technical Park) and a Public and Private Open Space category. The geographic locations of these current land use designations are shown by Figure 5.

Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, up to approximately 1,173 additional dwelling units could be added in coming years. This would bring Lynnwood's total housing stock up to 13,766 dwelling units, an increase of about nine percent over 1992. Population could increase by about 2,765 persons to a total of 31,878. Most of this growth would occur on vacant or underdeveloped land in the City's existing residential areas west of 36th Avenue West and north of 196th Street SW. A relatively small portion of this residential growth (about fifteen percent) would occur in areas that, under the other plan alternatives, would be designated as Activity Centers (see Figure 4).

Non-residential development could increase from the current 14 million square feet to approximately 16.25 million square feet (an increase of about sixteen percent) under the Current Trends Alternative. Of this 2.25 million square feet increase, most (approximately 1.5 million square feet) would be built within the Subregional Activity Center. The remaining 0.75 million square feet of additional space would be built in other parts of the community. Employment could grow by as much as nineteen percent under the Current Trends Alternative, from 21,717 jobs in 1990 to an estimated 25,808 under build-out conditions. Most employment growth would occur in existing commercial areas.

The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative assumes there would be no significant additions to designated park, recreation, open space or school sites. No significant new transportation facilities (other than the currently planned I-5/196th Street SW interchange) would be built.

**Moderate Growth Alternative**

The basis of the Moderate Growth Alternative (Figure 6) is to preserve and enhance existing residential areas and focus moderate growth within five activity centers. Three types of activity centers would be established: governmental/educational activity centers, commercial activity centers and a park and recreation activity center. The location of these centers is illustrated by Figure 4.

Two governmental/education activity centers would be designated; one in the Edmonds Community College area and one in the area of Lynnwood City Hall. The area of Wilcox Park/Scriber Lake and Scriber High School would be designated a park and recreation activity center.

Two commercial activity centers are proposed, one along the Highway 99 corridor extending from the north to the south city limits, the other in the Alderwood Mall/44th Avenue West/I-5 area. This second commercial center, known as the Subregional Activity Center, is a key element in the Moderate Growth Alternative's strategy for coordinating growth and transportation needs. The Moderate Growth Alternative would allow and encourage intensification of existing land uses and a more diverse mixture of uses in this area in order to promote conditions under which viable alternatives to single-occupant vehicle (SOV) use could develop over time. Increased intensity could make it more feasible to provide improved public transit service to the area, thus making it more practical for people to travel to the area by bus or rail. Diversifying the mix of land uses, to include high density residential, office and retail commercial could provide some opportunities for people to walk to work and shopping, and
make it easier to accomplish multiple shopping or business tasks within the Subregional Activity Center on foot. Intensifying uses and encouraging high density residential development within the Subregional Activity Center could also reduce pressure on other portions of the community, especially residential areas, to accept significant new development at higher densities.

Four residential land use designations would be created under the Moderate Growth Alternative: Single-family 1 (up to 5 dwelling units per acre), Single-family 2 (up to 8 dwelling units per acre), Multiple Family 1 (up to 12 dwelling units per acre), and Multiple Family 2 (up to 20 dwelling units per acre). Table 1 compares these residential categories to those of the current plan (the Current Trends Alternative). Under the Moderate Growth Alternative there would no longer be a Low Density (up to 2 dwelling units per acre) category. This is of little significance, since no land within Lynnwood carries this designation at this time. Of greater interest is the slight to moderate increase in allowable density for the SF1 and SF2 residential categories, when compared to the Medium Density category of the current plan.

Under the current Plan, approximately 2,075 acres of land are designated for single-family use at up to four dwelling units per acre. Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, this area would be re-designated to Single-family 1, allowing development of up to five dwelling units per acre (1,910 acres) and Single-family 2, allowing up to eight dwelling units per acre (244 acres). The actual effect of this change will be limited by the fact that approximately 85 percent of single-family land is already fully developed. Construction of new homes at the higher densities would be largely limited to approximately 90 acres of vacant land and approximately 210 acres of underdeveloped land scattered throughout the SF1 and SF2 designated area (vacant and underdeveloped lands are shown by Figure 9 in Chapter III, Environmental Analysis).

Under the current Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan, approximately 474 acres are designated for multiple family residential use. Allowable density is determined on a case-by-case basis. The Moderate Growth Alternative would replace the current multi-family designations with two new designations: Multiple Family 1, allowing up to 12 dwelling units per acre (136 acres), and Multiple Family 2, allowing up to 20 dwelling units per acre¹ (348 acres). Approximately 90 percent of this land is currently developed. Construction of new multiple family housing would be anticipated on the remaining 35 acres of vacant or underdeveloped land within the MF1 and MF2 areas, and in the Mixed Use (MU) area located within the Subregional Activity Center described above.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, up to 1,773 new single-family and multi-family dwelling units could be added in coming years (compared to 1,173 added units under the Current Trends Alternative). This would bring Lynnwood's total housing stock up to approximately 14,326 dwelling units, an increase of about fourteen percent over 1992. Population could increase by an estimated 3,977 persons, to a total of approximately 33,090. Approximately one-third of these new dwelling units and about one-fourth of the new residents would be located in the Subregional Activity Center, with the remainder locating on currently undeveloped or underdeveloped properties distributed throughout the rest of the community.

Non-residential development could increase from the existing 14 million square feet to approximately 19 million square feet under the Moderate Growth Alternative, an increase of about 36 percent (compared to a projected increase of sixteen percent under the Current

¹More than 20 dwelling units per acre could be allowed within the Subregional Activity Center, based on a density bonus system.)
Trends (No Action) Alternative. Of this five million-square-foot increase over existing conditions, approximately three-fifths (three million square feet) would occur in the Subregional Activity Center, with the remaining two million square feet occurring primarily within the Highway 99 corridor and the other designated activity centers. Total employment could grow from 21,717 jobs in 1990 to an estimated 35,500 under build-out conditions, an increase of over sixty percent. Approximately two-thirds of these new jobs would occur within the Subregional Activity Center.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, the City would plan for the acquisition and improvement of additional park, recreation and open space lands. Additional improvements to the area's transportation system would be planned to accommodate future growth, with an emphasis on multiple modes of transportation and circulation. Attention to urban design techniques that encourage functional and appearance improvements, and enhance the livability of the community, would also be emphasized.

High Growth Alternative

The High Growth Alternative (Figure 7) is very similar to the Moderate Growth Alternative with the exception that it would encourage and accommodate significantly higher land use intensities and residential densities within the Subregional Center. The High Growth Alternative's treatment of the remainder of the community is virtually identical to the Moderate Growth Alternative.

Land use intensities and residential densities within the Subregional Center would be increased sufficient to accommodate population and employment growth allocations adopted by Snohomish County as targets for the Lynnwood area (see discussion of the Snohomish Countywide Planning Policies in Chapter III under the heading Relationship to Existing Plans and Policies). This would be accomplished in part through the creation of a third multi-family land use designation, not included within the Moderate Growth Alternative: Multiple Family 3 (MF3), which would allow up to 60 dwelling units per acre, or potentially more based on a density bonus system. About 69 acres of land within the Subregional Activity Center would be designated MF3 under the High Growth Alternative.

Under the High Growth Alternative, approximately 4,000 more dwelling units, 6,750 more residents and 4,500 more jobs could be accommodated within the Subregional Activity Center than under the Moderate Growth Alternative. Total population for the City could reach 39,843 at build-out, compared to 33,090 under the Moderate Growth Alternative and 31,878 under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. This would represent a 37 percent increase over Lynnwood’s 1992 population. Employment could reach 40,527 compared to 35,500 under Moderate Growth and 25,808 under Current Trends. This would represent an 84 percent increase over 1990 employment. Achieving such commercial intensification and residential densities could depend on the approval and construction of two regional high capacity transit stations; one at the existing park-and-ride lot at 44th Avenue and I-5, and the other in the Alderwood Mall area.

As with the Moderate Growth Alternative, under the High Growth Alternative the City would plan for the acquisition and improvement of additional park, recreation and open space lands. Additional improvements to the area's transportation system would be planned to accommodate future growth, with an emphasis on multiple modes of transportation (e.g.,
transit, pedestrian, carpooling, bicycling, SOV's etc.). In addition, the High Growth Alternative assumes the approval, construction and operation of a regional high capacity transit (HCT) system with at least one transit station located within the Subregional Center. Attention to urban design techniques that encourage alternative modes of transportation and enhance the livability of the community would also be emphasized.
Environmental Analysis and Mitigation
III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

EARTH

Affected Environment

Topography

The of Lynnwood is situated on an upland plateau north and west of Interstate 5 (I-5). The topography of the area is gently sloping with elevations ranging from approximately 240 feet to 610 feet above mean sea level.

Soils

In general, the soils in the area can be divided into three categories: till soils, outwash soils, and wetland soils. Till soils are relatively impermeable and generally have a layer of hardpan within 2 feet of the surface; these soils are found over the majority of the planning area. Wetland soils are found along stream corridors, and areas of outwash are found in the Perrinville and Meadowdale pond subbasins along the western edge of the City. Soils throughout the City have been disturbed by as a result of grading and extensive urban and suburban development (R.W. Beck, 1991).

U.S. Department of Agriculture soils maps indicate that the Alderwood-Everett unit is the predominant soil type found within the City of Lynnwood. The unit is comprised of 60 percent Alderwood soil, 10 percent Everett soils, and 30 percent various other soils. Soils in the Alderwood series are moderately well drained gravelly sandy loams that are 20 to 40 inches deep, situated over consolidated glacial till with relatively low permeability. The Alderwood association is found in upland terraces on slopes ranging primarily between 0 and 30 percent, but can extend into slopes up to 70 percent (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1983).

Everett Soils are on terraces and outwashes. These are very deep and somewhat excessively drained. They formed in glacial outwash. The surface layer is gravelly sandy loam, while the subsoil is very gravelly sandy loam. The substratum to a depth of 60 inches or more is very gravelly loamy sand over extremely gravelly sand.

Soils in this unit that are of minor extent are the Kitsap, Ragnar, Indianola, McKenna, Norma, Bellingham, Mukilteo, and Terric Medisaprists soils. The Kitsap, Ragnar, and Indianola soils range from moderately well drained to excessively drained and the McKenna, Norma, Bellingham, Mukilteo, and Terric Medisaprists soils range from poorly to very poorly drained.

The Alderwood-Everett unit is suitable for woodland, urban development, hay, and pasture, but are poorly suited for cultivated crops. These soils have slight to moderate limitations for urban development. The primary limitation of this soil is the seasonal wetness, depth to the hardpan,
and steepness of slope. If the density of housing is moderate to high, community sewage systems are needed to prevent contamination of water supplies as a result of seepage from on-site sewage disposal systems (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1983).

Geologic Limitations

In general, soil type and degree of slope affect the suitability of a site for building locations, recreational facilities and landscaping. Based on review of the City's Sensitive Areas Map (October, 1992), the city is not significantly constrained by geologic hazards. Identified erosion hazard areas are susceptible to erosion and landslide effects. Areas identified on the Sensitive Areas map are typically small linear segments of land and are primarily located within the I-5 and SR 525 corridors, and adjacent to 36th Avenue W between 188th Street SW and 179th Street SW. The majority of the land designated as erosion hazard is within highway right-of-way or is developed with structures.

The Puget Sound region generally has a high susceptibility to damage from earthquakes. No seismic hazards are identified within the City.

Significant Impacts

Significant earth-related impacts are not anticipated for any of the land use alternatives. Erosion is the primary impact that could result from future development/redevelopment in the City. Earth-related impacts would be common to each of the land use alternatives. New development would require excavation and disturbance of soils, covering of soils with impervious surfaces and exposure of soils to erosion. Soil excavations and site grading would result in small changes in local topography. Adverse impacts are generally greater for more intensive development patterns; thus, the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative likely has the lowest potential, and the High Growth Alternative the highest potential for adverse impacts.

Erosion Impacts

Soil erosion is a natural process caused by the action of water or wind on exposed soil that can be transported to streams, lakes, wetlands and other locations. This process can be accelerated by development activity that exposes and disturbs soils so they are more vulnerable to erosive forces. In addition, decreasing infiltration of rainfall by creating impervious surfaces and clearing vegetation causes runoff to increase, which produces even greater erosion potential. As noted in the Water section, erosion and sedimentation adversely affect the physical and biological characteristics of streams and other water resources. The extent of erosion and sedimentation depends on soil type, degree of soil disturbance, rainfall, slope and other physical factors. In addition, the amount of impervious surface created by new development can reduce rainfall infiltration and increase runoff rates.

Activities associated with future construction and development activities that would generally contribute to erosion potential include:

- Clearing vegetation and excavation, which exposes soil to erosive forces, loosens soil structure by removing root structure, making soil more susceptible to detachment;
Grade change upsets natural drainage patterns and potentially concentrates runoff at undesirable locations;
Compacktion increases runoff by reducing the capacity of the soil to absorb water; and
Drainage systems concentrate and increase runoff.

Following construction, when slopes are stabilized and revegetated, and drainage systems are in place and functioning properly, erosion hazards would be less.

Landslide Impacts

The risk of landslide occurrence depends on natural factors including soil vulnerability, slope and water saturation. Construction activities can increase this risk by exposing soil through clearing vegetation, altering natural drainage patterns, excavating the "toe" of a slope, and increasing soil moisture content.

Seismic Impacts

Impacts associated with seismic hazard areas are not anticipated. Potential seismic hazards are generally found in alluvial deposits along rivers and creeks (due to liquefaction potential), in deposits of recessional outwash, and in landslide prone areas. Seismic impacts focus on the potential effects to structures and infrastructure from intense ground shaking and/or liquefaction.

Strong earthshaking associated with a major seismic event could cause some soil or slopes to fall or become less supportive. Man-made structures would be vulnerable to seismic impacts such as ground shaking and ground failure in the event of a major earthquake.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Lynnwood's adopted Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO), stormwater design/planning regulations, and SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and limit risks associated with geologic hazards. The SAO contains permit submittal requirements and development standards. A sensitive areas permit is required for any development proposed to be located in or adjacent to a sensitive area or its buffer. Special studies may be required to evaluate potential impacts and to identify appropriate enhancement, mitigation, and monitoring measures.

As Lynnwood reviews its development regulations for consistency with its new comprehensive plan, special attention should be directed to: providing drainage and sediment collection systems before land clearing or excavation begins; minimizing soil exposure during clearing, excavation and grading; re-establishing vegetative cover as soon as feasible; controlling runoff volume, velocity, and concentrations; and ensuring proper final slopes and contours that blend with the surrounding topography to maintain natural drainage patterns.

All structures should be designed in accordance with applicable building codes and regulations to address slope stability, seismic, and environmental quality issues. Appropriate geotechnical considerations should be addressed for design of facilities in areas of vulnerable geology or on steep slopes.
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Growth within the City of Lynnwood and accompanying development activity would result in increased erosion and sedimentation. Topography will be permanently altered as a result of future development activities.
AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment

Weather

The general meteorological conditions of the Puget Sound area are typical of a marine climate. Due to the low solar heating of the land in winter, however, temperature inversions can form at night and can last until late in the day. On occasion, such inversions can last for several days. Due to the poor vertical dispersion during these very stable atmospheric conditions, high concentrations of automotive-related pollutants may occur because pollutants emitted near ground level become trapped under the low inversion level.

The frequency of occurrence and severity of ground level inversions varies from year to year. The National Weather Service issues an Air Stagnation Advisory when poor atmospheric dispersion conditions exist and are forecast to persist for 24 hours or more. There are rarely more than 3 or 4 such advisories per year, and some winters pass without any Air Stagnation Advisory's issued. Published air pollution and meteorological data summaries for 1989-91 indicate there were two air pollution episodes over about 7 days in 1989, none in 1990, and two episodes over about 3.5 days in 1991 (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Existing Air Quality

Ecology and PSAPCA maintain a network of air quality monitoring stations throughout the Puget Sound area. In general, these stations are located where there may be air quality problems, and so are often near urban areas or close to specific large air pollution sources. Other stations located in more remote areas provide an indication of regional or background air pollution levels. There are currently no monitoring stations within or near the City of Lynnwood. The nearest stations are located in Everett or Seattle, but are too far to give an accurate indication of existing air quality within the City.

Several areas within the Puget Sound region, including Seattle, Kent and Tacoma, have been declared PM10 non-attainment areas because pollution concentrations sometimes exceed health standards. PM10 (inhalable particulate matter) is generated by industrial activities and operations, fuel combustion sources like residential wood burning, motor vehicle engines and tires, as well as other sources.

King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties are designated non-attainment for ozone as of January 1992. This designation has resulted in additional pollution control requirements for some large industrial sources, as well as the development of strategies to reduce transportation-related ozone precursor emissions. Nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds are considered ozone precursors.

In January 1992, the EPA designated the Federal Aid Urban Areas of King, Pierce and Snohomish counties non-attainment for carbon monoxide. This designation has affected transportation planning throughout the region.

PSAPCA is currently developing air quality maintenance plans for carbon monoxide, ozone, and PM10 that are designed to keep the region in attainment for at least 10 years following
federal attainment compliance and re-designation by EPA. It is anticipated that re-designation could occur by 1995 at the earliest (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Three agencies have jurisdiction over the ambient air quality in Lynnwood: EPA, Ecology, and PSAPCA; each agency has established its own standards. Unless the state or local jurisdiction has adopted more stringent standards, the EPA standards apply. Table 4 displays the outdoor, or "ambient" air quality standards that apply in the project area. Primary standards are designed to protect human health with an adequate margin of safety. Secondary standards are established to protect the public welfare and are less stringent.

Given traffic conditions in Lynnwood, it is likely that automobile traffic and resulting carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations represent one of the most significant air quality issues for the City. Meteorological and air quality monitoring for CO concentrations conducted for the I-5/196th Street SW Interchange Project indicate that peak-period 1-hour CO levels were below the 1-hour standard (35 ppm) at all locations examined east of I-5 (City of Lynnwood, 1993). It is possible that areas to the west of I-5, and particularly areas near the Lynnwood Triangle and/or Alderwood Mall, could exceed this threshold (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

**Significant Impacts**

**Impacts Common to Alternatives**

Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan would not, in itself, have direct effects on air quality. The Comprehensive Plan will, however, provide a framework to guide future growth and development. Indirectly, the plan could affect local and regional air quality. For example, dust associated with construction could be significant. Future residential wood burning or industrial emission sources within the City could also release air pollutants. Increased traffic associated with future residential, commercial, and industrial development would generate vehicle emissions.

During construction, dust from excavation and grading would contribute to ambient concentrations of suspended particulate matter. Construction contractors are required to comply with PSAPCA regulations that require best available control technology be used to avoid dust emissions. This may include applying water or dust-binding chemicals during dry weather, paving disturbed areas, or other control measures. Heavy trucks and smaller equipment, such as generators and compressors, would emit air pollutants during construction activities. These emissions would slightly degrade local air quality in the short-term. Some construction activities, such as paving with asphalt, could cause odors that may be detectable to some people away from the construction site. Such odors are usually temporary.

Construction equipment and material hauling can also affect traffic flow. If construction activity results in significant traffic delays, general traffic-related emissions would temporarily increase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>National Primary</th>
<th>National Secondary</th>
<th>Washington State</th>
<th>PSAPCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspended Particulate Matter (TSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Geometric Mean (µg/m³)</td>
<td>60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hour Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean (µg/m³)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hour Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.03&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.02&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.02&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-day Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.14&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.10&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.10&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hour Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.50&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.25&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-hour Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.40&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.40&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-minute Average (ppm)</td>
<td>1.0&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-hour Average (ppm)</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-hour Average (ppm)</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-hour Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.12&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average (ppm)</td>
<td>0.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.05&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Average (µg/m³)</td>
<td>1.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter; ppm = parts per million

<sup>a</sup> Never to be exceeded
<sup>b</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once per year
<sup>c</sup> Standard attained when expected number of days per year with maximum hourly average above this limit is equal to or less than one.
<sup>d</sup> Not to be exceeded more than twice in seven days
<sup>e</sup> Not to be exceeded more than once in eight hours

Source: City of Lynnwood, 1993.
Impacts Specific to Alternatives

Current Trends (No Action) Alternative

Air quality impacts occurring under the No Action Alternative would be primarily either associated with residential wood burning or transportation-related emissions. The potential exists for air quality impacts to occur from wood burning, if residential development includes the installation of fireplaces or wood stoves. Wood burning appliances have the potential to cause elevated concentrations of air pollutants during periods of poor dispersion. Consequently, if residential development includes installation of a large number of wood burning appliances, it would represent a potentially significant source of carbon monoxide, respirable particulate matter, and a range of toxic air contaminants. Approximately 1,173 residential units would be added under the Current Trends Alternative.

Increased levels of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides would generally be associated with increased vehicle traffic. Actual emissions would depend on vehicle-miles traveled, average speeds, and other emission factors. Transportation improvements that increase intersection efficiency, flow of traffic, or overall level-of-service, would generally improve air quality.

Average automobile carbon monoxide emission rates are expected to decline in the future due to improvements in engine efficiencies, and from continuing federal and state vehicle emission control requirements. Modeling conducted for the I-5/196th Street SW Interchange Project indicated that the Peak-hour CO emissions anticipated to occur in 2010 would decrease with the No-Build Alternative due to expected declines in vehicle emission rates. Calculated 1-hour concentrations were well below the 1-hour limit at all receptors and low enough to ensure compliance with the 8-hour standard as well.

Employment uses within Lynnwood likely contribute to degradation in air quality through the increased number of commuter trips they encourage. Under the Current Trends Alternative, approximately 4,091 additional jobs would be created within Lynnwood. While future mass transit improvements may mitigate a portion of these impacts, additional jobs and associated commute trips will further degrade air quality.

Moderate Growth Alternative

The Moderate Growth Alternative would create air quality impacts similar to those described for the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. However, under this alternative, approximately 1,733 new housing units would be constructed. This amount of development represents a 48-percent increase over the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. As a result, air quality impacts associated with fireplace smoke would likely be greater under the Moderate Growth Alternative than under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.

Regarding employment increases under the Moderate Growth Alternative, approximately 13,783 additional jobs would be created under this alternative. This represents 9,692 more (three times more) new jobs than proposed under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. The implication of this increase in jobs would be additional traffic-related degradation of air quality under this alternative than under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.
greater emphasis of this alternative on transit-oriented and multimodal transportation objectives would partially mitigate the impact.

**High Growth Alternative**

As with the other two alternatives, the High Growth Alternative would create air quality impacts from wood smoke. While the nature of these impacts would be similar to those described for the other two alternatives, this alternative would include construction of approximately 6,043 new housing units. This addition of housing units represents a fivefold increase over the number of additional housing units proposed for the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, and more than three times as many new units as under the Moderate Growth Alternative. Air quality impacts associated with fireplace smoke would likely be much higher under the High Growth Alternative than under either of the other alternatives.

The High Growth Alternative would also include creation of approximately 18,213 additional jobs. This represents 14,122 more (four times more) jobs than proposed under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative and 4,430 more (32 percent more) jobs than proposed under the Moderate Growth Alternative. As a result, this alternative would likely create the greatest traffic-related air quality degradation of the three alternatives. This alternative would have a similar emphasis on transit-oriented and multimodal transportation objectives as the Moderate Growth Alternative. This emphasis would help to mitigate air quality impacts to some degree.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City's proposed comprehensive plan should seek to minimize the adverse effects of development on air quality. Specific goals should encourage separation of land uses that generate airborne pollutants from less intensive developments; ensure that developments meet or exceed applicable air quality standards; promote the use of the least air polluting forms of industrial equipment and types of transportation; and encourage the use high occupancy vehicles.

Dust emissions during construction are regulated by PSAPCA, which requires contractors to take all reasonable means to minimize emissions. This includes such things as applying water sprays to roads and washing vehicles to prevent transport off-site. State and local air pollution control strategies require new PM10 sources to obtain permits and to control PM10 emissions.

Federal and state regulations governing residential wood burning provide a significant reduction in air pollution. However, wood smoke could still cause adverse air quality impacts if a substantial number of new residences elect to burn wood.

Implementation of programs mandated by the Transportation Demand Management Act of 1991 (for employers with 100 or more full-time employees) would help reduce dependency on single occupant vehicles and would help minimize automobile-related air pollution, traffic congestion, and energy use.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Future residential, commercial, and industrial development and associated vehicle traffic would contribute to air pollutant emissions. Air quality would deteriorate incrementally.
WATER RESOURCES

Affected Environment

Several reports prepared for planning activities within the City contain extensive information on existing environmental conditions within the planning area. These include the Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO), Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Management Plan (R.W. Beck, 1991), Water System Comprehensive Plan Update (Gray & Osbourne, 1992), and Scriber Creek Watershed Management Plan (R.W. Beck, 1989).

Pursuant to WAC 197-11-635, these documents are incorporated into this EIS by reference. Where appropriate, the Draft SEIS summarizes information presented in the referenced documents.

Drainage System

The City of Lynnwood is divided into 18 major drainage areas covering approximately 7 square miles. The topography of the area is gently sloping and drains to Scriber Creek, Hall’s Creek and Hall’s Lake in the southern portion of the City, Edmonds in the western portion, and Swamp Creek in the northeast corner. In the northwest corner of the City, drainage is carried to a local depression of outwash soils where it infiltrates into the ground (R.W. Beck, 1991).

The drainage system is comprised of a network of natural features and manmade facilities used to store or transport surface water. The primary drainage network consists of the larger storm sewer pipes, open channels, wetlands and detention systems. Roadside ditches and smaller storm sewers form the secondary drainage system. The entire drainage system has approximately 3,700 catch basins or manholes, 124,400 feet of storm sewers, 48,400 feet of ditches or grassed swales, and several miles of streams (R.W. Beck, 1991).

Rapid development that has taken place within the City in recent years has resulted in increased surface water runoff entering its primary natural drainage systems. The City experiences some localized flooding, ponding, channel overflows and water quality problems. The flooding and water quality problems are the result of uncontrolled runoff from developed areas, inadequate capacity in existing storm drainage systems, and the loss of natural flood attenuation capacity of wetlands and riparian corridors.

Surface Water

Surface water features include Scriber Creek, its two primary tributaries, Poplar Creek and Golde Creek, Meadowdale Pond, Swamp Creek, Hall’s Lake, Hall’s Creek, and an unnamed creek flowing west into Perrinville in Edmonds.

Scriber Creek originates from drainage and groundwater that feeds a large wetland area in the northern portion of the City and flows south to Scriber Like. From Scriber Lake, the creek flows to the southeast. Poplar Creek originates in storm drain systems north of I-5 near 37th Avenue W. Golde Creek has two tributaries in its uppermost reaches. The main or west tributary originates at the detention facility that collects drainage from the Alderwood Mall and flows south, crossing beneath I-5 and 196th Street SW. The east tributary originates on the north side of 196th Street SW just of 28th Avenue W (R.W. Beck, 1991).
Existing water quality conditions are primarily affected by man-created activities such as clearing, paving (increasing storm water runoff and erosion), runoff from roadway surfaces, and the inadvertent release of pollutants. Pollutant loading estimates made for the Scriber Creek Watershed Management Plan detected a number of priority water quality problems among the Scriber Creek subbasins. The primary pollutant detected was lead. Lead concentrations are likely due to the relatively large areas of parking lot and roadway associated with Lynnwood's extensive commercial land use. A number of elements being introduced into Scriber Creek include oil, grease and sediment from the park-and-ride lot and I-5 off-ramp runoff, and iron oxide precipitate. Urban storm water, animal-keeping activities, destruction of riparian vegetation and alteration of stream channels are a few of the activities that can result in sedimentation of stream channels and fish habitat (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

**Wetlands**

A wetland inventory conducted as part of the City's Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Management Plan identified a total of 30 wetlands covering approximately 107 acres within the City limits. Nearly all of the wetlands possess surface water connections to either Scriber Creek or the Hall's Lake inlet or outlet. Many of the wetlands are riparian wetlands with Scriber Creek bisecting the wetland. The hydrologic values associated with wetlands include flow attenuation, low flow augmentation and water quality improvement.

The City of Lynnwood is a highly urbanized area. These wetlands are, for the most part, the remaining large tracts of naturally vegetated land. All of the wetlands have been affected by urbanization, either through degraded water quality, high flows, filling, or intrusion by humans and pets. As Lynnwood continues to develop, additional pressure will be placed on wetland resources, and the value of the remaining wetlands will increase.

**Groundwater**

Till soils are found over most of the planning area. Till soils are relatively impermeable and generally have a layer of hardpan within 2 feet of the surface. Depths to the water table average 75 feet, generally making the area more suitable for site development (Snohomish County, 1989).

Surface water features such as streams and lakes are hydrologic boundaries that locally intercept groundwater flows. The majority of drainage within the City is carried to surface water features. However, in the northwest portion of the City drainage is carried to a local depression of outwash soils where it infiltrates into the ground.

**Significant Impacts**

Urbanization generally results in the clearing of vegetated areas, increased soil erosion during and after clearing, site preparation and construction operations, an increase in human activity levels, loss of stream and wetland buffers, alteration of stream courses and loss of habitat, and an increase in impervious area. All of these activities give rise to nonpoint pollution of surface and groundwater, and would be common to all the land use alternatives. The Moderate Growth and especially the High Growth Alternative would create the greatest amount of
impervious surface area and would have a greater potential to impact surface water and groundwater resources.

Surface Water

Construction activities associated with new development could result in adverse impacts to water quality. Removal of existing vegetation, disturbance of soil and erosion of exposed soil, could result in sedimentation in receiving waters (e.g., Scriber Creek, Scriber Lake, Poplar Creek and Gold Creek, Meadowdale Pond, Swamp Creek, Hall's Lake, Hall's Creek and wetlands). The severity of water quality impacts would depend on several factors, including the effectiveness of review and enforcement of erosion and sediment control plans, on-site maintenance of control facilities, and the overall pace of development.

Water quality problems occur primarily from activities such as clearing, runoff from roadway and parking surfaces, and spills of hazardous materials. Creation of additional impervious surface area would result in additional runoff volumes and an increase in peak rates.

Land use has a dramatic effect on surface runoff in urban areas because so much of the land within the City is covered by buildings or pavement. The pavement channels storm water, that would otherwise be soaked up by soil and vegetation, and diverts it into streams and ditches causing bank erosion, flooding, sedimentation and water quality problems. Increased development would result in increased pollutant loading to surface waters due to increased runoff from new roadways, driveways, parking areas, and other impervious surfaces. Future commercial and industrial development could be a source of lead and other heavy metals in stormwater runoff. Fertilizer and pesticide use in residential and landscaped areas, pet wastes, and a wide variety of other residential activities would contribute to additional pollutant loading.

Indirect impacts to water quality and quantity in wetlands would also be likely because of increases in stormwater runoff. Pollutant loading from runoff could inhibit wetlands' natural capacity to remove nutrients, process chemical and organic wastes, and reduce sediment loads. Development activities in areas near or hydrologically connected to wetlands could interrupt water infiltration. This could result in reduced groundwater inflows to wetlands and indirect effects comparable to the draining of wetlands (e.g., changes in wetland size, vegetation composition, and quality). The degree of impacts to wetlands would depend on the design of future development projects.

Groundwater

As development occurs and surface areas are sealed with paving and other urban uses, runoff would increase and infiltration into the groundwater would be reduced. Significant impacts to groundwater resources are not anticipated due to the relatively impermeable nature of the soils and the average depth to groundwater.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Lynnwood's adopted Sensitive Areas Ordinance, Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Management Plan and SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and limit potential water quality risks associated with future development.
Surface Water

The City's Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Management Plan contains recommendations for both non-structural and structural solutions to water quantity and water quality problems. Non-structural solutions include policies, ordinances, maintenance practices, and public education. Structural solutions include the construction of regional stormwater detention facilities, improvements to the capacity of stormwater conveyance systems, and the use of biofiltration swales, extended detention dry ponds, wet ponds and similar facilities (R.W. Beck and Associates, 1991).

Groundwater

- In areas where appropriate soil types exist, infiltration should be used in preference to releasing stormwater to surface waters, consistent with Department of Ecology (1992) guidelines, to partially mitigate the reduction of groundwater recharge due to increased impervious surface coverage.

- Stormwater facilities should be designed to provide adequate protection for groundwater quality.

- Other potential measures could involve identification and classification of aquifer recharge areas.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

An increase in stormwater runoff and pollutant loadings within receiving waters is an unavoidable consequence of further development within the City.
PLANTS AND ANIMALS

Affected Environment

Plants

The City is located in the Puget Sound lowlands. Weather systems moving inland from the Pacific Ocean create moisture and temperature regimes ideally suited for the establishment and growth of coniferous forests. Natural vegetation in the area is primarily classified as the Western Hemlock Zone, the most extensive vegetation zone in western Washington. In the succession climax condition, forests in this zone are typically dominated by western hemlock and Douglas-fir. Most of the zone, however, has been altered through logging and development. Major portions of the city have subsequently been developed for commercial and residential uses. Vegetation in the developed portions of the city includes lawns with scattered trees and shrubs (native and ornamental), street trees in residential areas, and grasses and scattered trees (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Wetlands

Approximately 30 wetlands are present in the City of Lynnwood, covering approximately 107 acres of land (see Figure 8). This coverage represents approximately two percent of the total area within the city limits. The City's wetlands range from areas under 5,000 square feet, to integrated wetland systems covering more than 20 acres. The majority of City wetlands are found within the Scriber Creek Watershed. Three large wetlands within this watershed comprise slightly more than half of all City wetland acreage. A fourth large wetland is associated with Hall's Lake. Virtually all City wetlands possess surface water connections to either the Scriber Creek or Hall's Lake waterway systems. In many cases, wetlands are bisected by creeks and, subsequently, provide very high hydrologic value (City of Lynnwood, 1991).

Given the currently urbanized nature of Lynnwood, wetlands are generally comprised of remaining tracts of naturally vegetated land. All of the wetlands have been affected to some extent by urbanization, with the result of degraded water quality, high flows, filling, or intrusion by humans and domestic animals (City of Lynnwood, 1991).

Rare Plants and Plant Communities

A number of the wetland areas contain potentially rare plant communities. The North Scriber Creek Wetland, Wetland 16, and Wetland 15, and wetland areas surrounding Hall's Lake all represent very high quality wetlands (City of Lynnwood, 1991). Another unique plant community is a rare pine bog recently identified on the east side of I-5. The pine bog represents an unusual wetland community that is rare in both Snohomish County and Washington State. The pine bog community is dominated by western white pine, Labrador tea (Ledum groenlandicum), and sphagnum moss (Sphagnum spp.). The pine bog meets the requirements for a Class 1 wetland under the City of Lynnwood's Sensitive Areas Ordinance (City of Lynnwood, 1993).
Stream Habitat and Fisheries

Within Lynnwood, Scriber Creek, Scriber Lake, Halls Creek and Halls Lake provide limited habitat for anadromous salmon and resident trout. The creeks are underutilized by fish primarily due to relatively poor water quality and stream damage from past development practices and periodic high flows.

The half-mile reach of Scriber Creek running from I-5 downstream to the southeast city limits flows through forested and shrub wetlands with a wide floodplain. This reach provides no spawning habitat, but good rearing habitat for salmonids due to extensive cover provided by the deciduous tree canopy and refuge from high stream flows provided by the wetlands. The stream section from I-5 to Scriber Lake is more urbanized, and provides little vegetative cover. This reach generally provides poor spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids due to channelization, siltation and poor water quality.

Scriber Lake supports populations of largemouth bass and yellow perch. The Washington Department of Wildlife (WDW) plants Scriber Lake with rainbow and cutthroat trout fry annually.

From Scriber Lake upstream, Scriber Creek flows at a moderate gradient through residential and commercial land. Large sections are piped or riprapped, and vegetative cover is limited. This reach provides poor spawning habitat and fair rearing habitat for salmonids due to extremely degraded habitat and water quality.

The .25 mile reach of Halls Creek flowing from Halls Lake to the south city limits provides fair spawning and good rearing habitat for resident salmonids (primarily cutthroat trout). This reach flows through a narrow riparian wetland with dense vegetation and cover. Anadromous fish are excluded from Halls Creek and Halls Lake by a culvert under I-5 on McAleer Creek, downstream of the city limits.

Halls Lake provides habitat for rainbow trout that are planted annually by the local Homeowners Association (R.W. Beck, 1991).

Upland Habitat

Upland habitat is generally fair to poor within the City of Lynnwood. This situation arises from the extensive development within the City, resulting in suitable habitat only being found within steep slope and wetland areas. Forested "pockets" provide some wildlife habitat within urban areas, but most of the suitable wildlife habitat is found within wetlands. Of the wildlife species that may exist in these areas, some likely occur in very low numbers or only during certain seasons of the year. Few if any wildlife corridors exist within the City (City of Lynnwood, 1991).

Rare and/or Endangered Wildlife

Candidate species such as the spotted and red-legged frogs are likely found in certain portions of Lynnwood. In addition to these species, priority species occur or could potentially occur in the area, such as the pileated woodpecker (state candidate), band-tailed pigeon, and Columbia black-tailed deer (game species) (City of Lynnwood, 1993).


**Significant Impacts**

Future growth and development in Lynnwood under any of the land use alternatives would have the potential to adversely impact fish and wildlife habitats and species.

**Fish and Wildlife Habitat**

Over time, upland habitats would be further replaced by suburban development. By full buildout, the majority of land within Lynnwood would support residential, industrial, and commercial uses, as well as roads and other public facilities. Small pockets of open space and naturally vegetated areas would be retained. Clearing forested areas, grasslands, and other plant communities and the associated fragmentation of habitat would result in wildlife losses.

Future growth and development would increase ambient noise levels and could adversely impact some wildlife species. Disturbance and noise would probably reduce the viability of remaining habitats for wildlife nesting and breeding. Wildlife species react differently to varying noise levels. Some wildlife species may adjust to the low noise levels and activity and could re-inhabit previously abandoned areas.

In general, wetlands (as identified in the City's Sensitive Areas Ordinance) and their buffers would be retained in accordance with the SAO under all of the land use alternatives. As previously noted, these areas serve as the primary habitat within the City. However, the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives would preserve less open space for other wildlife habitat. While potentially possessing less habitat value than wetlands, these areas are also valuable for retaining wildlife.

Increased development may impact fish populations in direct and indirect ways. Increased stormwater runoff flow and duration of flow can cause channel instability. Removing woody debris reduces fish habitat and can cause increases in predator populations, competitive species, and decreases in salmonid production. Water quality degradation can also increase disease, alter behavior, or otherwise reduce salmonid production.

Riparian areas are among the most important habitats for wildlife. Construction activities associated with future development proximate to Scriber Creek and other riparian areas within Lynnwood could impact these habitats and disrupt wildlife use of these areas. Increased stormwater runoff, disturbance or removal of vegetation, erosion and sedimentation, and other construction-related impacts could degrade the quality of these habitats. Future development activities that impact groundwater quality or quantity could also adversely impact riparian areas connected to the area's groundwater systems.

All alternatives would preserve wetlands within the City, however, the higher urban development represented by the Moderate Growth and especially the High Growth Alternative could potentially result in greater impacts to wetland systems and associated wildlife habitats.
Mitigation Measures

Lynnwood’s existing Sensitive Areas Ordinance provides a relatively high degree of protection for important habitat areas. Proposed developments proximate to sensitive areas are required to survey the habitat for the presence of candidate or priority species and to prepare a management plan, as appropriate.

The new comprehensive plan should include policies designed to preserve fragile and unique environmental systems. Specific policies might include:

- Managing the City’s park system in a manner that balances the needs of natural and manmade environments;
- Protecting and preserving significant natural features and amenities; and
- Managing and maintaining open spaces to optimize habitat values and wildlife use.

Future industrial developments that pose potential risks to groundwater quality and quantity could be required to prepare a long-term monitoring program that addresses groundwater withdrawals and groundwater quality. Such requirements could be considered as future developments are reviewed under SEPA.

Aside from these guidelines, other project-specific mitigation measures could include efforts to minimize the loss of wetlands and critical wildlife habitat during project planning and permitting, and requiring compensation for any unavoidable loss. Compensation could include creating, enhancing, or restoring wetlands or other habitats on mitigation sites that would be permanently retained and preserved.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Native vegetation and wildlife habitat will be lost as a result of population growth and increased development within the City of Lynnwood. Reduced and fragmented habitat will cause a decrease in local wildlife populations.

Traffic and other human activities associated with future growth would reduce habitat value of adjacent areas resulting in a reduction of animal life in those areas. Increased traffic could result in increased animal mortality.

Cumulative development within the surrounding area will result in water quality impacts that could adversely affect fisheries resources.
ENERGY

Affected Environment

Petroleum

Vehicle travel is the predominant use of petroleum-based energy resources in the Puget Sound region. Fuel for travel accounts for three-fourths of all petroleum consumed, with the remaining fuel used for space heating. Travel-related fuel consumption is influenced by several factors, including: the number of trips made by vehicles, the amount of congestion on roadways, and the mix of vehicles using the system. The most important factor affecting fuel consumption is the number of trips made by vehicles, which is significantly influenced by the pattern of development and the spatial relationships among residences, work sites, and shopping areas. The availability of alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle, such as transit, car pools and walking, also affects the number of vehicle trips in an area.

Natural Gas

The Washington Natural Gas Company (WNG) supplies natural gas to the entire City of Lynnwood. All natural gas is supplied to Washington Natural Gas customers from Northwest Pipeline which operates north-south pipelines located east of Redmond. Gas is distributed through feeder lines to the North Seattle supply lines.

As of December 1993, there were 6,777 WNG customers in the City of Lynnwood; this represents approximately 9 percent of the total 72,000 customer connections in the Southwest Snohomish County service area. WNG has the capacity to accommodate an additional 120,000 customers in this service area (Chambers, 1994). Availability of resources in the future will depend on the level of growth that occurs in the service area. The average energy use for residential customers is 50 cubic feet per hour during winter months (Chambers, 1994). Energy use from office, commercial and industrial development varies.

At this time, no improvements to the system are planned prior to the year 2000. Future growth within the service area will determine the level of improvements required.

Electricity

The City of Lynnwood receives electrical service from Snohomish County PUD, who receives power from the Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) power distribution system as well as from its own generating sources. Transmission of electrical power is provided through a cooperative agreement between BPA and Snohomish County PUD. The PUD maintains several 115 (kilovolt (kV)) and 230 kV lines in Snohomish County.

Power is distributed from BPA's SnoKing station to the Swamp Creek substation (northeast of I-5/I-405 interchange) where it is transformed from 115 KV down to 12.5 KV and distributed to Lynnwood and surrounding areas. The existing 115 KV line will be at 90 percent capacity within 5 years (Martinsen, 1994).
There are 7 substations that distribute power throughout Lynnwood; these substations are located in the vicinity of Olympic View Drive and 168th Street SW (Meadowdale), Blue Ridge Drive and 88th Street SW (Pentinville), east of 60th Avenue W on 188th Street SW (Lynnwood), the Alderwood Mall (North Alderwood), I-5 south of 196th Street SW (Alderwood Manor), and 60th Avenue W and 212 Street SW (Halls Lake and Esperance).

The PUD is in the process of completing a 20-year plan that will be supplemented by 5-year plans that identify capital projects. The 20-year plan is based on several factors – peak demand during the winter peak utility, energy forecasts, land use permits, zoning, and historical data. This information is then broken down into 5-year forecasts for capital improvements. In 1996, the PUD plans to construct a new switching station at the Swamp Creek substation, which is expected to accommodate growth that is forecast (OFM) within the District (Martinsen, 1994). The PUD indicated that an additional distribution and transmission substation may be constructed to relocate the Alderwood Manor substation, which is within the I-5/196th Street Interchange project area.

**Significant Impacts**

All of the land use alternatives would result in energy consumption increases within the city. In general, the three land use alternatives contain a similar number of single family residential units, resulting in similar energy demands. The number of multifamily units varies between alternatives ranging from 689 additional units under the No Action Alternative to 1,151 units under the Moderate Growth Alternative to 5,461 under the High Growth Alternative. Land use alternatives with relatively more multifamily uses could experience slightly higher energy efficiency, given features such as common walls. As the mix of commercial uses changes under the different land use alternatives, commercial energy uses would also change. Alternatives with more commercial and industrial uses (Moderate and High Growth Alternatives) would generally be expected to consume more power than those with fewer of these uses (No Action Alternative). However, the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives could also possess a greater potential energy efficiency (e.g., common walls, less building surface area to outside).

Although energy conservation efforts help to curb energy demands, certain uses inherently consume more energy than others. Table 5 shows a variety of uses and their energy consumption. To the extent that the three Alternatives will accommodate differing amounts of residential, commercial, industrial and other uses, the quantity of electric energy and natural gas consumed within the City will vary, with the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative consuming the least energy, and the High Growth Alternative consuming the most. However, since the affected energy sources are regional in nature, more intensive development in Lynnwood will likely involve overall (regional) energy savings compared to less intensive development in Lynnwood, assuming that the same overall level of regional development would occur in a less compact manner.

Snohomish County PUD indicated that there would be adequate power to supply the future population that is projected for the City of Lynnwood under any of the land use alternatives. The PUD has the ability and capital to buy additional power and/or build its own power resources to serve the load growth (Beck, 1994). The new substation that is planned for the Swamp Creek area would provide an additional 115 KV of energy from the PUD. The PUD
indicated that additional facilities may be required in the future if electric rail is developed (Martinsen, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Energy Use (kWh/gsf/year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily Residence</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Varies with type of use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bonneville Power Administration, 1993.

WNG indicated that existing natural gas distribution infrastructure would be sufficient to handle current and projected peak demands generated by the any of the land use alternatives (Chambers, 1994). Over time, population growth within the service area would require modifications and improvements to the existing infrastructure. At this time no major improvements are planned before the year 2000 (Chambers, 1994).

The Moderate Growth Alternative and the High Growth Alternative emphasize a strategy of supporting high capacity transit (HCT) and other alternatives to the continued expansion of street and arterial capacity. The strategy is seen as important in providing an efficient transportation system. These alternatives encourage the development of transit-supportive land uses and intensities in the vicinity of planned transit stations, and the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle access. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would be the least energy-efficient alternative since the resulting land use patterns and intensities would be difficult and inefficient to serve with public transit or other alternatives to private automobiles.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures should be considered in selection of a preferred land use alternative and should be addressed in the comprehensive plan:

Coordinate planning and construction activities with energy purveyors (i.e., Snohomish County PUD, BPA);

Encourage extension of transit services; including increased use of HOV lanes, and other policies designed to reduce dependency on single-occupancy vehicles; and,

Include energy saving features in the design and construction of projects. These energy saving measures might include insulation, double glazed windows, reflective exterior surfaces, energy saving lighting, or other measures designed to decrease energy use.
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Energy consumption will increase in response to population growth, the amount of commercial development, and the number of vehicles on the City's road system. These demands are likely to occur with or without adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.
RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING LAND USE PLANS AND PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

The Washington State Growth Management Act has established a new hierarchy of planning within the state. The Act itself establishes broad statewide goals and specific requirements for the content of local comprehensive plans and their implementation. The Act also establishes regional planning requirements at both the multicounty and countywide levels to ensure proper coordination and consistency among local comprehensive plans. Local plans are required to be consistent with GMA, and coordinated with the plans of other jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction is required to consider the applicable multicounty and countywide planning policies as they develop their own individual plans.

This environmental impact statement evaluates the impacts and implications of developing and adopting a new comprehensive plan for the City of Lynnwood. The environmental impacts of the Multicounty Planning Policies for Pierce, Kitsap, King and Snohomish Counties, and for the Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies have been evaluated in other environmental documents. For the purposes of this EIS it is assumed that these other documents have adequately evaluated these impacts and that implementation of the multicounty and countywide planning policies is feasible.

Washington State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A)

Summary

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), first enacted as ESHB 2929 by the 1990 legislature and amended in 1991 (RESHB 1025), contains a comprehensive framework for managing growth and coordinating land use planning with infrastructure requirements. Provisions of the Act apply to the state's largest and fastest growing jurisdictions, including Snohomish County and all its cities. The following discussion is a brief, selective summary of relevant provisions.

Counties and cities must prepare and adopt comprehensive plans that are consistent with the goals of the Act, which include: directing growth to urban areas; reducing sprawl; providing efficient multi-modal transportation systems; promoting a range of residential densities and housing types, and encouraging affordable housing; protecting property rights; ensuring timely and fair processing of permits; promoting economic development throughout the state; involving citizens in the planning process; maintaining and enhancing resource-based industries; encouraging retention of open space and habitat areas and the development of recreational opportunities; ensuring that adequate public facilities are provided concurrent with planned development; and preserving lands with historical and archaeological significance.

Local comprehensive plans must contain elements dealing with land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, rural lands (counties only) and transportation. Lands useful for public purposes, including utility and transportation corridors, are to be identified in comprehensive plans. Plans must also establish a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities. The plans of jurisdictions having common borders or dealing with related regional issues must be coordinated with one another.
Jurisdictions subject to the Act must prepare and adopt development regulations that are consistent with and implement their adopted comprehensive plan. They must also adopt regulations that assure the conservation of designated natural resource lands (agricultural, forest and mineral lands), and preclude land uses or development that is incompatible with designated critical areas (defined as wetlands, geologic hazard areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, habitat conservation areas, and frequently flooded areas).

Impact fees for specified public services and facilities — roads, schools and parks — are authorized by the Act. Cities and counties may impose impact fees based on adopted capital facilities plans and facility standards.

Counties must designate "urban growth areas" within which urban growth is encouraged and services and facilities are, or are planned to be, available. All cities must be located within an urban growth area; unincorporated lands within urban growth areas must be urban in character or adjacent to such lands.

In 1991, the Growth Management Act was amended to require that counties adopt countywide planning policies to guide and coordinate the comprehensive plans of the county and its cities. The adopted Snohomish County Countywide Planning Policies are discussed later in this section. To help coordinate planning in larger urbanized regions, the development of multi-county planning policies was also required. King, Pierce, and Snohomish counties were required to adopt multi-county planning policies under this provision and Kitsap county has opted to participate in adopting and implementing these policies. The Multicounty Planning Policies adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) in March 1993 are described in the next section of this chapter.

Discussion

The City of Lynnwood is working towards compliance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. As described in Chapter II, the City is currently developing a new comprehensive plan to meet the City’s needs and the requirements of the GMA. This environmental impact statement is part of the planning process. The City anticipates adoption of its new comprehensive plan in 1994.

The City adopted its Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO) in February, 1992, thus meeting the GMA requirement for designation and regulation of critical areas. Since no agricultural, forest or mineral resource lands meeting state designation criteria exist within Lynnwood, resource land conservation regulations are not required.

This Draft EIS analyzes three land use alternatives that may meet the goals and requirements of the GMA to varying degrees. While all three alternatives are generally consistent with the Act's goals, the Moderate Growth Alternative and especially the High Growth Alternative provide greater support to the anti-sprawl, natural resource preservation, transportation and housing goals thandoes the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. Consistency with other specific requirements of GMA (e.g., the specific content of plan elements) cannot be assessed at this time. Plan elements and detailed planning policies are being developed concurrent with the SEPA environmental review process (see discussion under the heading Integrating SEPA and the Comprehensive Planning Process in Chapter II).
Vision 2020/Multicounty Planning Policies

Summary

Vision 2020 is a growth strategy and transportation plan for the central Puget Sound region. Adopted by the Puget Sound Council of Governments (now the Puget Sound Regional Council) in 1990, Vision 2020 predates the state requirement for multicounty planning policies (discussed in the previous section of this chapter). However, Vision 2020 embodies most of the concepts and regional planning issues required of multicounty planning policies, and was intended to provide the kind of coordinated framework for guiding regional growth and transportation actions envisioned by the GMA multicounty planning requirements. Therefore, the policies of Vision 2020 have been identified by the Puget Sound Regional Council as multicounty planning policies under the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

Vision 2020 is generally intended to create a more compact and intensively developed urban area. The plan’s six-part strategy for managing growth includes the following general goals:

- Create a regional system of central places framed by open space;
- Strategically invest in a variety of mobility options and demand management to support the regional system of central places;
- Maintain economic opportunity while managing growth;
- Conserve environmental resources;
- Mitigate potential adverse effects of concentrating development by early action; and
- Refine Vision 2020 based on collaboration among all agencies in the region.

In March of 1993, PSRC amended Vision 2020’s policies, and formally adopted them as the official multicounty planning policies for King, Pierce, Snohomish and Kitsap Counties. The following Framework Policies form the foundation for the multicounty planning policies:

- Concentrate development in urban areas to conserve agricultural, forest, and environmental resources. Within urban growth areas, promote growth into centers that are connected by an efficient, transit-oriented, multi-modal transportation system.
- Protect critical areas, conserve resource lands, and preserve lands and resources of regional significance.
- Phase development of public facilities and services to achieve the adopted regional vision.
- Develop a transportation system that emphasizes accessibility, includes a variety of mobility options, and enables the efficient movement of people, goods and freight.
- Provide diversity and choice in housing and employment options.
- Maintain economic opportunities while managing growth.
- Mitigate potential adverse effects of concentrating development by early action.

Additional policies address regional aspects of the following topics: designation of urban growth areas; contiguous and orderly development and the provision of services; transportation facilities and strategies; siting of regional capital facilities; interjurisdictional
planning; economic development; affordable housing; and open space linkages/resource protection/critical areas.

Discussion

The adopted multicounty planning policies are quite general in nature, and are in the process of being further refined. While all three Lynnwood plan alternatives being considered in this EIS are generally consistent with the current multicounty planning policies, the Moderate Growth Alternative and especially the High Growth Alternative provide greater support to the growth concentration, natural resource preservation, transportation, housing and employment policies than does the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.

Snohomish County Tomorrow/Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County

Summary

The Snohomish County Tomorrow Steering Committee was formed in 1989 to develop "a publicly shared vision and goals to guide effective growth management and preserve Snohomish County's unique quality of life" (Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County, 1992). This group, made up of elected officials from the County, cities, towns and the Tulalip Tribes, adopted a set of goals for the County's future in 1990. When the 1991 amendments to the Growth Management Act established a requirement for adopting countywide planning policies, it was decided that the Snohomish County Tomorrow process and goals would serve as the basis for policy development.

The Steering Committee issued its proposed Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County in December, 1992. These policies were subsequently adopted by the Snohomish County Council.

The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) address the implementation of urban growth boundaries; promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services; joint county and city planning within urban growth areas; rural land use; affordable housing; siting of public capital facilities of a countywide or state-wide nature; economic development and employment; fiscal impact analysis; and transportation. Following is a brief summary of major policies.

Implementing Urban Growth Areas

• Establish urban growth areas that will accommodate the County's 20-year urban allocation of growth.

• Allocate growth to appropriate areas. The countywide population forecasts allocate 39,840 residents to the City of Lynnwood, an increase of 10,727 over the City's estimated 1992 population of 29,1131. Countywide employment forecasts allocate 39,930 jobs to Lynnwood by the year 2012, an increase of 18,213 over estimated 1992 employment.

1The initial countywide population forecast allocated 38,043 residents to Lynnwood. This allocation was later revised to 39,840 (Revised Initial 2012 Population Targets, Steering Committee Acceptance September 22, 1993).
• Reverse the current trend of an increasing share of the County's population growth occurring in rural areas.

• Establish a hierarchy of centers within the County's urban growth areas, consistent with Vision 2020.

• Encourage higher densities and employment concentrations in centers, and land use patterns that support transit and the efficient utilization of infrastructure.

  **Promotion of Contiguous and Orderly Development and Provision of Services**

• Promote development within Urban Growth Areas and direct growth consistent with land use and capital facilities plans.

• Regulate development within the Urban Growth Areas such that urban densities are not precluded.

• Develop and coordinate compatible capital facility standards for all service providers within an Urban Growth Area.

• Encourage the co-location of jobs and housing to optimize use of transportation systems.

• Allow for infill and redevelopment of suitable areas.

• Establish low densities of development and use outside Urban Growth Areas.

  **Joint County and City Planning within Urban Growth Areas**

• Facilitate coordination through public planning processes as provided through interlocal agreements. Emphasize the importance of early and continuous public participation, and focus on decision-making at the local level

• Establish an interjurisdictional group of elected officials, appointed officials, citizens and staff through Snohomish County Tomorrow to review disputes regarding the consistency of comprehensive plans with each other.

  **Housing**

• Ensure fair and equal access to housing.

• Provide for the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the County.

• Adopt and implement a fair share distribution of low income and special needs housing. Each jurisdiction's housing element will specify strategies to achieve the jurisdiction's fair share.

• Adopt land use and density incentives to ensure the availability of affordable housing.
• Encourage the upgrading and preservation of the existing affordable housing stock.

• Adopt a local planning process for siting essential public residential facilities for special needs populations.

• Provide housing choices within close proximity to places of work and affordable to the work force.

• Consider the implications of proposed building and land use regulations on housing cost.

• Consider a variety of infrastructure funding methods to minimize impacts on housing production costs.

**Siting of Public Capital facilities of a Countywide or Statewide Nature**

• A guiding principle for siting countywide and statewide public facilities is that communities have a shared responsibility to site facilities for which they contribute to the need.

• A common siting review process and common siting criteria shall be developed and incorporated into the comprehensive plans of each planning jurisdiction. The siting process shall provide for incentives to host communities, a public involvement strategy and safeguards for the environment, public health and safety.

• Facility siting criteria will not preclude the siting of essential public facilities in any jurisdiction.

**Economic Development and Employment**

• Jurisdictions are encouraged to incorporate an economic development strategy as part of their comprehensive plans.

• Each local government should designate in their land use elements areas where future economic growth is desired, adopt economic development policies, coordinate economic plans with transportation, housing and land use policies, and recognize the needs of businesses of local, regional and statewide significance.

**Fiscal Impact Analysis**

• Jurisdictions will jointly develop a method to assess fiscal impacts.

**Transportation**

• A Countywide Transportation Plan will be developed to serve as the preferred framework for the transportation plans of all jurisdictions in Snohomish County.

• Jurisdictions shall establish agreements and procedures for jointly mitigating traffic impacts, and local plans shall encourage private sector investment in transportation services and facilities.
• Designate transportation service areas that provide a geographic basis for joint projects, maintenance, level of service methods and investment in facilities and services.

• Provide transportation facilities and services that support the land use elements of the County cities' comprehensive plans.

• The County and cities will review land use designations where roadway capacity and/or transit service capacity cannot adequately serve.

• Develop consistent transportation design standards, consistent rules and procedures for locating transportation facilities and consistent techniques for calculating transportation level of service on a system basis.

• Level of service will be used as a growth management tool to limit development in rural areas and offer incentives for more intensive development within urban areas.

• Establish land use designations and site design requirements that are supportive and compatible with public transportation.

Discussion

The adopted Countywide Planning Policies are somewhat general in nature and, to a large extent, establish a framework for further interjurisdictional planning and coordination that will occur in the future. To the extent the current policies provide specific guidance to local planning efforts, the relationship between them and the three plan alternatives under consideration for the City of Lynnwood can be discussed.

Neither the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative nor the Moderate Growth Alternative would achieve the population growth target adopted under the Countywide Planning Policies. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would accommodate an ultimate population of approximately 31,878 residents, 7,962 fewer than the current CPP target. The Moderate Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 33,090 residents, 6,750 fewer than the CPP target. The High Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 39,843 residents, essentially matching the CPP target of 39,840.

Neither the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative nor the Moderate Growth Alternative would achieve the employment growth target adopted under the Countywide Planning Policies. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would accommodate approximately 25,808 jobs, 14,122 fewer than the CPP target. The Moderate Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 35,500 jobs, 4,430 fewer than the CPP target. The High Growth Alternative would accommodate an estimated 40,527 jobs, about 600 more than the CPP target of 39,930.

The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative is generally inconsistent with Countywide Planning Policies calling for the establishment of a hierarchy of centers, supporting transit, supporting greater efficiency in the utilization of infrastructure, and supporting the co-location of jobs and housing to reduce transportation needs. The Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives are consistent with these policies and would support the countywide policy of reversing the trend of increased population growth in rural areas, by accommodating more growth within
Lynnwood. The High Growth Alternative generally provides greater support for these policies than does the Moderate Growth Alternative.
LAND USE IMPACTS

Affected Environment

The City of Lynnwood encompasses approximately 7.2 square miles and is a largely developed area with few sizable tracts of undeveloped land. Table 6 indicates the amount of land in Lynnwood that is currently devoted to various uses, while Figure indicates the general distribution of existing land uses within the City.

Table 6
Existing Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low Density (fewer than 4 units per acre)</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium Density (4 to 12 units per acre)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential High Density (greater than 12 units per acre)</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential subtotal</td>
<td>1,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Service</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial subtotal</td>
<td>766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDEVELOPED</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT-OF-WAY (est.)</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest single user of land in Lynnwood is residential development, occupying more than 40 percent of the City's total land base. Over 80 percent of this residential land is occupied by single family detached homes. Multiple family housing occupies less than 20 percent of the total land in Lynnwood, yet accounts for approximately 46 percent of all dwelling units. Single family development is generally located in neighborhoods separated from the community's major arterials by commercial and, in some locations, multiple family development. Much of
PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Affected Environment

Parks and Recreational Facilities

The City of Lynnwood, Edmonds School District, and private organizations provide a variety of parks, recreational facilities, and open space areas for the enjoyment of residents. Within the city, there are lakes, developed and undeveloped parks, private facilities, and school facilities that provide both active and passive recreational opportunities.

The City of Lynnwood currently contains approximately 279 acres of park land and 7.2 miles of trails within its city limits. Total park land includes school playgrounds, pocket, neighborhood and community parks: baseball, football, soccer and softball fields; tennis and volleyball courts; bicycle/jogging trails; golf course; picnic area; swimming pool, recreation center and gymnasium. Figure 12 indicates the location of existing City parks. Lynndale Park, Meadowdale Playfields and Scriber Lake Park are the largest City parks.

Adjacent cities and jurisdictions also provide recreational opportunities for local citizens. Larger park and recreation facilities in adjacent areas include Meadowdale Beach Park in Meadowdale, Snohomish County Park in Fernvinkle, Edmonds Underwater Park, Deer Park Reserve, Ballinger Park and Nile Temple Golf Course in Edmonds, and Richmond Beach.

Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan

The City of Lynnwood is in the process of updating their Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan. The revised plan will be incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan. Level of service standards developed for the Plan are discussed below.

The Plan provides an inventory of existing park and recreation facilities, identifies deficiencies in public services, and recommends capital improvements to eliminate deficiencies. It is the City's primary goal to "provide and maintain a superior system of parks, public open spaces, natural areas, cultural facilities and recreational opportunities to properly serve the residents of the community". The Plan proposes to accomplish this by (1.) Developing an open space and park system that complements and enhances the natural and manmade environments; and (2.) Providing a balanced system of recreational and cultural facilities and programs to serve the needs of users of all ages.

Level of Service Standards

The revised Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan contains recommended level of service standards for park land. The Plan estimated existing and future park and recreation needs within the City using the existing trends (no action), moderate and high growth population projections for years 1990 and 2012. Current standards indicate a level of service of 7.5 acres per 1,000 persons for park land and 1.8 acres per 1,000 population for open space land.

The City has developed a revised level of service standard that is higher than the current standard. The proposed standard is 10 acres per 1,000 persons. Using the proposed level of
KEY:
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B Lynnwood Athletic Park
C Lynndale Park
D Lynnwood Civic Center
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F Wilcox Park
G Scriber Lake Trail
H Interurban Trail
N Neighborhood Park
P Pocket Park
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service standard, current park needs would total approximately 290 acres. Compared to existing facilities, the current deficit would be 21 acres.

**Impacts of the Alternatives**

Impacts to park and recreation services would vary between the Existing Trends Alternative and the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives. Under the Existing Trends Alternative no significant additions to designated park, recreation, open space or school sites would be made. Under the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives, approximately 330 acres would be dedicated for parks, recreational facilities and open space lands.

At buildout (2012), the current standard for total park land of 7.5 acres/1,000 population for park land and 1.8 acres for open space would result in a deficit of 25 acres under the Existing Trends Alternative, a deficit of 37 acres under the Moderate Growth Alternative and a deficit of 101 acres under the High Growth Alternative. The proposed standard of 10 acres/1,000 population would yield a deficit of 49 acres under the Current Trends Alternative, a deficit of 60 acres under the Moderate Growth Alternative and a deficit of 128 acres under the High Growth Alternative. If these deficits are not addressed through a coordinated land acquisition and development program, the quality of life for Lynnwood's residents will decline as the community grows.

The *Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan* provides the City with an adequate tool for park facility planning. Level of service standards are the driving factor in determining park needs and deficiencies. These standards have and will continue to help the City identify and plan for future park and recreation needs.

**Mitigation Measures**

The park deficits anticipated under the three alternatives could be mitigated through acquisition and development of additional park land. Adding 50 to 60 acres under the Current Trends (No Growth ) and Moderate Growth Alternatives would be a challenge, but is realistically achievable. Acquiring and developing 130 additional acres for park and recreation purposes under the High Growth Alternative would be more problematic, due not only to considerably greater cost but also due to the increased scarcity of available land that would likely accompany this alternative.

Population targets in the City's Comprehensive Plan should be used in the ongoing planning for park, recreation and open space. The rate of population and user growth should be monitored to enable the City to identify facility and funding requirements during the planning horizon.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Over time, population growth will place increased demands on existing park and recreational facilities and programs and create a need for additional facilities and programs. If additional acquisitions are not made, existing deficiencies would be exacerbated. Additional costs for park and recreation development improvements, and operation and maintenance would need to be planned and incurred.
HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment

The City of Lynnwood lies on an upland between the drainages of Lake Washington to the south and the Snohomish River to the north, areas that were used before Euroamerican settlement by the Duwamish and Snohomish people. These groups generally located their winter villages along the shorelines of bays, rivers, and large lakes, leaving them in early spring to pursue resource harvesting at locations where concentrations of fish, roots, shellfish, berries, mammals, and waterfowl could be obtained seasonally (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Most of the area surrounding Lynnwood was settled in the late 1800's and early 1900's. During this period, the Puget Mill Company controlled and logged significant portion of what is now Lynnwood. During the early twentieth century, the area became central to the Back-to-the-Land Movement to reclaim logged-off lands. At that time, promoters boasted that Alderwood was one of the greatest land settlement projects in the country (City of Lynnwood, 1993). Few families were successful in making a living from farming. Many residents took jobs in Everett and Seattle and farmed on the side; others left Alderwood Manor. For the most part, those who remained relied on other sources of income.

More recently (1950's), the first suburban development occurred in Snohomish County, spawning a new type of suburban community. Lynnwood followed the suburban development trends and, after significant growth, incorporated in 1959. The City core was near the intersection of Highway 99 and 196th Street SW, but soon shifted to the intersections of 44th Avenue W and 196th Street SW with Interstate 5. The commercial core of Lynnwood is still located in this area, with the addition of the continuing commercial development associated with Alderwood Mall (City of Lynnwood, 1989).

Several sites and structures within Lynnwood have been determined to have historical/cultural significance and/or have been determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. These include the Wicker's Building, Masonic Temple, Manor Hardware, Irwin House, Demonstration Farm, Keelers Corner, and the Cedar Valley Grange and associated Interurban stop at Cedar Valley (City of Lynnwood, 1993 and City of Lynnwood, 1989).

Significant Impacts

Future development under any of the land use alternatives could potentially impact known historic sites. Additional currently unidentified prehistoric and historic sites may be located throughout the area. Future development could disturb these sites as well as unknown historical/cultural artifacts.

Mitigating Measures

Comprehensive plan goals and objectives should encourage recognition and integration of the City's historic and cultural heritage with future growth and development. Specific measures included in the 1989 Lynnwood Policy Plan could be retained within the General Policy Plan, including:

- Identify historically significant and culturally important buildings;
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• Create and adopt of a program for preservation of historically and culturally important buildings;
• Review and, if necessary, modify regulations to encourage preservation of historic and culturally significant buildings;
• Review city regulations and policies on non-conforming uses for potential impacts on historical and cultural preservation;
• Review and broaden permitted uses in historic and culturally significant buildings, if compatible with surrounding uses; and,
• Discourage demolition or extensive remodeling of historic or culturally significant buildings.

In addition to these measures, the City should establish monitoring procedures for development activities in areas where sensitive remains/artifacts could occur. Monitoring plans could be developed that include identification and reporting procedures to be followed in cases where artifacts or remains are unearthed during construction or other activity.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future growth and development within the City of Lynnwood could disturb or destroy previously undiscovered archaeological/historic artifacts.
NOISE

Affected Environment

Regulatory Overview

A variety of entities regulate noise levels within and near the City of Lynnwood, include the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Snohomish County, and the City of Lynnwood. FHWA regulations primarily focus on traffic-related noise, whereas the other two sets of regulations focus on noise generated by a variety of sources. City of Lynnwood noise regulations are essentially the same as Snohomish County regulations, with the exception that the city regulations establish environmental designations for noise abatement based on zoning and historical uses, instead of land uses as under the county regulations.

The City of Lynnwood code establishes limits on the level and duration of noise crossing property boundaries. The maximum allowed sound levels are based on the land use of the noise source and that of the receiving property (see Table 15). Generally, the lowest noise levels are required in residential areas and the highest levels are permitted in industrial areas. The maximum sound levels noted are based on measurements at the property line of the receiving property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use at Noise Source</th>
<th>Land Use of Receiving Property Res. (Day/Night)</th>
<th>Land Use of Receiving Property Comm.</th>
<th>Land Use of Receiving Property Ind.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>55/45</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>57/47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>60/50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Lynnwood.

The sound levels noted in Table 15 for residential uses are reduced by 10 dBA between the hours of 10 P.M. to 7 A.M. Increases in dBA sound levels are permitted for any source of sound that is short in duration (i.e., 1.5 to 15 minutes, depending on amount of sound level increase). Under the City's noise ordinance, several noise sources or activities are exempt from the noise regulations, including motor vehicles, aircraft, watercraft, and daytime construction activity.
Existing Conditions

The City of Lynnwood is bordered by the City of Edmonds on the west, the City of Mountlake Terrace on the south, and unincorporated Snohomish County on the north and east. Two major highways, Interstate 5 and Highway 99, travel in a north-south direction through the city. Important sources of noise include low flying airplanes from Paine Field and traffic, particularly along Interstate-5. These sources of sound occur both day and night. It should be noted that weather conditions can affect sound propagation to sensitive noise receptors, such as homes near busy arterials or commercial/industrial areas.

Existing Lynnwood sound levels were measured in 1993 in conjunction with the proposed improvements to the 196th Street SW and Interstate 5 interchange. Background sound levels were recorded at several locations along the east side of Interstate 5 and near 196th Street SW. Sound levels during the measurement period were generally below the sound levels prescribed in Lynnwood’s environmental noise ordinance for residential receivers (the most sensitive receivers). Locations near Interstate 5 exhibited slightly higher sound levels than other areas, but as previously noted, general traffic noise is not subject to City of Lynnwood noise regulations (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Significant Impacts

Future development and population growth within the City of Lynnwood under any of the land use alternatives will increase noise levels. Major sources of noise include temporary construction (e.g., grading, clearing, and building activities) and increased vehicles on local and regional roadways. Industrial activities could also be an important noise source, depending on the activity.

Future development would concentrate noise sources within the City, where many other noise sources already exist. On-site noise increases would tend to be concentrated in those areas with the highest residential or employment densities, adjacent to retail shopping areas, and adjacent to major arterials.

More industrial area would be developed under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative than under the Moderate or High Growth Alternatives. As a result, the potential for more industry-related noise could be generated under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, than under the other two alternatives. However, the increased development activity (particularly construction activities) and higher supported population under the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives would result in greater construction and traffic noise, respectively, than generated under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative. The higher resident population under these two alternatives would also result in more noise receptors within Lynnwood, than under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative.

Mitigating Measures

Specific roads could be designated as appropriate for use as truck routes. This would help reduce traffic noise impacts to residential areas and other sensitive land uses. Promoting the use of public transit, high occupancy vehicles and other transportation management techniques that would help reduce overall traffic impacts, including traffic noise.
Avoiding noisy operations during quiet times of the day would help minimize noise impacts. To the extent possible, noisy activity should take place during daytime hours.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Noise levels in the area will increase as a result of future population growth, development, and traffic.
TRANSPORTATION

Affected Environment

Streets and Vehicular Traffic

Lynnwood is located adjacent to the intersection of the two most heavily traveled transportation systems in the Puget Sound region: Interstate 5 and Interstate 405. These facilities carry many thousands of vehicles per day and at times experience significant congestion in the Lynnwood vicinity.

Highway 99 is another important transportation facility, serving both regional and local mobility needs. Various segments of Highway 99 within Lynnwood carry approximately 40,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADT). 196th Street SW and 44th Avenue W also serve both regional and local traffic.

The City's arterials are currently classified into a hierarchy of three categories: principal, minor and collector (see Figure 13). In general, principal arterials are the largest and have the greatest vehicular capacity. Their function is to connect major regional facilities such as freeways and to move people as well as goods into and out of the City. The City's three designated principal arterials are 196th Street SW, 44th Avenue W (south of 196th Street SW), and Highway 99. Minor arterials connect to Principal Arterials and provide for vehicular movement among the various areas within the community. Collector arterials collect traffic from neighborhood collectors and local access streets, connecting all parts of the community to the overall transportation network. Table 16 indicates the total length of arterials and neighborhood collectors within the City.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Class</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Arterial</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Collector</td>
<td>50.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Lynnwood
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Lynnwood’s multiple family development is situated between commercial and single family areas, serving as a transitional use (see Figure 9).

Commercial development occupies approximately 17 percent of the land in Lynnwood. Commercial development is generally located along the community’s major arterials (Highway 99 and 196th Street SW) and in the Alderwood Mall and Lynnwood Triangle areas.

Less than 3 percent of Lynnwood is in developed industrial land use. Industrial development is somewhat scattered, primarily in the southern portion of the community (in the general vicinity of Hall’s Lake) and to a lesser extent along Highway 99 in the vicinity of 180th Street SW.

Institutional uses, which include schools, parks, churches and government buildings are distributed throughout the community, accounting for approximately 10 percent of the land base. Public right-of-way consumes approximately 18 percent of Lynnwood’s land base, while approximately 7 percent of the community is undeveloped (vacant) or underdeveloped (land that is lightly developed and has some capacity for additional development under existing land use regulations). The general location of vacant and underutilized land is shown by Figure 10.

Much of the land adjacent to Lynnwood’s city limits is developed. To the west, Lynnwood is bordered by residential neighborhoods lying within the City of Edmonds or in unincorporated Snohomish County. Unincorporated areas with scattered residential development lie to the north and east. Residential land within the City of Mountlake Terrace lies adjacent to Lynnwood’s southern boundary.

**Significant Impacts of the Alternatives**

**General Land Use Impacts Common to the Three Alternatives**

The Proposed Action, would not, in itself, directly affect land use. The General Policy Plan and Land Use Map will, however, provide a basic framework that will guide future planning, growth and the use of land in the City of Lynnwood over the next 20 years. It will guide future City actions and decisions that will influence the use of land, such as implementing new development regulations or investing in public facilities. It will also influence the actions and decisions of private parties relating to their land use and development options.

Future development regulations intended to implement the Plan will indirectly affect land use by establishing requirements for the location, density, bulk, scale, use and design of development sites and structures. Other City decisions guided by the Plan, such as the development of recreation, utility and transportation facilities will also affect land use by making it easier or less costly for individuals to develop land at certain benefited locations.

Future development projects permitted or encouraged under the new comprehensive plan could directly or indirectly affect adjacent land uses. These impacts could be short-term (e.g., construction-related) or long-term (e.g., operation-related) in nature. General land use impacts that could be associated with future development include increased noise, light and glare; impacts to the natural environment; changes in views or aesthetic character; loss of archaeological or cultural resources and increased pressure to develop/redevelop vacant or underutilized parcels for compatible uses. These potential impacts and mitigating measures are discussed in general terms within individual sections of this Draft EIS. Future development
KEY:
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projects having potentially significant adverse environmental impacts will be subject to project-level environmental review under the provisions of SEPA and City requirements.

Under all three land use alternatives, much of the currently undeveloped and underdeveloped land within Lynnwood would be developed over the next twenty years.

Comparison of the Alternatives

Table 7 compares the amount of land that would be designated for various uses under the three land use alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Current Trends Alternative</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Alternative</th>
<th>High Growth Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. density multi-family</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density multi-family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential subtotal</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>2,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Services</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial subtotal</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Institutional</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td>4,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department. Please note acreages do not include arterial right-of-way.

As indicated by the Table and by Figures 5, 6 and 7, the alternatives are relatively similar in the acreage devoted to the major categories of use, and in the geographic distribution of those uses. The three alternatives differ primarily in the density or intensity of use within those areas.

Central to the Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives is the designation of commercial, institutional and recreation/open space activity centers (see Figure 4). As indicated by Table 8, the significant majority of future non-residential development would occur within the
commercial and institutional activity centers under all three alternatives (even though activity centers would not be formally designated under the No Action/Current Trends alternative).

Table 8

General Location of Non-Residential Growth Capacity in Square Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Location</th>
<th>Current Trends Alternative</th>
<th>Moderate Growth Alternative</th>
<th>High Growth Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Center</td>
<td>1,506,000</td>
<td>3,041,000</td>
<td>6,248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 Activity Center</td>
<td>391,000</td>
<td>1,249,000</td>
<td>1,249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Act. Centers</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>371,000</td>
<td>371,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Activity Centers</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>597,000</td>
<td>597,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,192,000</td>
<td>5,258,000</td>
<td>8,465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department. Additional calculations by Huckell/Weinman Associates.

Residential development potential outside the subregional center would be similar under the three alternatives. Under each alternative, approximately 900 additional housing units could be built outside the subregional center. Residential development capacity within the subregional center area varies substantially among the alternatives. Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, fewer than 200 new units could be built in this area. Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, approximately 800 units could be built in the subregional center, while under the High Growth Alternative approximately 5,000 dwelling units could be built.

The substantial increase in development and land use intensity under the Moderate Growth Alternative and the High Growth Alternative is the most notable land use impact associated with the proposed land use alternatives. While most of the added growth would be focused within the Activity Centers under both alternatives, considerably more non-residential development capacity would exist outside the Activity Centers, as well.

With the considerable increase in development capacity will come additional opportunities for land use incompatibilities. Such impacts will be most likely near boundaries separating the commercial Activity Centers and non-center commercial areas from single family neighborhoods. Existing buffers of moderate density multi-family development, institutional and open space uses will provide some protection from such incompatibilities.

Table 9 provides a detailed breakdown of anticipated residential and non-residential development capacity by land use analysis zone (see Figure 11 for the three alternatives. This Table provides a general view of the level of development that can be anticipated in the various parts of the City over the next 20 years.
Figure 11
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Please refer to the *Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives* section of Chapter II for additional information on land use impacts and implications.

**Mitigation Measures**

Focusing most future growth and development toward the proposed Activity Centers will reduce the geographic extent of potential land use conflicts and incompatibilities. Proposed goals and objectives, and the land use designations of the alternative land use plans, will provide considerable protection to established residential neighborhoods.

As the comprehensive plan is further refined and as implementing regulations are developed they should reflect and seek to resolve the issues and potential impacts identified in this EIS. The potential for land use incompatibilities between adjacent uses and adjacent districts should be addressed through development and design standards and guidelines, buffering requirements and/or transitional uses and standards.

The comprehensive plan and development regulations should recognize the role played by public facilities in supporting increased land use intensities. The City should consider ways to ensure that adequate parks, open spaces, sidewalks and other urban amenities, as well as adequate streets and utilities, are available as development occurs. The proposed General Policy Plan goals and objectives listed in Chapter II of this EIS provide a basis for promoting the provision of adequate facilities concurrent with development.

Since Lynnwood is largely developed, most growth under the three land use alternatives will occur through infill and through redevelopment. Under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives, such development will be at densities and intensities that are considerably higher than existing patterns. The development and adoption of design guidelines for specific areas can be an effective way of managing associated impacts. Lynnwood should work toward completion and implementation of the Highway 99 Streetscape Improvement Guidelines, and then build upon this experience to develop guidelines appropriate to the other Activity Centers.
## Table 9

Dwelling Unit and Non-Residential Development Capacity by Land Use Analysis Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Analysis Zone</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Non-Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Net New Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Analysis Zone</th>
<th>Existing Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Net New Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential</th>
<th>Net New Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Trends</td>
<td>Moderate Growth</td>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>Current Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>6,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Total: 12,593 13,767 14,326 16,636 13,778,000 15,970,000 19,036,000 22,243,000

Source: Lynwood Planning Department.
POPULATION, HOUSING & EMPLOYMENT

Affected Environment

Population

The City of Lynnwood is located in the urbanized South County area of Snohomish County. Snohomish County, with an estimated 1992 population of 494,300 people (OFM, 1992), is the third most populous county in Washington, behind King County and Pierce County. The South County area – which includes the cities of Edmonds, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Brier and Woodway – has a combined population of 86,335. Between 1980 and 1990, Snohomish County was the fastest growing county in the state. Sixty-eight percent of Snohomish County’s growth was due to net in-migration (OFM, 1992).

Lynnwood has an estimated population of 29,113 and is the third largest city in Snohomish County. The city has a land area of approximately seven square miles and a density of 4,044 persons per square mile, based on the 1992 population estimate. Compared with other major cities in Snohomish County with populations of over 15,000 people, Lynnwood is the second most dense – following only Mountlake Terrace (5,120 people/sq. mi.). With regard to the spatial distribution of Lynnwood’s population, approximately fifty-five percent of the 1990 population was located in the portion of the City east of SR 99. Similar to the aforementioned Snohomish County growth, the population of Lynnwood increased at a faster rate during the 1980-1990 period than surrounding cities (e.g., Edmonds, Mountlake Terrace). Most of Lynnwood’s growth during this decade, like that of Snohomish County, was attributable to net in-migration.

The most recent State of Washington data indicate that average household size is 2.42 people per household (OFM 1993). This is significantly fewer persons per household than in past periods. Average household size for Lynnwood was 3.27 persons in 1970 and 2.57 persons in 1980 (City of Lynnwood, 1989). The steady decrease in the average household size is consistent with national and regional trends toward smaller households. In Lynnwood, this trend is likely related in part to the increased proportion of multi-family housing.

Housing

There are 12,593 housing units within the City of Lynnwood. Information in Table 10 indicates that the housing characteristics for Lynnwood differ from comparable characteristics for Snohomish County or Washington State. For example, in 1990, approximately 8 percent fewer of the dwelling units in Lynnwood were owner occupied than for Snohomish County. This is likely related to the relatively higher proportion of multi-family housing in Lynnwood compared to Snohomish County as a whole. A comparison of the five largest cities in Snohomish County indicates that Lynnwood has the highest percentage of multi-family housing (46%), followed closely by Everett with 44 percent, then by Marysville (42%), Mountlake Terrace (37%) and Edmonds (31%) (OFM, 1993).
Table 10
Housing Characteristics of Lynnwood, Snohomish County, and Washington – 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>City of Lynnwood</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>Washington State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Housing Units</td>
<td>12,006</td>
<td>183,942</td>
<td>2,032,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Occupied</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner Occupied</td>
<td>58.5*</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renter Occupied</td>
<td>41.5**</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 2-4 Dwelling Units</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage &gt;5 Dwelling Units</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Mobile Homes/Other</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value (Own. Occupied)</td>
<td>$130,100</td>
<td>$127,200</td>
<td>$93,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$511</td>
<td>$467</td>
<td>$383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Range of values varies widely between census tracts comprising this area – from 29.8% - 64.3%.

**Range of values varies widely between census tracts – from 29.8% - 92.1%.

Source: City of Lynnwood, 1993.

Employment

Total Snohomish County employment in 1990 was 162,100 (PSRC, 1992). Employment grew by 43 percent between 1970 and 1980 (PSCOG, 1988), with the following decade experiencing growth of 57 percent (PSRC, 1992). In 1970, seven percent of all Snohomish County jobs were located in Lynnwood (PSCOG, 1988). By 1990 this figure had increased to eleven percent of total county employment. Over this same time period, the unemployment rate within Lynnwood decreased from 10.3 percent to 5.1 percent (City of Lynnwood, 1991).
There are currently 21,717 jobs based within the City (Lynnwood Planning Department, 1993). No particular economic sector stands out as a dominant source of employment. Most (68 percent) of the jobs are located east of SR-99. Retail employment (31 percent of total employment), service employment (30 percent), and governmental employment (27 percent) all represent very similar percentages of total employment. Of the remaining sectors, manufacturing represents seven percent of total employment and wholesale/transportation/communications/utilities represents five percent of total employment within the city (PSRC, 1992).

While no particular economic sector appears to dominate, Lynnwood’s economic base can best be characterized as oriented to retail establishments. The City has over 800 stores and specialty shops in plazas and malls and receives 54 percent of its annual general fund tax revenue from sales taxes (City of Lynnwood, 1992). Lynnwood’s retail base is geographically concentrated into two areas: Alderwood Mall, and the Lynnwood Triangle. Alderwood Mall occupies 77 acres, contains approximately 1.1 million square feet of gross leasable area, and is occupied by 135 tenants. The other primary retail area within Lynnwood is known as the Lynnwood Triangle. The Lynnwood Triangle is generally demarcated by 196th Street SW, 44th Avenue W, and I-5. A total of 264 commercial establishments exist within and along the border of the Lynnwood Triangle. Approximately 170 of these businesses are services (64 percent), 65 are retail sales establishments (25 percent), and the remaining 29 are restaurants (11 percent).

The largest private employer in the City of Lynnwood is the Boeing Company with approximately 1,500 employees. Other large Lynnwood employers include Edmonds Community College with approximately 1,600 employees, the City of Lynnwood with just under 250 employees, Harris Ford with approximately 160 employees, and the Carver Corporation (audio component/electronics manufacture) with about 150 employees. While not a single employer, the Alderwood Mall employs over 1,000 persons. Moreover, the mall generates substantial secondary business activity, indirectly helping create additional jobs.

**Significant Impacts**

One of the more significant aspects of comprehensive planning under the Growth Management Act is the requirement that County’s plan to adequately accommodate the amount of growth forecast to occur over the next 20 years. In Snohomish County, the Countywide Planning Policies seek to accomplish this by establishing population and employment growth targets for each city and for the various unincorporated areas of the County. The 2012 population target established for Lynnwood is 39,840, which would represent an increase of nearly 11,000 residents over today. The established 2012 employment target for Lynnwood is 39,930, which is approximately 18,000 more jobs than currently exist within the City.

**Population**

Population estimates for the land use alternatives at buildout are presented in Table 11. Under the alternative development scenarios used in this analysis, population capacity within the City of Lynnwood could range from a low of 31,878 residents (under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative) to a high of 39,843 residents (under High Growth Alternative) at full buildout. This represents a population increase of 2,765 to 10,730 people.
The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would allow for the smallest population increase among the three alternatives -- approximately 2,765 additional residents by the year 2010. The highest population increase would arise under the High Growth Alternative (10,730 additional persons), with the Moderate Growth Alternative exhibiting a population increase of 3,977 persons.

Full development under the High Growth Alternative would accommodate the population that is called for under the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) targets. The Moderate Growth Alternative would fall short of accommodating the CPP population targets by about 6,750 residents, and the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would fall short by nearly 8,000. If the Countywide growth projections prove accurate, the Moderate Growth and Current Trends Alternatives would result in additional pressure on other areas to accommodate more growth than the current targets contemplate.

Population-related impacts on public services and the level of overall development in Lynnwood would be greater under the High Growth Alternative than under the other alternatives.

Housing

Housing estimates for the land use alternatives at build-out are presented in Table 11. Under the alternatives, housing capacity in Lynnwood would range from a low of 13,766 units (Current Trends Alternative) to a high of 18,636 units (High Growth Alternative). The general location and mix of new housing capacity under the alternatives is shown by Table 12. Capacity for housing development outside the vicinity of the Subregional Center is similar under the three alternatives (around 1,000 units). The greatest difference among the alternatives would be in the Subregional Center, where multi-family capacity would increase from 95 units under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative to 698 units under the Moderate Growth Alternative, and to 5,008 units under the High Growth Alternative.

Table 13 indicates the potential single-family/multi-family unit mix under build-out conditions for the three land use alternatives. Under both the Current Trends (No Action) and Moderate Growth Alternatives about 45 percent of the City's housing in 2012 would be single-family, and about 55 percent would be multi-family. Under the High Growth Alternative, 35 percent of the housing would be single-family, and 65 percent would be multi-family.

Employment

Employment estimates for the land use alternatives at buildout are presented in Table 11. Under the alternative development scenarios, total employment within Lynnwood could range from a low of 25,808 jobs (under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative) to a high of 40,527 jobs (under the High Growth Alternative) at full buildout.
### Table 11
Projected Levels of Growth and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>13,766</td>
<td>14,326</td>
<td>18,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>29,113</td>
<td>31,878</td>
<td>33,090</td>
<td>39,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential* Employment</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,717</td>
<td>25,808</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>40,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregional Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>6,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,681</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>10,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential*</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>7,970</td>
<td>10,697</td>
<td>16,940</td>
<td>21,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remainder of City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>11,283</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>12,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>26,432</td>
<td>28,825</td>
<td>29,277</td>
<td>29,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Residential*</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13,747</td>
<td>15,111</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>18,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In millions of square feet.

Note: Figures not adjusted for future park land acquisition.

Source: Lynnwood Planning Dept., City of Lynnwood Plan Alternatives Totals Analysis, January 19, 1994

The Moderate Growth Alternative would allow for a total of 35,800 jobs over the planning horizon. Estimates reflect Lynnwood's existing job base (21,717 jobs). Under all the alternatives, a substantial portion of new jobs would be created within the Subregional Center (41-53 percent, depending on alternative).

Non-residential development could increase by 2.3 million square feet under the Current Trends Alternative. Most of this space would be built within the Subregional Activity Center. The remaining 0.75 million square feet of additional space would be built in other parts of the community. Most employment growth would occur in existing commercial areas and in the Regional Commercial land use category.
Table 12
General Location of New Housing Unit Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>5,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subregional Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>5,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remainder of City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department. Additional Calculations by Huckell/Weinman Associates.

Table 13
Total Housing Unit Capacity and Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>6,363 (46%)</td>
<td>6,460 (45%)</td>
<td>6,460 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>7,403 (54%)</td>
<td>7,866 (55%)</td>
<td>12,176 (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,766 (100%)</td>
<td>14,326 (100%)</td>
<td>18,636 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department. Additional Calculations by Huckell/Weinman Associates.

Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, non-residential growth would increase by approximately five million square feet. Of this five million square feet increase over existing conditions, approximately three-fifths would occur in the Subregional Activity Center, with the remaining two million square feet occurring primarily within the Highway 99 corridor and the other designated activity centers. As Table 14 shows, most employment growth would occur in the Regional Commercial and Office Commercial categories. These two categories account for over 78 percent of all additional employment generated under this alternative.
Under the High Growth Alternative, employment could grow by 84 percent over existing employment levels. Most of this employment growth would, once again, be in the Subregional Activity Center. As shown in Table 14, the greatest employment growth would occur in the same land uses as under the Moderate Growth Alternatives – the Regional Commercial and Office Commercial categories. It is also noteworthy that employment in one category, Light Industrial, would actually decrease under the High Growth Alternative.

Table 14

Additional Employment by Alternative and Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Current Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (Retail and Office)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>8,108</td>
<td>9,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Commercial</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>5,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>2,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>18,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would fall more than 14,000 jobs short of the Countywide employment targets for Lynnwood by the year 2012. The Moderate Growth Alternative would fall approximately 4,000 jobs short. The Current Trends and, to a lesser extent, the Moderate Growth Alternative could result in pressure on other areas within the County to accommodate more employment growth than the current Countywide targets contemplate, or result in jobs going elsewhere. The High Growth Alternative would provide adequate capacity to meet the employment targets established by the Countywide Planning Policies.
Mitigating Measures

Population

The proposed General Policy Plan goals and objectives are intended to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of increased growth in the City of Lynnwood. Proposed goals and objectives encourage new development in ways that are compatible with the overall character of existing neighborhoods, and phasing of new development with the provision of services and facilities. Environmentally sensitive areas would be protected through the City's Sensitive Areas Ordinance.

The City should continue to work with the Snohomish County to prepare revised population, housing, and employment targets that accurately reflect Lynnwood's development potential.

Housing

The effects of increased residential densities in developing areas and an increase in the proportion of multi-family housing (primarily within the Subregional Center) can be mitigated through development standards that promote careful design, and through the provision of neighborhood amenities including parks and open spaces, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and high quality public services.

Employment

Adverse impacts associated with employment are primarily related to the impacts of building their places of employment and to employee commuting. Mitigation for impacts related to general development and transportation are discussed elsewhere in this EIS.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future development and population growth within the City of Lynnwood will place greater demands on existing facilities and infrastructure, and more resources will be consumed. Land developed for residential and employment uses will generally be unavailable for other uses.
AESTHETICS, LIGHT AND GLARE

Affected Environment

The City of Lynnwood is situated on a gently rolling to nearly level plateau approximately 240 to 610 feet above sea level. The City is bordered by lands within Snohomish County on the north and east, the communities of Brier, Mountlake Terrace and Seattle Heights on the south, and the City of Edmonds on the west.

In general, the City is characterized by suburban residential development with strip commercial development along major arterials (i.e., Highway 99, 196th Street SW, Alderwood Mall Boulevard) and a major shopping center.

Visual Character

Lynnwood is fortunate to be an economically thriving community, growing at a fast pace. Unfortunately, one of the side effects of rapid growth is the lack of a strong City identity. Many cities in the Puget Sound region have beautiful natural settings, a well preserved historic center, or both. Lynnwood has neither and is an example of the regional development pattern in post-war America that is characterized by the horizontal suburb — low-rise development with few distinguishing features, spreading out from the central City. This type of development does not result in a community with a strong visual character, unique and easily recognized.

Lynnwood can be divided into three primary land use types — single family residential community with several distinct residential areas; strip commercial development along the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors; and a regional shopping center — each with a distinct visual character. Multi-family residential areas often provide a transition between single-family neighborhoods and strip commercial areas.

Neighborhoods throughout the City vary with regard to age, architectural styles, building size, building setbacks and the nature of public facilities (sidewalks, overhead power, etc.). In older neighborhoods, vegetation has been retained to buffer homes from major roadways, while in newer neighborhoods fences have been constructed to serve as buffers. Vegetation within older neighborhoods and on undeveloped lands is characterized by mature stands of indigenous and introduced plant species. Overall, the majority of Lynnwood's neighborhoods are characterized by relatively low densities, and are well-maintained and attractive.

Much of the arterial commercial land is underutilized with lower-quality buildings and minimal site improvements. Some areas appears "transitional" in character (i.e., potentially converting to different land uses or structures).

The commercial/retail center located west of I-5 along 196th Street SW and Highway 99, serves as the major gateway to the community. The overall visual character reflects the dominance of retail and service land uses located in this area. There are several large chain stores that are grouped with other buildings to form shopping complexes that make up the overall commercial center along 196th Street SW and Highway 99. Structures are oriented to provide parking visibility and access from adjacent streets. Alderwood Mall, located approximately one quarter mile northeast of the I-5/196th Street SW interchange is the City's commercial anchor.
Buildings in this area are similar in scale, with the majority being one- or two-stories, and similar in form, with flat roofs and structural canopies/facades that contain tenant signage. Building materials include brick, painted concrete and stucco. The colors of most buildings are earth tones. The area does not reflect the use of strict or consistent design or landscaping standards and, in general, lacks unique visual character.

The majority of land area in the commercial centers that is not occupied by buildings is devoted to surface parking. Parking is located in front of the buildings and abuts Highway 99, 196th Street SW, Alderwood Mall Boulevard and adjacent streets. Streets serving these commercial areas are multi-lane; typically three to five lanes. Sidewalks front the commercial and retail buildings; however, there are no landscaped public walkways or sitting areas. Vegetation is limited to sparse perimeter and some internal "island" landscaping within the parking areas.

Gateways

There are four primary entrances to the City of Lynnwood that are considered as "gateways"—the I-5/196th Street SW and I-5/44th Avenue W interchanges, and Highway 99 at the north and south. Currently, there are no entry features at these entryways other than highway exit signs or small roadway signs that indicate one is entering the City of Lynnwood.

The I-5/196th Street SW interchange is the primary "gateway" to the City from the north. Alderwood Mall and the commercial development along the 196th Street SW draw people into the City at this location. Visual characteristics at this entry point include office and commercial development. From Highway 99 at both the northern and southern city limits, the entrance is characterized by older strip commercial development.

Light and Glare

A considerable amount of ambient light is generated throughout the City. Principal sources of light and glare include motor vehicles, parking area lighting (shopping complexes and Alderwood Mall), interior and exterior lighting associated with buildings, street lighting, and lighting associated with I-5.

Residential areas emit substantially less ambient light when compared to the commercial and business districts in the City. Key sources of light include motor vehicles, street lighting, and residential lighting.

Light and glare at the perimeters of the City varies with location. At the northern perimeter of the city, light at the northern, western and southern perimeters are characteristic of residential development. Interstate 5 marks the current eastern city limits and is characterized by a substantial amount of light and glare.
Significant Impacts

Changes in Visual Character

Potential impacts to visual resources are similar among the land use alternatives and primarily relate to the size, scale, and intensity of future development. Proposed changes are concentrated west of I-5 along the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors, the area along 212th Street SW in the vicinity of 60th Avenue West, areas within the Lynnwood Triangle and around the Alderwood Mall.

The remaining areas of the City are designated for residential uses, with various institutional and open space uses intermixed. Large single family areas are designated in the northeast and northwest portions of the City, and a smaller single family area in the south. Change in established residential neighborhoods is expected to be minor under all three alternatives. Most multi-family residential uses are located between the commercial and single family residential areas.

Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, changes in the community's visual character would be relatively minor and gradual. Under the Moderate Growth Alternative and especially under the High Growth Alternative, the visual character of the Subregional Center would experience greater change, related primarily to increased land use intensity. One measure of land use intensity is the floor area ratio (FAR). A floor area ratio of 1.00 means that there is one square foot of building space for every square foot of land. The current FAR within the Subregional Center is approximately 0.18, (meaning that there are 18 square feet of building for every 100 square feet of land). Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, the FAR at buildout would be approximately 0.23, a 30 percent increase over the existing situation. FARs for the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives at buildout would be 0.28 (a 50 percent increase over existing) and 0.37 (a 100 percent increase, or doubling of land use intensity over the existing situation). Visually, this increased intensity would translate into larger and taller buildings and smaller surface parking lots.

At this time, no specific improvements have been identified for gateways to the City. Views from the Lynnwood Triangle gateway could improve as infill and redevelopment occurs and design improvements are implemented over time. Entry points at the northern and southern ends of Highway 99 would not change.

It is intended that design policies and standards will be included in the comprehensive plan and will be implemented through development standards as growth and redevelopment occur. This could have a beneficial impact with regard to the City's visual character. Without design guidelines and regulations, the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors could continue to develop in an unorganized fashion that characterizes the area today.

Light and Glare

Light and glare would not change significantly along the Highway 99 and 196th Street SW corridors. The greatest change in light and glare would result from intensification of land use in the Lynnwood Triangle, the Alderwood Mall area, and along 212th Street SW in the vicinity of 60th Avenue West. Use of reflective materials for buildings could generate impacts. Light
emitted from new residential development would be similar to residential lighting in other areas of the City.

**Mitigation Measures**

Measures to help reduce the potential for visual impacts from future development could include the adoption of design policies, standards, and guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan development regulations; creation of a design review process; revised sign controls and lighting standards; retention of open space; and creation and enhancement of public open space.

Lynnwood should also work toward completion and implementation of the Highway 99 Streetscape Improvement Guidelines, and could then build upon this experience to develop guidelines appropriate to other areas.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

The visual character of the community will change under any of the alternatives.
The majority of roads in the Lynnwood are in good condition. The City of Lynnwood maintenance budget for 1993 was approximately $1.5 million. This money was spent on overlay of existing lanes, striping, signage, street cleaning, snow removal, landscaping maintenance, and the like. The City of Lynnwood maintains a Pavement Management System to monitor the condition of its road inventory and help prioritize maintenance needs. The current roadway maintenance programs have been successful in providing safe, and well maintained streets.

The ability of an arterial street system to move traffic is typically limited by intersection capacity. As the design capacity of an intersection is approached or exceeded, congestion and delays increase. Transportation engineers use a "level of service" (LOS) grading system of A through F to indicate the relative level of congestion experienced by a specific intersection. As used in this EIS, the grading system is based on the ratio between the volume of traffic flowing through an intersection and that intersection's design capacity. Intersections experiencing vehicle volumes of up to 60 percent of capacity are said to be operating at LOS A, which is characterized by generally free-flowing traffic. At the other end of the scale, intersections experiencing volumes greater than 100 percent of their design capacity are said to be operating at LOS F, which is characterized by unstable traffic flow, long queues at intersections and significant travel delays. Lynnwood also recognizes a LOS F+ condition, where volume exceeds 130 percent of design capacity. Under LOS F+, congestion and delays are very significant.

Table 17 provides the existing (1992) average afternoon peak hour level of service for intersections where a principal arterial meets any other arterial. The afternoon peak hour is generally the most congested period during the day. The Table indicates that 11 of 23 major intersections in the City currently operate above their design capacity during the typical afternoon peak hour.

A substantial share (estimated at up to 30 percent) of traffic on Lynnwood's principal arterials is "pass-through" traffic, having neither origin nor destination within Lynnwood.

Parking

The City of Lynnwood experiences significant demand for parking for employees who commute to work by auto, and to support retail land uses that are especially prevalent in the Alderwood Mall, Highway 99, and Lynnwood Triangle areas. Existing areas within the City of Lynnwood that have a relatively large supply of parking include the following:

- 44th Avenue Park-and-Ride lot with 985 stalls is the largest in the state;
- Alderwood Mall was developed on a ratio of five stalls per 1,000 square feet of retail space;
- Boeing Materials Division;
- Major retail facilities (e.g., Costco and Home Base) on Highway 99; and
- Edmonds Community College.

The City of Lynnwood is in the process of completing an inventory of existing parking facilities by land use type, parking ratio, and other criteria. In the next year or so, the City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Peak Hour Volume</th>
<th>Peak Hour V/C</th>
<th>Peak Hour LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 212th</td>
<td>4,577</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 208th</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 200th</td>
<td>5,728</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 196th</td>
<td>7,021</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 188th</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 180th</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 176th</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 168th</td>
<td>4,644</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 164th</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 212th</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at I-5 Southbound Ramp</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 200th</td>
<td>5,604</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 196th</td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 76th</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 68th</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 64th</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 60th</td>
<td>5,491</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 52nd</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 48th</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 40th</td>
<td>4,642</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 36th</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at I-5 Northbound Ramps</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at Poplar</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department, based on analysis conducted by Bell-Walker Engineers
expects to finish this Parking Needs Study, and upon completion of this study, amendments to various regulations, policies, and guidelines will be considered.

Sidewalks

Like other suburban communities, the City of Lynnwood has developed over time as an auto-oriented community, which means that more emphasis has been placed on accommodating automobile travel and less emphasis has been placed on pedestrian or bicycle connections. Table 18 indicates the proportion of arterial and neighborhood collector mileage within the City having sidewalks. The percentage figure reported in this table compares the actual miles of sidewalk to the mileage that would exist if sidewalks were provided on both sides of the streets. In other words, a figure of 100 percent would mean that the entire length of arterials of that category have sidewalks on both sides.

Table 18

Sidewalks on Arterials and Collectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Class</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Miles of Sidewalk</th>
<th>Percent with Sidewalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>7.95 mi.</td>
<td>3.75 mi.</td>
<td>23.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>17.85 mi.</td>
<td>29.50 mi.</td>
<td>82.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Arterial</td>
<td>13.75 mi.</td>
<td>19.20 mi.</td>
<td>69.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Collector</td>
<td>50.80 mi.</td>
<td>55.90 mi.</td>
<td>55.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.40 mi.</td>
<td>108.35 mi.</td>
<td>59.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Lynnwood

Generally, in the City of Lynnwood walking or bicycling from point to point can be a challenge, since walking or bicycling facilities that do exist often do not connect with each other or with primary activity centers. The lack of safe and convenient pedestrian facilities to connect residential areas with transit service, schools, parks, shopping and other nearby activities limits opportunities for the substitution of walk trips for short vehicle trips, and decreases the attractiveness of transit for longer trips.

Public Transit Service

Public transit service is provided to the Lynnwood area by Community Transit (CT). CT uses the "hub and spokes" method for its system routing in the Lynnwood area, with all routes
currently channeled through the park-and-ride lot located on 44th Avenue W. Figure 14 shows the location of existing transit routes serving Lynnwood.

CT classifies its bus service into two separate components: local service and commuter service. Local service is operated by CT, with senior and special needs service contracted out. Local service includes routes to Alderwood Mall, Edmonds Community College and Boeing. Total 1993 ridership for local routes serving Lynnwood was 1,579,291. An estimated 57 percent of those trips (891,185 riders) had origins or destinations in Lynnwood. This accounts for a very small fraction of total trip-making by those who live, work and shop in Lynnwood. CT's most successful local routes serve the Highway 99 corridor (Route #610) and Edmonds Community College (Route #620). Ridership on routes serving the Alderwood Mall (Routes #160 and 170) has been increasing recently. CT is currently planning some improvements in its local service by building a transit center at Edmonds Community College (1995-95), building a second park-and-ride lot at Ash Way, and by posting bus stops and building shelters in various locations.

CT contracts for its successful commuter service. Commuter routes have three primary destinations: downtown Seattle; the University District; and Bellevue. Total ridership on the Seattle routes in 1993 was 1,092,372. The proportion of these commuters whose trips originated in Lynnwood is unknown (Lynnwood Planning Department, 1994).

Demand Management

In response to the State of Washington's Commute Trip Reduction Law (RCW 70.94.527.), on December 28, 1992, the Lynnwood City Council authorized the Mayor to sign Ordinance No.1930, creating the commute trip reduction program for the City's largest employers. This plan calls for a 15% reduction of single occupancy commute trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to work by 1995, a 25% reduction by 1997, and a 35% reduction by 1999.

There are six employers in Lynnwood who meet the program participation criteria set forth by state law. Table 19 identifies the affected employers, their number of employees, and their VMT reduction goals for 1995.

Significant Impacts

Vehicular Traffic

Vehicular traffic and hence demands on the community's street system will increase under all three comprehensive plan alternatives. The City's transportation engineering consultant has conducted a preliminary analysis of existing traffic conditions and has projected what traffic conditions are likely to be in the year 2012 under the three comprehensive plan alternatives, based on the following assumptions.

- Non-SOV (single occupant vehicle) trips will account for 3.0 percent, 6.0 percent and 7.5 percent of all peak hour trips for the Current Trends, Moderate and High Growth Alternatives, respectively (it is estimated that at present, transit accounts for no more than 3.0 percent of all trips originating or terminating in Lynnwood).
### Table 19

Commuter Trip Reduction Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>SOV Base</th>
<th>1995 SOV Goal</th>
<th>1994 VMT**</th>
<th>1995 VMT Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boeing</td>
<td>1,563</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver Corp.</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lynnwood</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds Com. College</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Ford</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Base is the percent of employees commuting to work alone in their cars prior to the mandated CTR program.

** "VMT" is the average vehicle miles traveled by employees.

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department.

- The community will be fully developed by 2012 in accord with the types and intensities of uses provided by the plan alternatives.

- Population growth outside Lynnwood was assumed to be as forecast by Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County for all alternatives. Employment growth outside Lynnwood was based on a growth factor reflecting historic growth. Population and employment growth within Lynnwood were projected by Traffic Analysis Zone (see Figure 15), based on the growth capacity of the three land use alternatives (see also Table 9).

- The new I-5 interchange at 196th Street SW will be completed.

- Currently programmed street improvements will be completed (these improvements are reflected in the "Funded Capacity" column of Table 20).

Table 20 summarizes the results of this analysis for 23 intersections where a principal arterial meets any other arterial. The Table indicates that 11 of these 23 intersections currently operate at or above capacity (LOS F or worse). Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, 20 of the 23 intersections would operate at or above capacity by the year 2012. Under both the Moderate Growth Alternative and the High Growth Alternative, 21 intersections would operate at or above capacity by 2012.
Table 20
Projected PM Peak Hour Capacities and Level of Service at Selected Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Capacity</th>
<th>Funded Capacity</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Current Trends</th>
<th>Moderate Growth</th>
<th>High Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 212th</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 208th</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 200th</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 196th</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 188th</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 180th</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 176th</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 168th</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 99 at 164th</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 212th</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at I-5 SB Ramp</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 200th</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th at 196th</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 76th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 68th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 64th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 60th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 52nd</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 48th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 40th</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at 36th</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at I-5 NB Ramps</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196th at Poplar</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td>F+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lynnwood Planning Department, based on analysis provided by Bell-Walker Engineers.
Under any of the alternatives, traffic congestion within Lynnwood will be very serious unless aggressive measures are taken to increase the capacity of the street system and promote transit and other alternatives to single occupant vehicle use.

Public Transit Service

The increased traffic congestion that is expected to accompany growth under each of the three alternatives will affect not only single occupant vehicle travel but will also adversely affect any public transit service that competes with SOVs for street use. While growing congestion may result in some increase in transit ridership and other alternative travel modes, significant ridership increases would be expected only to the extent that transit can provide time savings or other advantages (e.g. cost or convenience).

The three alternatives differ in the extent to which they would encourage or establish other conditions which may benefit public transit. The Current Trends (No Action) Alternative would continue Lynnwood's current density and development patterns. Such land use patterns are relatively difficult and inefficient to serve with public transit, and significant improvements in public transit and ridership would be less likely over the life of the comprehensive plan.

The Moderate Growth Alternative would provide for increased development intensities within two commercial and two institutional activity centers (see Figure 4). A mixture of higher density residential, retail and office development would be encouraged within the commercial activity centers, particularly in the Subregional Center proposed for the Alderwood Mall/Lynnwood Triangle area. As these areas develop, they would create an environment under which public transit and other alternatives to SOVs could become more efficient and successful.

The High Growth Alternative would provide for even higher development intensities within the Subregional Center. As with the Moderate Growth Alternative, the environment for successful transit and other non-SOV travel modes would be enhanced as these areas develop over the life of the comprehensive plan.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

In general, increasing congestion will make pedestrian and bicycle travel more difficult and potentially more hazardous due to increased opportunities for conflicts with motorized vehicles. However, under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives, pedestrian travel will become more practical within the activity centers, particularly within the Subregional Center. Higher development intensities and a mix of uses will make it possible for more people to live near their jobs and near shopping and recreational opportunities. It will also allow visitors to the area to undertake a number of activities on foot rather than having to travel from one place to another by car.

Mitigation

The development of a comprehensive analysis and strategy for managing the community's transportation needs is underway but incomplete. Completion of a comprehensive transportation plan is essential to the community's ability to adequately plan for the future under any of the land use plan alternatives. The City should not make a final and irreversible commitment to any land use alternative prior to substantially completing this effort. The
following should be considered by the City as it further develops its transportation planning program.

There are two basic strategies for mitigating the increased traffic congestion that will accompany community growth under all three alternatives. One strategy is to increase the capacity of the existing street network. The other strategy is to reduce the volume of vehicles placing demands upon the system, particularly within peak travel periods. Measures supporting public transit improvements (including construction of HOV lanes and other transit facilities), commute trip reduction (CTR) measures, investment in bicycle lanes and trails, and promoting development patterns and standards that encourage and accommodate pedestrian travel should be part of the solution. A successful approach to addressing current problems and mitigating the traffic effects of future growth will most likely depend on a combination of substantial capacity expansion and aggressive demand reduction strategies.

The development patterns, land use mix and intensity of development proposed for Activity Centers under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives would be expected to facilitate the implementation of strategies for reducing overall demand for single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel. However, a more detailed analysis will be needed prior to final adoption of a new comprehensive plan.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Travel demand will increase substantially under each of the alternatives. This will likely lead to increased arterial congestion and longer travel times even if an aggressive program of transportation system capacity improvements and demand management is developed and implemented.
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

POLICE SERVICE

Affected Environment

Police protection services within the city are provided by the Lynnwood Police Department (LPD). The department's service area boundaries coincide with city boundaries (approximately 7.2 square miles), although the department cooperates with other neighboring police departments to provide necessary police services elsewhere. Similar to the Lynnwood Fire Department, the police department utilizes Sno-Com to dispatch calls (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

The LPD currently operates one station, which also houses a jail, at 44th Avenue W and 194th Street SW. Approximately 86 personnel are assigned to the station, of which 48 employees are commissioned police officers, resulting in an average officer-to-population ratio of 1.65 officers per 1,000 population (based on 1992 OFM population). In addition to the commissioned police officers, department support staff include 9 jail full time employees (FTEs), 2 jail part-time employees, 8 clerical/records FTEs, and other personnel such as police reserve officers, and individuals performing similar support functions (Norton, 1994). The department has 9-10 marked police cars, 5-6 unmarked police cars, two police motorcycles, one jail van, one crime scene van, as well as an assortment of personnel equipment (Norton, 1994).

The department currently experiences a response time of approximately two minutes to most areas within the city limits. This relatively fast response time is achieved, in part, by the cooperative arrangement the department has with the other surrounding police departments. The department responded to a total of 30,851 calls for service during 1993. This represents an increase of 16 percent over the number of calls received within each of the past few years (average of 26,000 calls).

During 1992, a total of 3,177 crimes (109.4 crimes/1,000 population) were committed in the City; this represented a 7.1 percent increase over 1991. Most calls for service involved property crimes such as arson, larceny, and vehicle theft. The number of arson-related crimes increased 127.8 percent over the previous year while the number of violent crimes decreased by 15 percent.

The LPD does not anticipate the need to upgrade facilities in the near future. In January 1994, the LPD headquarters relocated to a new building, just south of the old facility.

Significant Impacts

Future population growth and development under any of the land use alternatives would result in increased demand for police protection services, as well as other community programs supported by the Police Department (e.g., DARE, community watch programs). To meet increased demands, the Police Department would be required to hire additional personnel, purchase new equipment, and expand existing facilities or construct new facilities. As a consequence, service costs would increase.
The ratio of police officers to population is frequently used as a measure of the level of police service. The Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC, 1992) collect data on law enforcement employee rates per 1,000 inhabitants. For cities with populations of 25,000 to 50,000, the 1992 ratio of commissioned officers to population was approximately 1.55 officers for every 1,000 people. For the City of Lynnwood, which had a 1992 population of 29,113 (OFM, 1992), the equivalent ratio is 1.65 officers for every 1,000 people. For Snohomish County, the ratio is 0.61 commissioned officer/s for 1,000 people. According to the LPD, this ratio does not accurately reflect the situation in Lynnwood, because the city’s approximately 3,500 businesses attract a transient population of approximately 150,000 into the area daily. This reduces the officer-to-population ratio to .27 officers/1,000 people.

Table 21 presents estimated police personnel needs based on estimated population growth under the proposed land use alternatives.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Alternative</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Estimated Police Personnel Needs¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action Alternative</td>
<td>31,878</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Growth Alternative</td>
<td>33,090</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth Alternative</td>
<td>39,843</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Based on the 1992 average of 1.55 commissioned officers per 1,000 population for Washington cities with populations of 25,000-50,000 (WASPC, 1992). Numbers have been rounded to the nearest whole number.


Total police personnel needs would range from 1-3 commissioned officers under the Existing Plan and Moderate Growth Alternatives to 14 under the High Growth Alternative. This represents an increase of 102 to 129 percent over current staffing levels within the City. Considering the number of new businesses that would be added to the area, additional officers may be required to handle the increased transient population to the area.

Mitigation Measures

Goals contained in the City’s Comprehensive Plan Update promote and encourage growth and development in a manner consistent with City policies and regulations. Specific goals encourage the provision of necessary police services concurrent with new development within the City.

Specific impacts of future development proposals should be assessed and appropriate mitigation measures imposed through the City’s SEPA authority. Measures should be taken during construction to provide on-site security (e.g., secured areas for equipment, private security guards, and lighting). Building and site designs that would reduce opportunities for
crimes to occur should be encouraged. Adequate street lighting should be provided for residential, commercial, and industrial developments.

Development of community crime prevention programs (e.g., neighborhood watch programs) could also help mitigate some impacts on police services.

Tax revenues generated as the result of future development activities and population growth would be available to help finance additional staff and equipment requirements of the City.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future population growth and development activity will increase the need for police protection services in the City of Lynnwood. Resources will have to be expended to meet these needs.
FIRE SERVICE

Affected Environment

Fire protection and emergency medical services in the City of Lynnwood are currently provided by the Lynnwood Fire Department (LFD). The Department is the first dispatched primary service provider for the City and areas beyond the city limits. This area encompasses 9.75 square miles, with a population of approximately 36,100 (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

The LFD currently has a rating of 4 by the Washington Survey and Rating Bureau (City of Lynnwood, 1993); ratings range from a high of 1 to a low of 10. The department generally responds to emergency service calls within 3 to 5 minutes after being dispatched (Meador, 1994). The department is part of mutual aid agreement with three other surrounding fire departments to provide fire suppression and emergency aid assistance when requested. These cooperating fire departments include the Mountlake Terrace Fire Department, Edmonds Fire Department, and Snohomish County Fire District #1 (Meador, 1994). The four cooperating fire departments have used a centralized dispatching service, Sno-Com, for the past 20 years. This dispatching service assigns calls to the fire department with the shortest response time, regardless of jurisdictional boundaries (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

The LFD currently operates two fire stations. Fire Station #1 is the main station and is located at the corner of 44th and 188th S.W. This station is equipped with two 1,500 gpm pumps, one aid car, and one aerial ladder truck. Fire Station #2 is located at the corner of 68th Avenue W. and 186th S.W. and is equipped with two 1,500 gpm pumps and one aid car. The department employs a total of 32 firefighters and 2 chief officers, 1 staff person, and 16 volunteer firefighters. The department operates three 24-hour shifts (on 24 hours and off 48 hours) with a goal of maintaining a 3-4 man crew per shift at each station (Hodgson, 1994).

During 1993, the LFD responded to a total of 4,351 service calls. The Department currently has the busiest alarm and fire crew in Snohomish County, nearly twice that of other departments in the four-department district, which has resulted in delayed response times. Construction of a new fire station is planned for 1994-95; the Department plans to add a 6 person aid company to its fire fighting force once the fire station is complete.

Significant Impacts

Future residential, commercial, and industrial development under any of the land use alternatives would generate additional fire service demands. As fire inspection, emergency, and fire-related calls increase, it would become necessary to expand fire protection services. It would be necessary to build or expand existing facilities, as well as expand the public water supply to ensure adequate fire flows. As a result, fire protection costs would increase.

A number of development characteristics could also affect service delivery within the City. For example, multi-family residential developments tend to create a higher degree of risk and greater fire prevention and firefighting challenges than do single-family developments. According to the Uniform Fire and Building codes, apartments are classified as a high fire risk. Taller buildings allowed under the Moderate Growth and especially the High Growth Alternative would require use of an aerial ladder truck, and pose significantly more complex challenges to emergency service providers.
Commercial developments would place increased demands on the City's fire personnel due to increased requirements for fire and life safety services (e.g., inspection, public education, training). Industrial uses could also require greater levels of service related to use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials.

Future residential and student population growth within Lynnwood would be greatest under High Growth Alternative, and would likely generate the greatest increase in demand for fire services. The relatively concentrated pattern of growth envisioned under this alternative could, however, facilitate provision of fire services.

When the alarm growth reaches 8-10 percent, outside agencies have to assist the Department with calls. The LFD uses the 8-10 percent growth factor to plan for additional staff and facilities (Meador, 1994).

**Mitigation Measures**

Proposed goals and objectives for the General Policy Plan seek to manage growth in a manner that ensures public facilities and services are adequate to meet the needs of existing and new development as the community grows. Other objectives address water system dependability and the appropriate timing of water system expansion in association with future growth. Specific policies and programs designed to implement these goals and objectives would help mitigate potential impacts.

Tax revenues generated by future commercial and residential development would be available to help finance additional staff and equipment requirements. Some service efficiencies could be achieved through cost-sharing measures with nearby jurisdictions.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Increased development and population growth within the City would increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services. Resources will have to be expended to meet these demands.
SCHOOLS

Affected Environment

The Edmonds School District Capital Facilities Plan is being developed and will be incorporated into the Capital Facilities Element of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. This plan is intended to help the district determine when new schools will be needed, and what funds may be available for these facilities.

Existing Facilities

The City of Lynnwood lies within the Edmonds School District. The Edmonds School District covers approximately 36 square miles of southwest Snohomish County. The District boundaries overlay the Cities of Brier, Edmonds, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, the town of Woodway and unincorporated Snohomish County. The City of Lynnwood contains a number of the elementary, middle and high schools belonging to the District. In addition to the school buildings, the administration offices and the maintenance and transportation buildings are located in Lynnwood.

The District has 23 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 5 high schools. Within the City of Lynnwood, there are 7 elementary schools (Beverly, Cedar Valley, College Place, Lynndale, Lynnwood Intermediate, Meadowdale, and Spruce Primary), 2 middle schools (College Place and Meadowdale Middle), and 3 high schools (Lynnwood High, Meadowdale High, and Scriber Lake High). The location of public schools within the City of Lynnwood is shown by Figure 16. The Edmonds School district’s student enrollment for fall 1993 was 20,269. Since 1989, student enrollment has been increasing at an average rate of 2.7 percent per year (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

School capacities, based on October 1993 enrollment, are shown in Table 22. Elementary schools are currently operating at 84 to 95 percent of capacity, middle schools at 87 percent of capacity, and high schools at 101 percent of capacity. Estimates for elementary schools are based on a class size of 25 and 28 while estimates for middle and high schools are based on a class size of 25.

6-Year (1993 - 1998) Student Enrollment Projections

Edmonds School District enrollment projections for the period 1993 - 1998 were developed using two different methodologies: the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) cohort survival model and the Population Based Enrollment Projections Model developed by Shockley/Brent, Inc. for use in the Snohomish County Capital Facilities Planning Project (Shockley/Brent, 1993). These models are described briefly below. A comparison of enrollment projections generated by the two models is provided in Table 23.

SPI Enrollment Projections

Enrollment projections are generated annually by SPI using a 6-year forecast period. SPI uses the cohort survival methodology for projecting student enrollment for grades 1 through 12. Kindergarten enrollment is projected based on a least squares linear regression analysis of actual kindergarten enrollment over the previous six years. This methodology assumes
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enrollment trends that have occurred over the previous six years will likely continue through the next six years (Shockey/Brent, 1993). The results of this methodology are indicated in Table 23 as SPI.

Table 22

School District Enrollment and Capacity, October, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>October 92 Headcount</th>
<th>October 93 Headcount</th>
<th>Percent of Capacity 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools*</td>
<td>12,250</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>11,581</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>100.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>20,750</td>
<td>19,893</td>
<td>20,038</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Elementary school capacity based on average class size of 25. Using average class size of 28, elementary schools are at 84.4% of capacity, and the District as a whole is at 90.2% of capacity.

Source: Edmonds School District, 12-07-93.

Population Based Enrollment Projections

Student enrollment projections were estimated for the District, based on the Snohomish County Planning Department’s preliminary distribution of OFM population projections. The enrollment projection model forecasts student enrollment using two separate approaches. The first approach applies countywide resident birth rates to estimated District population of the previous five years to determine the number of five-year-old children expected to be residing within the District for each year in the forecast period (1993-1998). A net migration rate, calculated for the District, based on a comparison of expected resident kindergarten students to actual kindergarten enrollment between 1989 and 1992, is then applied to determine the total number of kindergarten students for each year in the forecast period. Projected enrollment for grades 1 through 12 is then determined using the 3-2-1 cohort survival methodology (Shockey/Brent, 1993). The results of this approach are indicated in Table 23 as PBEP1.

The second approach forecasts total student enrollment by applying the 1990 student-to-population ratio, based on actual enrollment and 1990 census data, to the population projections for the forecast period (Shockey/Brent, 1993). The results of this approach are indicated in Table 23 as PBEP2.
Table 23.
Comparison of Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>20,091</td>
<td>20,869</td>
<td>21,762</td>
<td>22,758</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>24,508</td>
<td>25,353</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBEP1</td>
<td>20,091</td>
<td>20,751</td>
<td>21,580</td>
<td>22,484</td>
<td>23,202</td>
<td>23,898</td>
<td>24,545</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBEP2</td>
<td>20,091</td>
<td>20,080</td>
<td>20,636</td>
<td>21,053</td>
<td>21,440</td>
<td>21,835</td>
<td>22,236</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1992 actual enrollment


20-Year Student Enrollment Projections

Enrollment projections for year 2012 are also based on the Snohomish County Planning Department's preliminary distribution of the OFM 20-year population projection. An enrollment projection range was provided for each district using two separate student to population ratio assumptions (Shockey/Brent, 1993).

A projected student enrollment of 26,903 students by year 2012 was derived by holding the 1990 student to population ratio of 14.9 percent constant through the year 2012. This represents a 34 percent increase over existing enrollment levels. By holding the 1990 student to population ratio constant, it is assumed that there would be no change in birth rates, death rates, average age of population and net migration within the District over the next 20 years (Shockey/Brent, 1993).

A second estimate of student enrollment by year 2012 was derived using the percentage of school age children to total population projected for Snohomish County. Based on the OFM projections, the total number of school age children (5 to 17 years of age) would represent 17.6 percent of the total county population by year 2010. Using this methodology, a total enrollment of 31,656 students would be expected for the Edmonds School District by year 2012, representing an increase of 58 percent over existing 1992 enrollment levels. This methodology assumes that all school districts within the county will have similar demographic characteristics by year 2010 (Shockey/Brent, 1993).

Population based enrollment projections generated using the methodologies described vary by 2,309 students in 1998.

Planned Improvements

Several new schools and school expansions are planned by the District to house existing and projected growth in student population during the 1993-1998 planning period. Future improvements include: constructing one high school and one junior high school; renovation of Seaview Elementary School to expand the capacity to 600 students; and modernization and expansion of various other facilities. These projects have secured funding from bond issues that were passed in January 1994 (Normand, 1994).
Additional capital improvements are likely to be identified once the District's Capital Facilities Plan is further along in the planning process.

School Impact Mitigation

In 1990, the District prepared a long range facility plan that identified school needs and proposed financing strategies. Since the publication of the plan, several bond issues did not pass and the information contained in the plan does not accurately reflect current conditions within the District. The District is in the process of preparing a school impact mitigation proposal that will identify capital needs and funding strategies.

Significant Impacts

The School District's Capital Facilities Plan forecasts student populations and program capacities for a six-year period (1993 - 1998). Forecasts are updated on an annual basis. The District also prepared long range forecasts (2012) based on the two population ratio assumptions discussed earlier in this section.

The following analysis of long term school needs is based on 2012 housing projections for the three land use alternatives, and the student generation rates provided in the District's Capital Facilities Plan. Table 24 shows student population generated by each of the land use alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Existing Trends (No Action)</th>
<th>2012 Student Population</th>
<th>High Growth Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>3177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3990</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>5425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on 2010 housing projections (see Population, Housing and Employment Section).

Based on current student generation factors, the total number of school-age population within Lynnwood by buildout would range from approximately 5425 students under the Existing Trends (No Action Alternative) to 6625 students under the High Growth Alternative. The greatest impact would occur at the grade school level; approximately 57 percent of the school-age population would occur at this level.
Under the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, the City of Lynnwood would contribute 17 to 20 percent of the 2012 projected student enrollment for the Edmonds School District. Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, Lynnwood would contribute 18 to 21 percent, and 21 to 25 percent under the High Growth Alternative. New and expanded school facilities, transportation resources and programs would be needed to accommodate the growing number of Lynnwood families with school-age children.

Mitigation Measures

Proposed goals and objectives contained in the proposed General Policy Plan would seek to manage growth in a manner that ensures the provision of adequate public facilities and services concurrent with growth. The City and School District should coordinate planning efforts and consider joint services and facility use as deemed mutually beneficial.

The Edmonds School District's Capital Facilities Plan which covers a six-year planning period, is updated on an annual basis. It is anticipated that future school needs will be identified during the District's ongoing planning process. The School District should consider the population and housing targets ultimately adopted within the City's comprehensive plan, in its own planning.

Implementation of a school impact mitigation fee as authorized under the Growth Management Act could be a significant source of revenue to support the expansion or construction of facilities to serve a growing student population.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

As new development occurs and the number of families with school-aged children increases, the demand for school services and facilities will increase. Land developed or set aside for school facilities would be generally unavailable for other uses.
WATER SERVICE

The following analysis is based on information contained in the City of Lynnwood Water System Comprehensive Plan Update (Gray & Osborne, 1992). Information regarding existing water service to the City has been incorporated into the analysis.

Affected Environment

Water Supply

The water supply for Lynnwood is the watershed comprising the headwaters of the Sultan River, located 25 miles east of the City of Everett. Everett supplies water via pipelines to regional purveyors in south Snohomish County. The Alderwood Water District (AWD) purchases water from Everett and wholesales it to the City of Lynnwood (Gray & Osborne, 1992).

The City of Lynnwood water service area includes all of the area within the corporate city limits except the Spruce Hills development on Spruce Way at 172nd Street SW, and approximately 15 acres between SR-99 and 48th Avenue West at 168th Street SW which are served by the AWD (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

In 1978, the City of Lynnwood and the AWD entered into an agreement for water supply that established the rates and terms by which AWD supplies water to the City. The 1978 agreement provides for:

- The transfer of three water mains and two steel storage reservoirs with a combined capacity of 5.77 million gallons.
- The establishment of the master meter installation located at Spruce Way and 164th Street SW.
- The inclusion of all water withdrawal through a meter installation located at Spruce Way and 164th Street SW.
- The delivery of "peak day water" needed by the City. Peak day water is the 24-hour average flow rate for any maximum usage day during a calendar year.

An amendment to the agreement in 1980 extended the terms of the agreement to September 20, 2010, coinciding with the expiration date of the Alderwood Service District’s agreement with Everett (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Distribution System

There are three pressure zones that distribute water within the City of Lynnwood – the 573, 635 and 724 zones. The 573 and 635 pressure zones are served by the City, while the 724 pressure zone is served by the AWD. The City’s water distribution system is illustrated by Figure 17.
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GENERALIZED WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM
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The 724 zone serves an area approximately from 168th Street SW to 172nd Street SW and from Spruce Way to 36th Avenue W. The water is supplied from Alderwood Water District's 2.0 million gallon (MG) reservoir located one mile north of 168th Street SW near 35th Avenue W. Static water pressure in the area ranges from 50 psi to 80 psi. Service is provided from a 12" water loop with 8" distribution lines into the residential areas. Water storage for the zone is provided by a 2.0 MG reservoir which is served from a pump station containing 3 pumps capable of 1.4 million gallons per day (MGD).

The 635 zone serves an area approximately from 196th Street SW to 172nd Street SW and from 40th Avenue/Spruce Way to 36th Avenue W. North of 172nd Street SW the westerly boundary moves west to Highway 99. The water is supplied through the city's master meter located at 168th Street SW and Spruce Way. The water is supplied from the Alderwood Water District's reservoirs totaling 76 MG. Static pressure in the area is 35 psi to 90 psi. Service is provided from 10" and 12" mains feeding 8" distribution lines.

The 573 zone serves the remainder of the city. The water is supplied through the City's master meter and goes through the pressure reducing station located at Spruce Way and 173rd Street SW. Water is stored in the City's two reservoirs totaling 5.7 MG located at 40th Avenue W and 185th Street SW. Static water pressure in the area ranges from 60 psi to 100 psi.

The primary water transmission main for the City is a 24" concrete cylinder pipe on 35th Avenue W and Spruce Way, that runs from AWD's terminal storage facilities at 153rd Street SW to the intersection of 164th Street SW and Spruce Way. A pressure reducing valve (PRV) vault, located at 173rd Street SW and Spruce Way, on the 24" main reduces the pressure of the incoming supply from Alderwood to feed the City's supply lines. Two transmission mains (a 16" and an 18") split off at the termination of the 24" CCP main. The 16" main supplies water to the northwestern portion of the City and the 18" main supplies the City's storage reservoirs. A 24" CCP main runs from the storage reservoirs and connects to a combination of 18", 16" and 12" mains that distribute water to the remaining portions of the City.

A second PRV station, located at 196th Street SW and 40th Avenue W provides a secondary means of supplying the 573 pressure zone when the main PRV is out of service or when there are high demands on this zone. If the main PRV is out of service for an extended period, the secondary PRV would be unable to meet the demand in the 573 pressure zone. The distribution system off the second PRV consists of looped 6" through 12" water mains (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

The transmission capabilities within Lynnwood are generally good. Analysis of the system is dependent on the required fire flows for different uses. The Alderwood mall area requires fireflow capability of 6,000 gallons per minute (gpm), multi-family development requires 3,000 gpm and single family 1,500 gpm. To serve the various areas the City has a network of looped 10" and larger mains. Localized deficiencies are under evaluation for improvements. The City has pursued implementation of its Water System Comprehensive Plan in requiring upgrades to the system as needed to correct any deficiencies and provide adequate service to new development.

School fire flow requirements range from 1,750 gpm to 6,000 gpm. The Water System Comprehensive Plan describes several improvements needed to attain those fire flows and the City is pursuing those improvements. As the school district expands or improves its facilities it is required to update the water system as appropriate and according to the Plan. Water
improvements are also installed as a part of all major street renovations if called for in the Plan.

Water pressure generally ranges from 30 psi to 100 psi. During periods of high use the pressure in the 635 zone can fall below the minimum of 30 psi due to falling water tank elevations and increased head loss due to velocity in the mains. The City currently requires the installation of individual booster pumps for new construction within those areas affected.

Storage

The City has a total of 5.77 million gallons (MG) storage capacity with two reservoirs located at 185th Street and 40th Avenue W. Both reservoirs are in the 573 pressure zone. In 1990, the total required storage (fire, equalizing, emergency) for the 573 pressure zone was 12.46 MG; this represents a storage deficit of 6.69 MG (City of Lynnwood, 1993). Storage for the 635 and 724 pressure zones is provided by the AWD; at this time, no formal agreement exists between the City and the AWD regarding storage within these pressure zones.

Fire flow, equalizing, and emergency storage is required to be provided by the City of Lynnwood by terms set in the agreement with the AWD. The required fire flow of 6,000 gpm for Alderwood Mall is the most demanding requirement, dictating storage of at least 2.16 MG. Equalizing storage is equivalent to 25 percent of the maximum daily flow. Based on the 1989 maximum daily demand, the equalizing storage requirement is 2.29 MG.

The City is currently deficient in storage for the 573 and 635 zones. Based on the 1987 Land Use Comprehensive Plan by the year 2010 the City will need an additional 10 MG of storage. The City is currently planning on building additional water reservoirs in the near future and has been setting aside money anticipating the need. Estimated costs are 10 to 12 million dollars. Another option to be explored will be the purchase of Alderwood Water District's excess storage capability.

The Department of Health criteria for calculating emergency storage for systems with more than 100 connections and multiple sources is 800 gallons per connection. In 1990, Lynnwood had an estimated 6600 total connections. Based on the Department of Health criteria, Lynnwood's emergency storage is 5.28 MG. The City's Water System Comprehensive Plan Update recommends the emergency storage minimum be equivalent to the maximum daily volume; this would be 9.1 MG (City of Lynnwood, 1993).
Significant Impacts

Future Demand

The Sultan River watershed has the capability to supply the current and projected future demands for the City of Everett and its service area, which includes the City of Lynnwood (Gray & Osborne, 1992). The maximum day demand for the existing service area was calculated using population projections and a proportionate amount of commercial growth by Forecast Analysis Zones (FAZ) and taking an average day demand of 125 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) then multiplying the average by a factor of 2.5 (to account for maximum day demand). The Water System Comprehensive Plan Update estimated the maximum day demand to reach 10.43 MGD by year 2000 (based on a projected population of 33,377), 11.41 MGD by 2010 (for population of 36,522), and 12.49 MGD by 2020. By 2020, the water system was projected to serve an estimated population of 39,964 residents (based on FAZ projections) (Gray & Osborne, 1992).

Future storage requirements for the 573 pressure zone are estimated to be 14.01 MG by the year 2000 and 15.12 MG by 2010. The required storage for the existing 573 pressure zone includes: fire flow storage of 2.16 MG, equivalent to 6,000 gpm for 6 hours (the fire flow requirement for Alderwood Mall); emergency storage equivalent to the maximum day demand; and equalizing storage equivalent to 25 percent of the flow required on the maximum day. There is presently a storage deficit of 6.7 MG that is projected to grow to 9.4 MG by the year 2010 (Gray & Osborne, 1992).

Residential, commercial, and industrial growth associated with the City's land use alternatives would increase consumptive uses and would place increased demands on existing water supplies and facilities. Estimated total average and maximum daily demand at full development under each of the land use alternatives is presented in Table 25.

Table 25
2012 Average and Maximum Day Demand (MGD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>2012 Population</th>
<th>Average Day Demand</th>
<th>Maximum Day Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>31,878</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Growth</td>
<td>33,090</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Growth</td>
<td>39,843</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Estimates are based on an average daily demand of 125 gallons per capita per day which is consistent with the City's Water System Comprehensive Plan Update. Estimates do not reflect conservation measures, and are assumed to be conservative on the high side. Actual water demand would depend on household size, employment, the type of land uses that develop (particularly industrial uses), implementation of water conservation measures, and other factors. As indicated in Table 25, the year 2012 maximum day demand under all of the project...
alternatives is lower than that projected in the City's Water System Comprehensive Plan Update (12.49 MGD).

In order to meet increased demands under any of the land use alternatives, existing facilities would have to be expanded. The City of Lynnwood Water System Comprehensive Plan Update contains a list of recommended improvements that were developed to meet the projected requirements of the City's water system. These improvements include the aspects of supply, transmission, storage, distribution and instrumentation. It is anticipated that once all the identified improvements have been completed, there would be sufficient capacity to serve the projected population.

Recommended Improvements

A recommended 10-year capital improvement program (CIP) is outlined in the City's Water System Comprehensive Plan Update. The CIP is intended to be implemented in two 5-year phases, 1992-1996 and 1997-2001. Total project costs for both Phase I and Phase II are estimated at $12 million. The Plan also recommended that the City designate an additional $200,000 per year with an inflation rate of 5 percent to cover annual operation and maintenance improvement (Gray & Osborne, 1992). The City has developed and implemented a "cost of service" based strategy that assesses the benefit/need for site-specific improvements and determines overall rates for system improvements, maintenance and operation.

A water and sewer rate study prepared for the City in 1991 evaluated various options to fund identified capital improvements with special consideration for funding the relatively high cost reservoirs. The rate study concluded that an increase in water rates was required to fund the CIP and recommended increasing water revenues by 32 percent between 1992 and 1996 (Gray & Osborne, 1992).

The rate study indicated that the City would have sufficient revenues to construct all of the Phase I improvement projects if moderate rate increases are instituted. Phase II of the CIP includes construction of major storage facilities which would require the City to generate new revenues (Gray & Osborne, 1992). Other sources for financing capital improvements include grant and loan funds, revenue bonds, general obligation bonds, utility local improvement districts, and a general facilities charge.

General impacts that could occur during water system expansion and upgrading include construction activity that would create temporary traffic and noise problems; possible land condemnation for pipeline easements, storage tanks, and pumping stations; greater capital, and operation and maintenance costs for the City and consumers; and possible formation of utility local improvement districts to finance water system improvements.

Mitigation Measures

The water requirements of the City continue to grow as the population increases. To meet the demand additional water will be required from the Alderwood Water District which will mean amendments to existing agreements currently in place. In addition the cost of obtaining water is increasing due to new regulations being imposed on water suppliers. As volume goes up and the cost increases it will become increasingly important to conserve water. Currently the
City encourages water conservation through voluntary compliance with lawn watering restrictions and policies adopted by the City of Everett and the Alderwood Water District.

The City's Capital Improvement Program establishes priorities and identifies likely funding sources for implementing facility improvements identified by the Water System Comprehensive Plan Update.

In addition, the City of Lynnwood could develop specific policies to encourage water conservation. Adopted policies should encourage:

- using natural vegetation for landscaping;
- using ground cover in place of grass in landscaping. Ground covers have lower water and maintenance requirements;
- using low flow plumbing fixtures; and
- developing a water pricing structure that promotes conservation (i.e., an increasing block rate structure).

In general, fees collected from developers for connection to the existing water system, developer in-kind contributions, local improvement districts (LIDs), and user fees would help to offset capital and operating costs associated with new development.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Development would increase the demand for water resources and increase consumptive uses. Greater demands on existing water supplies could increase the cost of both present and future water development. Water consumed for residential, commercial and industrial uses is unavailable for other beneficial uses.
SEWER SERVICE

The following analysis is based on information contained in the City's 1988 Facilities Plan with the 1990 Addendum, and the 1993 Infiltration/Inflow Report. Information regarding existing sewer service to the City has been incorporated into the analysis.

Affected Environment

The City of Lynnwood is responsible for providing sewer service to its residents, and the maintenance and operation of the treatment plant and the collection and transmission systems. The City's wastewater treatment plant was converted to secondary treatment in 1992, increasing the plant's capacity to an average annual flow of 7.4 million gallons per day (MGD) (City of Lynnwood, 1993). Figure 18 illustrates the existing sewage collection and transmission system.

Collection System

The Lynnwood sewer service area is divided into four major drainage basins: Swamp Creek, Scriber Creek, McAleer Creek and Browns Bay. These basins are further divided into 17 unit sub-basins. The sewage collection system is for sanitary sewage only; storm water discharges into the system are not allowed.

The majority of the collection system was installed in 1961 and 1962. Additions to the original system have been numerous, particularly in recent years during annexation to and development of the northern and eastern parts of the City. Three small lift stations (Nos. 4, 6 and 8) serve local areas in the system.; these lift stations (LS) were constructed after the original sewer system was installed (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Transmission System

The components for the transmission system were installed with the original system and originally included two lift stations (LS Nos. 10 and 12), a force main and gravity trunk sewer from LS No. 10 to LS No. 12, and a second force main and gravity trunk sewer system from LS No. 12 to the treatment plant. In 1993, LS No. 10 was abandoned and replaced with a new station at the existing site, and a new force main which bypassed LS No. 12 was installed to the gravity main in 76th Avenue W. LS No. 12 was also modified and updated during 1993 (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

LS No. 10 receives flow from the Scriber Creek and Swamp Creek drainage basins. Flows received at LS No. 10 are pumped through a 24-inch diameter force main to a gravity sewer trunk line that leads to the treatment plant. The capacity of the force main is approximately 8.5 MGD at the maximum velocity of 8 feet per second (fps) (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Flows received at LS No. 12 are pumped through an 18-inch diameter force main to a 24-inch diameter gravity line that leads to the wastewater treatment plant. At the maximum recommended velocity of 8 fps, the flow capacity of the force main is approximately 9.1 MGD. The 24-inch gravity trunk line also receives tributary flows from Edmonds and the Browns Bay Drainage basin at several points along the alignment (City of Lynnwood, 1993).
Current transmission capacity generally meets the needs of the City. Isolated areas are subject to surcharging due to heavy infiltration during larger storm events.

Treatment Plant

The City's new waste water treatment plant was completed in 1992. The project upgraded the existing primary treatment plant to a secondary treatment plant utilizing the activated sludge process and incineration for solids handling. The Sewerage System Engineering Report (1987) and the Lynnwood Waste Water Facilities Plan (1988) established the design parameters, assumptions and regulatory criteria used in designing and construction of the plant. The plant design parameters were to handle an average annual flow of 5.4 million gallons per day (MGD) and an influent biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) of 12,960 lb/day for the design year 2010. The maximum month average flow is not to exceed 7.4 MGD. These reports assumed projected population for the City of Lynnwood of 44,700 people and a total population equivalent of 52,080 for the service area which includes a portion of Edmonds and all commercial contributions. The plant was to produce an effluent meeting or exceeding the discharge limitations set by the Washington Department of Ecology (DOE).

The treatment plant currently operates under a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit issued by the Department of Ecology. Limitations under the permit are as follows:

- Average flow for the maximum month - 7.4 MGD;
- Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5 day) (BOD5) loading for maximum month - 12,960 lb/day;
- Influent total suspended solids (TSS) - 12,960 lb/day.

The effluent limits for the system are calculated on a monthly and weekly average:

**Monthly Average**

- CBOD₅ - 25 mg/L, 1,543 lbs/day
- TSS - 30 mg/L, 1,851 lbs/day
- Fecal Coliform Bacteria - 200/100 mL
- Chlorine - 318 ug/L (7.16 lb/day) [daily maximum - 834 ug/L]

**Weekly Average**

- CBOD₅ - 40 mg/L, 2,469 lbs/day
- TSS - 45 mg/L, 2,777 lbs/day
- Fecal Coliform Bacteria - 400/100 mL

pH shall not be outside the range of 6.0 to 9.0

The NPDES permit also sets limits for effluent concentrations. The monthly average effluent concentration limitations for CBOD₅ shall not exceed 25 mg/L or 15 percent of the influent concentration; the monthly average effluent concentration limitations for TSS (total suspended solids) shall not exceed 30 mg/L or 15 percent of the influent concentration (City of Lynnwood, 1993).
When the actual flow or waste load reaches 85 percent of the design capacity or when the projected increases would reach design capacity within five years, whichever occurs first, the City is required to submit to the Department of Ecology a plan and a schedule for continuing to maintain capacity at the facility sufficient to achieve the effluent limitations and other conditions of the NPDES permit (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

The City is currently reviewing the system capacity of the plant as the 85 percent threshold has been experienced from a BOD loading perspective. Under the terms of the current NPDES permit the city must now evaluate the plant and service area flows to determine how to best respond to future systems sewage flows.

The plant has experienced additional BOD loadings exceeding that assumed in the original design criteria. The city has instituted operational changes at the plant and within the collection system to dampen the impact to the plant and to postpone major capital expenses. A plant system capacity analysis now underway will address these issues. A prime concern is the limited ability to further expand the treatment plant because of the costs due in part to the extremely restricted site that the plant occupies.

**Significant Impacts**

The capacity of the treatment plant is based on anticipated flows to the plant and on the biological loading the plant will receive. The DOE permit places limitations on both parameters.

An analysis of the actual flows since completion of the secondary plant has been done and based on projected population increases it is anticipated that average annual flows will increase from the current 3.42 MGD for 1990 to 4.94 MGD under the Moderate Growth and to 5.66 MGD under High Growth Alternative.

The biological loading (BOD) on the plant is currently exceeding the 85% criteria which requires the city to initiate an engineering study to maintain permit limitations. The Facility Plan assumed a concentration of 210 mg/l for influent entering the plant. Recent historical data has shown that influent BOD has been as high as 330 mg/l. An analysis of BOD loadings based on an average rate of 304 mg/l results in a projected average BOD loading of 17,468 lbs/day for Moderate Growth and 19,193 lbs/day for the High Growth Alternative. The projected BOD loading for both the Moderate and High Growth Alternatives exceed the current DOE permit limitation of 12,960 lbs/day.

Analysis conducted to date indicates that the City's treatment plant does not have the capacity to properly process the expected loadings under the High Growth Alternative and there may be limitations on its ability to handle the Moderate Growth Alternative.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Lynnwood is currently conducting an engineering study to further analyse conditions of the DOE permit and the actual operating capabilities of the treatment plant. The report is the result of the treatment plant having reached the 85% parameter for BOD loadings as outlined in the permit. The results of the study will better define the future needs of the City for meeting the permit limitations and future growth potential.
The existing site of the treatment plant is severely restricted with the recent upgrade utilizing all of the available land. Future options would include an alternative site if available or a change or enhancement to the method of treatment. Given the existing amount of development within the basins, an additional site is not readily available. Significant changes to the process are also not anticipated given the site restrictions.

The City should continue to review its ongoing pre-treatment program with an emphasis on ways to reduce the BOD loadings coming into the plant. Reductions can be made through education of users on proper and improper uses of the sewer system and also increases in the amount of pre-treatment for those users with high BOD effluent.

The existing Facilities Plan should be updated and expanded to include new information on flows and population and to expand the study to the basic trunk sewer system.

The City should continue to actively pursue elimination of those areas of high infiltration and inflow as outlined in the 1993 Infiltration and Inflow Report. Corrective measures include watertight manhole covers, repairs to broken lines and continued monitoring and elimination of storm water connections.

The City will work with the adjacent purveyors to pursue alternative routing of sewer effluent. The rerouting of sewage from Lift Station 4 to allow gravity flow to Alderwood Water District and ultimately to Metro is currently under review.

In general, fees collected from developers and individual homeowners for connection to the public sewer system, local improvement districts (LIDs), and user fees should help to offset the capital and operating costs associated with new developments.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Increased quantities of treated sewage would be discharged to Puget Sound.
STORMWATER DRAINAGE

Affected Environment

Existing Drainage Basins

The City of Lynnwood's drainage system consists of Scriber Creek, its two primary tributaries - Popular Creek and Golde Creek, Meadowdale Pond, Swamp Creek, Hall's Lake, Hall's Creek, and an unnamed creek flowing west into Perrinville in Edmonds. The entire drainage system has approximately 3,700 catch basins, 124,000 feet of storm lines, 48,000 feet of ditches and several miles of streams (R.W. Beck, 1991).

Localized, temporary flooding has been a problem in areas of the City due to increased development and insufficient culvert and detention capacity. Flooding also occurs as a result of ditches becoming clogged, debris plugging the inlets to catch basins and pipes backing up. Other problems result from surface runoff to infiltration systems causing system levels to raise (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Stormwater Drainage Requirements

The Puget Sound Water Quality Management Plan (1991) requires all counties and cities within the Puget Sound drainage basin to adopt ordinances to control runoff from new development and redevelopment by July 1994. At a minimum, ordinances must address:

- control of off-site water quality and quantity impacts;
- use of infiltration where appropriate;
- source control Best Management Practices (BMPs);
- effective treatment using BMPs of the storm size and frequency as specified in the Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin (Ecology, 1992) for proposed development;
- erosion and sedimentation control; and
- protection of stream channels and wetlands.

Stormwater programs must also include operation and maintenance programs for public and private stormwater systems; programs to educate citizens about stormwater and its effects on water quality, flooding, fish/wildlife habitat, and to discourage dumping into storm drains; coordination with provisions of GMA; and basin planning (as part of a comprehensive water quality protection program).

Ecology encourages adoption of additional and/or more stringent requirements as appropriate for each jurisdiction. Criteria may be modified through basin planning.

Development proponents are required to prepare Stormwater Site Plans, which include an Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan and a Permanent Stormwater Quality Control (PSQC) Plan. The ESC plan is intended to control erosion and sedimentation during the construction phase of projects, and is temporary in nature. The PSQC plan provides long-term best management practices (BMPs) for stormwater runoff control.
The City of Lynnwood currently requires that new developments meet stormwater requirements contained in Ecology's *Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin*, and will adopt a stormwater ordinance by the end of 1994.

**Impacts of the Alternatives**

Future conversion of open space to residential, commercial, and industrial development under any of the land use alternatives would result in increased volumes and peak flow rates of stormwater runoff. Increased runoff may contribute to increased erosion hazards, sedimentation in surface waters, and potential downstream impacts. In general, the greater the level of development, the greater the increase in impervious surfaces and stormwater runoff.

Uncontrolled runoff from residential, commercial, and industrial areas, as well as roadways, can contain a number of contaminants that can seriously impair surface and groundwater resources. These include pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers and other toxic chemicals, animal wastes, oils, cadmium, lead, heavy metals, PCBs, and many other pollutants.

Increased runoff and sedimentation in streams can negatively affect aquatic habitat by altering or destroying pools, riffles, gravel bars, and increase water temperature.

The long term accumulation of pollutants into receiving waters can also create problems such as eutrophication, polluted groundwater, and contaminated sediments.

**Mitigation Measures**

The City of Lynnwood’s stormwater design/planning regulations and SEPA review of individual development proposals would generally identify and limit potential stormwater quality risks associated with future development proposals. Continued implementation of the requirements and practices contained within the *Stormwater Manual for Puget Sound* and planned adoption of a new stormwater ordinance implementing best management practices will largely mitigate the impacts of future development.

Mitigation measures identified in the *Water Resources* section would also be appropriate for potential stormwater impacts.

The City has applied to Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) and the U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) for a system-wide permit that would allow the construction of additional stormwater detention sites in accordance with the City's Comprehensive Flood and Drainage Plan. Acquisition and development of additional detention sites would increase system capacity and thereby reduce the need for additional transmission system improvements. The City's application is currently under review by DOE and USCOE.

**Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

Future development would result in increased stormwater runoff volumes and lengthening of peak discharge periods. While increases in stormwater runoff and pollutant loading within the
Stormwater system are unavoidable, adverse impacts to receiving waters can be held to non-significant levels through proper stormwater management.
SOLID WASTE

The Washington Solid Waste Management Recycling and Recovery Act (RCW 70.95) requires each county within the state, in association with the cities and towns located within it, to prepare a 20-year comprehensive solid waste management plan (CSWMP) and to update the plan at least every 5 years.

Snohomish County is the solid waste management planning authority for all jurisdictions within the county except the City of Everett. Upon review and update, the CSWMP must be extended to show the long-range needs for 20 years in the future. A revised 6-year construction and capital acquisition plan must be included. Pursuant to the terms upon which participating jurisdictions have adopted the CSWMP Update, future updates of the CSWMP must be adopted by the County Council and participating jurisdictions. The County Solid Waste Management Plan (CSWMP) Update was adopted by participating jurisdictions (including the City of Lynnwood) and County Council in February 1990.

Affected Environment

Existing Facilities

Prior to 1992, Snohomish County's primary solid waste handling facilities were the Cathcart Landfill and the Everett, Southwest, and North County Recycling and Transfer Stations. In the fall of 1991, construction of a new landfill adjacent to the Cathcart Landfill was completed, and the Cathcart Landfill was subsequently closed in June 1992. Currently, no waste is being accepted at the new landfill (Kelly-Clark, 1994).

In early 1992, Snohomish County began sending 100 percent of its waste stream to a privately owned landfill in Klickitat County, Washington. The landfill has a 30-50 year life expectancy that depends in part on the incoming waste stream from other cities, counties and states. The Klickitat County landfill currently accepts waste from other cities and counties throughout the state, Oregon, and Northern California (Kelly-Clark, 1994).

The County has a 21-year contract with the landfill that is negotiated in 7-year terms. The current 7-year term expires in 1999, at which time the County will decide whether to continue sending its waste to Klickitat County or to open the new County landfill (Kelly-Clark, 1994).

The City of Lynnwood is currently served by two recycling and transfer stations - one located in Everett and one in Mountlake Terrace. The Everett Regional Transfer Station (ERTS) is on leased land that expires in 1994. With the coming closure of the ERTS, Snohomish County is faced with the need to develop functionally equivalent service capabilities by 1995. The County is looking at three potential locations for siting a new transfer station - 112th Street and Evergreen Way (south of Everett); 134th Street and I-5 (adjacent to I-5/128th interchange); and S. 164th Street, west of I-5 (close to Lynnwood). Once a site is selected, the County anticipates a new transfer station to open sometime in 1996-97 (Kelly-Clark, 1994).
Waste Generation

Estimates on existing and future solid waste generation within the City of Lynnwood are based on a Snohomish County Solid Waste Management Division report entitled 1995-2015 Snohomish County Small Area Waste Projections Under Existing-Conditions (Reiter Northwest and Dick Conway & Associates, 1992). The methodology for projecting future waste is described briefly below.

Future waste generation and long-term waste handling requirements were determined using an "existing conditions" scenario intended to highlight the quantity, type and location of waste throughout the County. Under the existing conditions scenario, a number of factors were held constant (e.g., recycling programs, waste handling policies, private alternatives to County facilities) while allowing the fundamental determinants of waste generation (i.e., growth in households and economic activity) to vary (Reiter Northwest and Dick Conway & Associates, 1992).

The existing conditions projections of the Snohomish County waste stream cover a 1995-2015 planning horizon and include five waste concepts: generation, recycling, (market curbside, dome, self-haul/transfer station), potential disposal (collection/self-haul), migration and net disposal. The waste generation projections were developed for 69 sub-areas of the Snohomish County forecast analysis zones, referred to as FAZxs (Reiter Northwest and Dick Conway & Associates, 1992).


Significant Impacts

Future development under any of the land use alternatives will add to the existing waste stream generated by the City of Lynnwood. Future waste generation under the Existing Trends Alternative would be similar to those projected in the study prepared by Reiter Northwest and Dick Conway & Associates (1995-2015 Snohomish County Small Area Waste Projections Under Existing-Conditions). The Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives are expected to generate a larger amount of waste due to the additional multi-family residential, commercial and industrial uses.

Mitigation Measures

The City of Lynnwood's ongoing planning efforts should be coordinated with the County's Solid Waste Management Division.

Implementation of local waste reduction and recycling programs for residential, commercial, and industrial land uses would help reduce the amount of waste to be landfilled.

Snohomish County has set several goals for waste reduction and recycling. The overall goal is to plan, design, and implement the most effective program given the opportunities and constraints in the county. The County's comprehensive waste reduction and recycling program challenges Snohomish County, its municipalities, waste haulers, citizens, and businesses to
work together to divert material from the County's solid waste management system. The CSWMP states that cities and towns are responsible for the implementation of the following services:

• curbside collection of residential recyclables from single family residences
• curbside equivalent collection of residential recyclable from multiple family residences
• collection of yard waste, including both curbside collection and community collection events
• collection of commercially generated recyclables

Cities and towns can provide these services directly, require the solid waste hauler to provide the service, or contract with an independent party.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future growth within the City of Lynnwood will result in increased waste generation and associated costs for disposal.
GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Affected Environment

The City of Lynnwood provides a number of general government services for residents and other City departments. These include executive (Mayor), legislative (City Council), planning, legal, building, finance, personnel, and general administrative functions. The City of Lynnwood employs 252 full-time employees within general government positions. With the exception of the planning department, City Hall, located at 19100 44th Avenue West, houses these departments.

The total 1994 budget for the City of Lynnwood is $61,940,768 which includes $18,248,700 for 1-5/196th Street interchange, $1,360,500 for SR 99 improvements, $1,255,000 for water/sewer construction improvements, and $998,400 for park improvement projects. The General Fund budget is $18,579,210 and includes the majority of departments and the administrative operation of the City. The General Fund total represents a 5.9 percent increase over the 1993 budget (City of Lynnwood, 1993).

Major capital proposed for 1994 are as follows:

- I-5/196th Interchange traffic impact assessment (TIA) $18,579,210
- SR99 TIA improvement 1,360,500
- Spruce Neighborhood Park - Phase II 250,000
- Interurban Trail Development 600,000
- Water/Sewer and Storm Drainage Projects 1,255,000

Capital projects will be financed from current revenue, local improvement districts and Federal/State Grants. Sales tax revenue is anticipated to be $10.0 million in 1994.

Significant Impacts

Future growth and development under any of the land use alternatives would most greatly affect the Administrative, Legal, and Community Development Departments within the City of Lynnwood. Specific types of service needs associated with planning, construction, and operation under the land use alternatives are shown in Table 26.

Public works improvements, particularly large capital facilities such as water and sewer system expansion, would likely be funded through formation of Local Improvement Districts (LIDs). Formation of LIDs would require considerable legal resources. However, costs of these services would be reimbursed from proceeds of the LID and would, therefore, be fully mitigated.

The Planning, Engineering and Building departments would be affected by future growth and development under the land use alternatives. The Planning Department is responsible for zoning, planning, and coordinating with the City Council, Planning Commission, Hearing Examiner and various committees. The building department is responsible for issuing building permits and conducting building inspections. The Engineering department would also be involved in development review, capital improvement project management, transportation planning and increased operations and maintenance of public facilities.
Table 26
General Government Service Demands
Generated by the Land Use Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Service Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Planning and Policy Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Administrative Tasks Related to Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>LID Formation Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract Negotiations for Additional Public Service Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Formulation/Enforcement of Land Use and Zoning Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Code Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council and Committee Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Improvement Design, Permitting and Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Improvement Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Planning and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>LID Formation Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Collection and Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Billing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll for Additional City Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeting Adjustments for Affected Departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc.

The Finance Department would be instrumental in issuance of LID bonds, design and negotiation of indebtedness repayment by developers, and securing an investment firm to underwrite possible bond issues. Other tasks associated with development might include property tax collection, increased payroll responsibilities associated with additional municipal employees, and numerous interim budget reassessments of the City’s financial position as growth progresses.

Compared with the Current Trends (No Action) Alternative, more multi-family units and commercial space would be developed under the Moderate Growth and High Growth Alternatives. Future commercial uses under the High Growth Alternative would likely require relatively greater effort to plan-check and inspect than under Current Trends. Increased population associated with future growth under the High Growth Alternative would also likely result in greater demands for general government services when compared with the Current Trends and Moderate Growth Alternatives.

**Mitigation Measures**

Increased government revenue from anticipated growth will at least partially offset the additional costs associated with associated expansion of general government services.
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Future growth and development within the City of Lynnwood under any of the land use alternatives would result in increased demand for general government services and increased costs to the City.
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