Final Environmental Impact Statement

GENERAL POLICY PLAN
CITY OF LYNNWOOD
July 18, 1994

Dear Reader and Interested Citizen:

On May 24, 1994, the City of Lynnwood issued a draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to evaluate the significant environmental impacts relating to the proposed Lynnwood General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan. The City is developing this plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A. The enclosed final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared in response to comments received relating to the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

The Comprehensive Plan is intended to guide future decisions and public investments relating to the natural and built environments of the City for the next 20 years. 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. Next year, the City will complete the third phase which will involve the adoption of new land development regulations and programs to implement the policies, goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

As part of the planning process, the City has developed three land use plan alternatives – Existing Trends (No Action), Moderate Growth and High Growth. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) examined the impacts that each plan alternative would have on the natural environment, transportation system, housing stock, capital facilities, utilities and parks. The EIS has been prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) of 1971 (RCW 43.21C).
Comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) were received from Tuesday, May 24, 1994 through Monday, June 27, 1994. During the comment period, there were two hearings to give the public the opportunity to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). All the comments received during this time are specifically addressed within the final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

Copies of the final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and the draft General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Plan are available for public review at the Lynnwood, Everett, Edmonds and Edmonds Community College libraries, the Planning Department, and City Hall. Please feel free to call us at 670-6645 if you have questions, wish to obtain copies of the above referenced documents, or have any additional comments.

Sincerely,

J. Robert Henderson, A.I.C.P.
Planning Director
FACT SHEET

Description of Proposal: The proposal includes the General Policy and Future Land Use Plans for the City of Lynnwood in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA) Chapter 36.70A. These plans represent the first phase of the Comprehensive Plan, which is intended to serve as a framework to guide future land use decisions and public investments over the next 20 years.

Alternatives: Three plan alternatives were analyzed in the EIS:

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 and transit. 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.

Lead Agency: City of Lynnwood Planning Department

Responsible Official: Environmental Review Committee

Bryant G. Harrison, A.I.C.P  
Jeff Elekes, P.E.  
C. William Evans  
A. John Anderson  
Asst. Planning Director  
Hydraulics Engineer  
Parks & Rec. Director  
Community Rep.

FEIS Contact Persons: Marc LaFerrier, Senior Planner at 670-6651  
Bryant Harrison, Asst. Planning Director at 670-6654

Permits & Approvals Required: Recommendation by Planning Commission and adoption by City Council

DEIS Issuance Date: Tuesday, May 24, 1994

Date Comments Due: Monday, June 27, 1994

FEIS Issuance Date: Monday, July 18 1994

Cost per Copy of FEIS: No Cost

Copies for Review Available at Local Libraries:

Lynnwood Library  
19200 44th Avenue West  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Edmonds Library  
250 5th N  
Edmonds, WA 98020

Everett Library  
2702 Hoyt  
Everett, WA 98201

Edmonds Community College Library  
20000 68th Avenue West  
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Further Review: This document represents a phased approach to environmental review under WAC 197-11-060 (5). Subsequent phases include: completion of the Comprehensive Plan containing more specific plans, projects and programs; new land development regulations and programs to implement the goals, polices and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.
Preferred Plan Alternative: July 25, City Council selects preferred plan alternative

Additional Hearings: Additional public hearings needed after completion and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan will be scheduled and notice provided.

Principal Authors and Contributors: Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc.
205 Lake Street S., Suite 202
Kirkland, WA 98033
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Comments & Responses on the Draft EIS
COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND RESPONSES

This section of the Final EIS presents comments received by the City relating to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and provides responses to those comments as required by the State Environmental Policy Act and the SEPA Rules. Comments were solicited and received in three ways: through a public hearing held May 24, 1994, specifically on the Draft EIS; through a public hearing held by the Planning Commission on June 16, 1994, regarding the draft Goals, Objectives and Policies of the General Policy Plan; and through written comments submitted to the City. The following pages contain minutes of the two public hearings and copies of each letter received during the Draft EIS comment period. Responses to EIS comments are provided on pages following each set of minutes and each letter.

The nature of responses provided in this Final EIS varies according to the nature of the comment being addressed. Comments identifying a need for more information on environmental impacts than is provided in the Draft EIS generally receive the most detailed and extensive responses. Comments pointing out a factual error or omission are generally addressed by acknowledging and incorporating the new or correct information. Comments addressing opinions about impacts or suggestions about the City’s comprehensive planning decisions, but not specifically suggesting an inadequacy or inaccuracy in the Draft EIS, are officially noted. All comments are incorporated into the Final EIS so they can be reviewed by the City Council and other decision-makers as they consider what actions to take regarding the General Policy Plan and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. This approach to comments and responses is in keeping with the purpose of an EIS: to provide accurate and thorough factual information on environmental impacts, to be considered along with other information and input as decisions are made (SEPA Rules WAC-197-11-448).
MINUTES of the May 24, 1994, DEIS Public Meeting held in the Council Chambers of the Lynnwood City Hall, 19100 - 44th Avenue West, Lynnwood, Washington, at 7:00 P.M.

Present:

Planning Department
   Bob Henderson, Plng. Director
   Bryant Harrison, Asst. Plng. Director
   Marc LaFerrier, Senior Planner
   Chris Jacques, Planning Technician

Public Works Department
   Loren Sand, Public Works Director
   Jeff Elekes, Project Manager
   Harry Dahm, Engr. Services Mgr.

Finance Department
   Bob Noack, Finance Officer

Lynnwood City Council
   Ned Daniels

Lynnwood Planning Commission
   Alison Sing

Huckell/Weinman Associates, Inc.
   Steve Lancaster

Presentation:

Asst. Plng. Director Bryant Harrison began with explaining the purpose of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) document. The DEIS is a tool used by a decision-making body to make more informed conclusions on a proposal.

Bryant Harrison continued with the upcoming timing for the DEIS document and means in which to submit comments. As the DEIS is issued today, a 30 day comment period ensues which expires on Thursday, June 23, 1994. Comments may be written (address on cover letter in DEIS) or oral. Comments are evaluated and necessary changes are made. Each comment is addressed and incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).
Bryant Harrison followed with the format and content of the document. The
document will analyze the impacts of the proposed plan alternatives on
identified elements of the natural and built environments. The analysis of each
identified element of the environment contains four parts: (1) existing conditions,
(2) significant impacts each alternative will have on the environment, (3)
mitigating measures which might avoid or minimize these impacts, (4)
unavoidable adverse impacts.

Senior Planner, Marc LaFerrier, continued the presentation with a description of
the existing conditions and the proposed plan alternatives. He explained that
the No Action/Existing Trends assumes the current adopted plan will continue to
affect future land use decisions based on existing trends. In an agreement with
the County, each jurisdiction must also analyze a High Growth Scenario. A
Moderate Growth scenario is the third plan alternative. The most important part
of the EIS is how each alternative will affect different portions of the City and
environment.

Marc LaFerrier continued with a description of some of the more distinguishing
components of the Moderate and High Growth plan alternatives. Only the
Moderate and High Growth Alternatives contain the 5 designated activity
centers.

With the Subregional Center, the idea is to preserve and enhance existing
neighborhoods while directing growth into areas with most potential for
development and areas with planned regional transit. The Edmonds Community
College activity center recognizes potential for expansion and tries to
create/continue land use patterns which complements the surrounding
residential character. The Highway 99 activity center works with design
standards to bring forth improvements to this commercial and transportation
corridor. The Park Central activity center around Scriber Lake/Wilcox Park
seeks an expansion of the park community center with stream restoration and
the possibility of a nature center and other improvements. Finally, the Civic
Center serves as a centrally located area to focus governmental and supporting
uses.

Marc LaFerrier continued with differences between the Moderate and High
Growth plan alternatives. Although similar, the High growth alternative
encourages and accommodates higher land use intensities and residential
densities within the Subregional Center. The accommodation of the
intensification and densification of the Subregional Center would depend on the
approval and construction of two regional transit stations. The mixed use
concept apparent in both plans, provides opportunities to conduct business,
shopping trips and live in the same area to cut down on vehicle trips. The High
Growth scenario provides for more intense and diverse land uses, whereas the
Moderate Growth favors a more office/commercial landscape.
Marc LaFerrier pointed out a statistical comparison of land use acreage between the Moderate Growth and the No Action alternatives. There was no comparison available for the High Growth scenario. There are opportunities for small-lot single family units in an effort to create smaller, more affordable units in areas close to existing Mobile Homes and apartments where densities are similar. Specifically, Marc acknowledged the Cedar Valley area as having some of the most diverse land uses in the City. The planning efforts try to create land use patterns which are compatible and complementary.

Steve Lancaster, Senior Associate with Huckell/Weinman Associates, INC. gave a brief look at some of the highlights contained in the draft EIS. With respect to water resources and plants and animals, the City’s Sensitive Areas Ordinance will be an important tool in helping to offset impacts to these areas. In addition, the planned expansion/addition of parks can provide habitats for animals thereby further reducing impacts.

Steve continued to report that the three alternatives will result in an increase in consumption of energy and petroleum. However, the Moderate and High growth scenarios may provide opportunities to conserve energy on a regional basis.

The acquisition and development of additional park land to meet deficits could create a challenge particularly in the High Growth Plan as the scarcity of remaining lands creates a competition among land uses.

All three plan alternatives will increase the traffic flow on Lynnwood’s streets. Even if Lynnwood does not experience any growth, traffic and vehicle miles traveled will still increase. Steve explained how much of the traffic traveling through Lynnwood has a source outside the city limits. The key to offsetting these impacts may rest with the following: (1) development of a comprehensive strategy for managing the City’s transportation needs, (2) physical expansion/widening of streets, (3) Investment and increasing reliance on public transit. The City could also focus on the "demand" side with encouragement of carpooling/HOV, Commute Trip Reduction (CTR), and land use patterns which enable/provide opportunities for persons to live near transit or employment centers.

Comment Period:

Verne Arnold, 15403 Ash Way, as Vice President of Alderwood Manor Heritage Association is concerned about historical/cultural resources. He was pleased that the DEIS addressed this topic. The association wanted to recommend that the Wicker Building (old interurban bldg.) be moved to the spot vacated by the State near the Masonic Temple and Manor Hardware Bldg.
Armand Chilelli, 17819 44th Avenue, wanted to make a point that from a builders’ perspective (him) government rules and regulations drive up housing prices and this is not fair to the younger generation. As an additional comment, he feels that 44th Avenue needs a center turning lane for safety.

Darryl Jensen, 7216 194th Pl. SW, asked why the City is going for high density and warned that if Seattle densities were adopted, then people squashed together would lead to undesirable impacts like crime. He felt the City’s approach was like leading the cart before the horse. That is, transportation network ought to be improved first, then growth would take a natural course.

Marc LaFerrier explained that the planning process wouldn’t propose land uses without considering the impacts on roads and other capital facilities but that there would still be some unavoidable impacts from growth.

George Heinrich, 19918 Locust Way, asked if the adopted plan would ever be revisited. He also felt that high density would change the character of the community. He felt that the most pertinent thing to do would be to take a more reasonable approach - let things continue as they are. He felt that more valuable land will change taxes which will change character.

Bob Henderson wanted to clarify to the public that the City is not pushing a High Growth plan. No Alternative has been selected at this time.

Bryant Harrison added that the process is not over. He reiterated what an EIS is and how is used. If someone feels that something is left out in the analysis then it needs to be commented upon.

Marc LaFerrier reviewed the phased approach the City is taking.

Ann Hoheisel, 20029 68th Ave W. was pleased that the EIS and planning efforts show how things should be built and that uses complement each other.

Councilmember Ned Daniels explained the process by which population figures were given by OFM and reallocated to the Cities by the County. He followed that the comprehensive plan should be a living document, but not one that is changed continually.

Meeting ended at 8:20
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS MADE AT MAY 24, 1994 PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Comments of Verne Arnold

Comments noted.

Comments of Armand Chilelli

Comments noted.

Comments of Daryl Jensen

Comments noted. No decision has yet been made regarding density. State planning requirements under the Growth Management Act and subsequent regional planning decisions have emphasized increasing densities within existing urban areas as a key measure to reducing the inefficiencies and environmental impacts of sprawl. The Draft EIS evaluates the environmental impacts of two alternatives that would result in higher densities in Lynnwood than current plans would allow. This information will be considered, along with public input, legal considerations and other issues, as the City makes its decisions regarding future land use and development.

Comments of George Heinrich

Comments noted. The draft General Policy Plan (GPP) would allow for annual evaluation and action on Comprehensive Plan amendments, and calls for a comprehensive review and revision of the Plan every five years (GPP Land Use Policies 1.4 and 1.5). State law provides that a comprehensive plan may be amended no more often than once a year.

Comments of Ann Hoheisel

Comments noted.
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 16, 1994

CALL TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M.

CHAIRMAN SING
COMMISSIONER FERGUSON
COMMISSIONER HUDSON
COMMISSIONER REYNOLDS
COMMISSIONER SILSBEE
COMMISSIONER SMITH
COMMISSIONER STANTON-MASTEN

PLANNING DIRECTOR HENDERSON
PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR SAND
FINANCE OFFICER NOACK
PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR EVANS
SENIOR PLANNER EASTIN
SENIOR PLANNER LAFERIER
SENIOR PLANNER WOODS
SENIOR PLANNER CONNER
ENGR. SERVICES MANAGER DAHM

APPROVAL OR CORRECTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 9, 1994, MEETING.

Chairman Sing, seconded by Commissioner Hudson, moved to approve the minutes of the June 9, 1994, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Sing gave a brief history of the Growth Management Act and its requirements.

ITEM NO. 1 — PUBLIC HEARING: FUTURE PLANS AND POLICIES - GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

Sr. Planner LaFerier made the presentation, stating that the subject of discussion is the Draft Goals, Objectives and Policies for the General Policy Plan. He listed the five elements of the Comprehensive Plan (Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Capital Facilities and Energy and Telecommunication Utilities, with Parks, Recreation and Open Space included as an optional element) and outlined significant proposals for each element. He presented maps of alternative land use proposals (High Growth, Moderate Growth, No Action and General).

PUBLIC HEARING:

Tom Stephens, PO Box 716, Lynnwood, presented the Commissioners with a statement concerning proposed changes of land use between 55th and 56th and bordered on the north by 206th and south by 208th, from light industrial to medium density housing; and land located at 20621 52nd from Light Industrial to Business Technical, under both Moderate and High Growth Alternatives. The property is owned by Connelly Skis, Inc. and was purchased for expansion of that facility. The changes would make these properties nonconforming.

Larry Ingraham, 8625 Evergreen Way S., #104, Everett, spoke in agreement with Mr. Stephens. He feels the Draft Environmental Impact Statement presents changes that are of concern and that there should be adequate opportunity for input from residents. He gave specific examples of his concerns.

Mike Hatch, 6515 202nd SW, Lynnwood, Director of Work Opportunities, spoke in defense of Mr. Stephens’ position. He said that Connelly Skis, Inc. has a commitment to improve the quality of life in the community.
George Nickle, 1615 143rd Place SE, Mill Creek, who is presently applying for a rezone for property on Cedar Valley Road, felt that light industrial property will not be able to expand much longer if more multi-family is allowed.

Keith F. Oles, 18304 68th Avenue West, Lynnwood, professor of geology and homeowner in the City, felt that the No Action alternative should be called the Low Growth alternative, and that term "Alternative" should be replaced with "Growth Plans." He stated that the City should be concerned with its present problems, such as Highway 99 appearance, traffic congestion, and yard clean-up.

Jess Randall Cary, 19210 43rd S.E., Bothell, was concerned that if property zoned Light Industrial is changed to residential, many small businesses would become nonconforming uses.

Jim Markezenis, 18826 Fremont North, Seattle, owner of property at the northeast corner of 168th and 48th, stated he would like to see the present zoning of the property, multiple family, changed to commercial.

Bob Otis, 9009 West Mall Drive, Everett, realtor for Mr. Markezenis, spoke in support of rezoning the property to commercial.

Denis Murphy, 5804 168th S.W., Lynnwood, said he was disappointed in the Commission's conduct in not starting meetings for public input earlier. He felt the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was not specific enough regarding parks, woodlands, wetlands and open space. He expressed concern about crowded arterials and on-street parking.

Edward Carroll, 18215 71st Avenue West, Lynnwood, was also concerned about traffic congestion and would like to see either no growth or low growth alternatives.

As no one else wished to speak, Chairman Sing closed the public hearing.

Chairman Sing recessed the meeting at 9:20 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Sing expressed appreciation for the public's involvement and comments.

Commissioner Silsbee felt the Commission should postpone or continue the hearing to allow staff to address the public's comments.

Commissioner Stanton-Masten said she concurred with Commissioner Silsbee and that staff should address the impacts of dealing with more industrial demands.

Commissioner Hudson stated he would like a list of comments from the public speaking at this meeting, questions and comments on the draft Goals, Objectives and Policies, and cost of the implementation of the Plan, and would also like to have the meeting continued.

Commissioner Smith concurred with Commissioner Hudson and would like to see staff addressing specific concerns.

Commissioner Reynolds agreed that the meeting should be postponed and that Mr. Murphy is right about not enough public involvement.

Commissioner Ferguson said she felt the meeting should be postponed.
MOTION:

Commissioner Silsbee, seconded by Commissioner Stanton-Masten, moved to continue the public hearing for Future Plans and Policies - Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan, to Thursday, July 14, 1994. Motion passed unanimously.

The Commissioners and staff agreed that they would hold a work session on Thursday, June 30, 1994, at 7:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

ALISON SING  (PW)
Chairman
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS MADE AT JUNE 16, 1994 PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE GENERAL POLICY PLAN

Comments of Tom Stephens

Comments noted. See also written comments of Thomas Stephens (Connelly Skis, Inc.) and response, below.

Larry Ingraham

Comments noted. Please see the Fact Sheet contained in this Final EIS for additional public hearings to be held on the General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Map. Additional hearings will also be scheduled for subsequent phases of the City's comprehensive planning program (see Cover Memo).

Mike Hatch

Comments noted.

George Nickle

Comments noted.

Keith F. Oles

Comments noted. Use of the terms "no action" and "alternative" is consistent with the terminology for environmental review established by the State Environmental Policy Act and the SEPA Rules.

Jess Randall Carey

Comments noted.

Jim Marceznis

Comments noted.
Bob Otis

Comments noted.

Denis Murphy

As described at page 24 of the Draft EIS, the City has been actively soliciting public input as it has developed its comprehensive planning program. A city-wide mail survey on planning issues was conducted in September, 1991. The City held a community-wide meeting in December, 1991, for which invitations were mailed to all households and businesses. A series of neighborhood meetings was held in February and March of 1992, and was repeated in June of 1993 and again in June of 1994. Two public hearings have been held on the Draft EIS. A number of citizen groups have been actively involved in various elements of Lynnwood's comprehensive planning program. These include the Highway 99 Task Force, the Environmentally Sensitive Areas Committee and the Lynnwood Legacy Planning Committee (see pages 22-24 of the DEIS). Additional citizen input has been obtained through periodic park and recreation intercept and telephone surveys. Input provided by citizens through these surveys, committees, hearings and meetings has been used to develop the land use alternatives and draft planning goals, objectives and policies currently being considered by the City.

The level of detail and specificity with which the Draft EIS discusses parks, woodlands, wetlands and open spaces is appropriate to a non-project EIS under the requirements of the SEPA Rules (see WAC 197-11-442). Specific park and open space sites may be identified by the Lynnwood Park and Recreation Plan that will be completed as part of the second phase of Lynnwood's comprehensive planning program.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on traffic were evaluated by the Draft EIS at pages 107-118. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS.

Edward Carroll

Comments noted.
June 23, 1994

CITY OF LYNNWOOD
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
19100 44th Avenue
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Washington 98046-5008

RE: DRAFT EIS GENERAL POLICY PLAN

Dear ERC Committee Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and provide input on the Draft EIS. My comments are from the perspective of one who does business in Lynnwood as a property owner, commercial real estate broker and builder/renovator of office, retail and business park buildings. Having been here since kindergarten, I still vividly recall the dreaded mandatory nap time in Mrs. Coble's kindergarten class at Alderwood Manor School, which became the district's administrative headquarters prior to demolition several years ago. I also remember Mr. Coble, her husband, being a fair man with a tough job when he was my principal at Lynnwood Junior High (now Scriber Lake High School). During the past four decades, I have seen many changes in the Lynnwood area.

The Draft EIS for the General Policy Plan addresses many more potential changes, some of which, when taken to logical conclusion are of real concern. You have heard testimony from Mr. Tom Stephens of Connelly Skis who is very concerned with legitimate cause. I echo his concerns and proposed solutions for the two Lynnwood sites owned by Connelly.

You are being asked to recommend to the City Council one of three alternatives or combinations thereof. Each alternative establishes general land uses for specific areas and in some cases for specific sites. Later during the Implementation Phase specific zoning regulations will be created that cover each parcel in Lynnwood. It is these regulations, related standards and policies that will dictate exactly what can be built, how it can be used, and what existing uses and buildings will become nonconforming. Assurances are needed that the staff and Planning Commission and City Council will each provide liberal opportunity for input from property owners and their consultants on the precise zoning standards, regulations and language. Assurances are needed that staff, appointed and elected officials will exhibit flexibility and a cooperative receptive spirit willing to accommodate specific concerns now raised and that such attitudes will be present through the entire process.

Early on you must be made aware that creating nonconforming properties and uses is not a fair or appropriate methodology to use in this process. Such a designation creates very real problems for property owners and businesses. Nonconforming, sounds innocuous, but such a designation creates
feel welcome in Lynnwood. Make ample provisions for them as demand is much greater than the recently annexed area east of I-5 on 196th St. SW will accommodate.

3. Future annexations? How will this process work and how will land use designations be determined. Have potentially impacted property owners been made aware of what the process will be?

4. Does the Draft EIS address job loss and the related economic impact of discouraging existing employers from continuing to do business in Lynnwood? There are many southern California communities and citizens wondering today what happened to their economic vitality and well being. When regulations, zoning and "General Policy Plans", etc. chase away employment we are in serious trouble. Such actions are in direct conflict with Lynnwood's stated objectives and results of completing this process.

In conclusion, please address these specific site concerns and provide assurances that between now and when the actual new zoning code becomes operative that these and the concerns of others can be resolved. The opportunity to work with you and the staff in coming up with acceptable solutions would be welcomed.

Sincerely,

HARMON AND ASSOCIATES REAL ESTATE, INC.

Larry W. Ingraham, CCIM
President

cc: J. Robert Henderson, A.I.C.P. Planning Director
   Alison W. Sing, Chairman Planning Commission
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF HARMON AND ASSOCIATES REAL ESTATE, INC. (LARRY W. INGRAHAM, CCIM)

1. Comments noted. The City intends to provide ample opportunity for public input during the development and consideration of ordinances and regulations needed to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

2. Specific permitted uses and nonconforming use restrictions under the various land use categories will be determined through zoning decisions to be made as part of phase three of the City's comprehensive planning program (see cover memo in this Final EIS). All land use alternatives have been revised to limit Institutional (I) designations to public and semi-public properties.

Please refer to the response to comments by Connelly Skis, Inc. (Thomas J. Stephens) and responses to comments by Wayne Hanzel, below, for information related to the Connelly Skis site.

Development standards will be established as part of the third phase of Lynnwood's comprehensive planning program. Specific requirement relating to parking and conditional uses will also be established at that time.

3. Comments noted. A policy calling for the establishment of special planning areas to accommodate large retail stores or groups of stores (such as high volume discount stores) has been included in the draft General Policy Plan (GPP Land Use Policy 10.5). In addition, it is intended that such large retail stores would generally be accommodated by the Regional Commercial (RC) land use designation.

4. The issue of future annexation areas is being pursued in cooperation with Snohomish County and the cities of southwest Snohomish County through the Growth Management Coordinating Committee (GMCC). This group is currently working on proposals relating to land use and annexation for the unincorporated areas of southwest Snohomish County. These proposals could ultimately be incorporated into the comprehensive plans of the County and cities, but only after appropriate opportunities for public review and involvement.

In the interim, Lynnwood continues to consider proposals for annexation on a case-by-case basis. Annexation is governed by state law which requires property owner and general public notification and hearings for specific annexation proposals. Snohomish County's Comprehensive Plan and subarea plans for the Paine Field and Alderwood areas are consulted when the City makes land use decisions relating to annexing areas.

Lynnwood has made special efforts to involve residents and owners of property near the City's current boundaries in the comprehensive planning process. These
efforts included special mailed invitations to the first City-wide and neighborhood planning meetings. All who attended these meetings received notification of subsequent planning meetings. The City has also conducted planning meetings specifically targeted for owners and residents of property in the unincorporated area near Lynnwood.

5. The Draft EIS generally assesses the employment effects of the three land use alternatives by estimating the number of jobs that could be accommodated by each (see Table 14 and pages 90 - 93, DEIS). The Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives would accommodate significantly more jobs on a city-wide basis than would continued growth under existing plans and regulations (Current Trends/No Action alternative). However, the Draft EIS did not evaluate potential impacts to specific existing employers. This type of economic analysis is not normally within the scope of an EIS (see SEPA Rules, WAC 197-11-448). An EIS is to evaluate environmental impacts, which are to be considered along with other issues (such as economic or social impacts) when government decisions are made. The fact that the EIS does not analyze the impacts of lost wages or related economic impacts does not mean these are not important issues. These issues will be considered by the Lynnwood City Council, along with environmental, legal and other factors, in its decision-making.

6. Comments noted.
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF WASHINGTON STATE DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION (LAWRENCE D. FRANK, PhD)

1. Comments noted.

2. The draft General Policy Plan (GPP) would not establish a specific transportation level-of-service standard, but would establish general guidelines for the development and use of an appropriate standard (GPP Transportation Objective 3 and related policies). Draft Transportation policies specifically calls for coordination of level-of-service standards with other agencies. Draft Transportation Policy 11.4 calls for cooperation with WSDOT in the planning, development and management of state routes. The City of Lynnwood recognizes the importance of working with WSDOT and other agencies to ensure consistency among transportation standards and programs.

3. Comments noted.

4. Comments noted.

5. The City has not developed mode split forecasts for specific transportation facilities. For the analysis of land use alternatives contained in the Draft EIS, a community-wide average mode split forecast was used (see item 15, response to Snohomish County). This issue will be addressed by the Transportation Element to be developed and adopted as part of the second phase of Lynnwood’s growth management comprehensive planning program.

The draft General Policy Plan would establish a number of objectives and policies intended to reduce reliance on single occupant vehicles (SOVs) and enhance the viability of non-SOV transportation options (see, for example, GPP Transportation Objectives 5, 6 and 8, and related policies). These and other transportation demand strategies will be further developed by the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

6. Comments noted.

7. Comments noted. The Draft EIS acknowledges that the High Growth alternative may not be feasible in the absence of high capacity transit service to the community (DEIS page 44). Regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, the City intends to further develop strategies to increase transit usage and non-motorized access as it develops the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

8. Comments noted.
Table 22

School District Enrollment and Capacity, October 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>12,318</td>
<td>11,704</td>
<td>11,614</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>5,830</td>
<td>5,463</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>21,448</td>
<td>20,091</td>
<td>20,269</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We recommend the following corrections to Figure 16:

a) Add the Educational Services Center (20420 68th Ave. W.)
b) Add District Maintenance and Transportation Center (3009 Alderwood Mall Blvd.)
c) Change the icon for Scriber Lake High School from middle school as shown to high school
d) Delete the two elementary school icons shown to be near 176th Street Southwest

Alderwood Middle School is not currently within the boundaries of the City of Lynnwood (boundary is at the school's north property line), however, it is able to be located on Figure 16 should you desire. The school's address is 20000 28th Avenue West, Lynnwood.

Within the section planned growth the following changes should be made:

a) The District has funding for the construction of a new 1600 student high school (Edmonds-Woodway), remodel of Meadowdale High School and expansion from the current 1200 student capacity to 1600 students, and the remodel of Seaview Elementary School with no additional student capacity.
b) The funds for the above school projects are possible thanks to funding approved by the voters in February 1994.

c) The District does not operate any junior high schools but does have four middle schools (also please note Table 24).

Within the section School Impact Mitigation mention is made to the fact that the District is also preparing a model school impact fee ordinance. Also, please note that the District's CFP assumes the enactment of such an ordinance as noted in the financing portion of same report. It is anticipated that the District's CFP will be updated biannually and not annually.

If you have any questions or comments please do not hesitate to contact me. The District appreciates the opportunity to comment on this most important work and welcomes continued collaboration with the City of Lynnwood. We further appreciate the City's attention to the needs of the students attending our public schools and request that those needs are considered in the continued development of the City.

Sincerely,

Bret M. Carlsted
Planning and Property Manager

cc: Brian Benzel, Superintendent
    Mike Warden, Executive Director
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF EDMONDS SCHOOL DISTRICT (BRET M. CARLSTAD)

1. Comments noted. The "Open Space" designation of portions of these school properties is intended to recognize the important role they play in helping to meet the open space and recreation needs of the community. These designations also recognizes the City and School District partnership in funding the construction, operation and maintenance of competitive level athletic fields at Lynnwood High School and the Meadowdale Playfields. As noted by the School District, these designations could cause difficulty for the District if currently open areas are proposed for intensive development in the future. Under either the Moderate Growth or High Growth alternative, such development could not occur without City Council approval of a comprehensive plan amendment. Under the Growth Management Act, such amendments may occur only once a year.

2. The Scriber Lake High School site would be located within the Park Central Activity Center under either the Moderate Growth or High Growth alternative as currently configured (see Figures 6 and 7, DEIS). This is not necessarily inconsistent with the continued use of the Scriber Lake High School site as an education center. Land Use Objective 14 of the draft General Policy Plan (GPP) specifically recognizes that this Activity Center will include a mixture of high quality cultural, educational and recreational activities and facilities. It is intended that a master plan be developed for the Park Central Activity Center in cooperation with the School District and others (GPP Land Use Policies 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3).

3. The School District's Maintenance and Transportation Center falls within the Planned Commercial Development classification of the current Comprehensive Plan, and is currently zoned BTP Business Technical Park. The Maintenance and Transportation Center is allowed as a conditional use within the BTP district. This situation would remain unchanged under the Current Trends (No Action) alternative.
EXISITNG
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Figure 16
Under the Moderate Growth Alternative, portions of the Maintenance and Transportation Center site would be designated Public Facilities (Institutional), Regional Commercial and Office Commercial. Zoning and other development regulations adopted later to implement the comprehensive plan would determine specific uses allowed within these designations. Based on the descriptions of the Regional Commercial and Office Commercial designations within the draft General Policy Plan (GPP Land Use Policy 3.2), it seems unlikely that the Maintenance and Transportation Center would be an allowable use in these areas under zoning regulations to be developed. Zoning regulations implementing the Public Facilities designation could allow such facilities as the Maintenance and Transportation Center. However, since this area has been identified as a desirable location for a future regional transit center, discussions between the City and the School District regarding this area should continue if the Moderate Growth alternative is pursued.

Under the High Growth alternative, portions of the Maintenance and Transportation Center site would be designated Public Facilities, Office Commercial and Mixed Use. The same potential limitations could exist under this alternative as under the Moderate Growth alternative.

4. Comment noted.

5. These clarifications are acknowledged and hereby incorporated into the Final EIS.

6. The corrected Table 22 included in the Edmonds School District's comment letter is acknowledged and is hereby incorporated into the Final EIS. The fourth paragraph on page 124 of the Draft EIS is hereby revised to read as follows:

"School capacities, based on October 1993 enrollment, are shown in Table 22. Elementary schools are currently operating at 94 percent of capacity, middle schools at 93 percent of capacity, and high schools at 96 percent of capacity. Capacities are based on an average class size of 25 students."

7. A corrected Figure 16 is presented on the following page, and is hereby incorporated into the Final EIS.

8. These clarifications and corrections are acknowledged and hereby incorporated into the Final EIS.

9. Comments noted.

---

1The draft General Policy Plan uses the new term "Public Facilities" in place of the "Institutional" designation used in the Draft EIS.
June 23, 1994

To: City of Lynnwood Environmental Review Committee
    19100 44th Avenue West
    PO Box 5008
    Lynnwood, WA 98046-5008

I am pleased to see that on the two growth alternatives my tri-angular
shaped acre on the Cedar Valley Road has been planned for office use and
conforms to the use to the north.

I am concerned about the vast reduction of Light Industrial Zoning in the
growth alternatives plan. While I agree with the idea of more Multi-
Family Zoning. It should not be at the expense of, or mixed with existing
Light Industrial.

Phasing out the Light Industrial is unfair to those who have built their
business in Lynnwood and wish to stay and grow with the city. On the
other hand wedging Multi-Family into and around existing industrial is not
conducive to the quiet enjoyment of a persons home.

Sincerely,

George M. Nickle
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF GEORGE M. NICKLE

Comments noted. As indicated by Table 2 at pages 36-38 of the Draft EIS, about 199 acres of land would be designated Light Industrial under the Current Trends (No Action) alternative, while approximately 62 acres would be designated Light Industrial under the Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives.
June 23, 1994

Mr. J. Robert Henderson, Director
Department of Planning
City of Lynnwood
19100 44th Avenue W.
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, WA 98046-5008

Subject: Comments on the City of Lynnwood Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the City General Policy Plan

Dear Bob:

The Snohomish County Planning Department appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the City of Lynnwood’s DEIS for its General Policy Plan. We look forward to conducting a more thorough review of the City’s Draft General Policy Plan once it is complete. In general, the City’s phased approach to Comprehensive Planning parallels the County’s process and it will be helpful to continue coordination of Lynnwood’s Phase II planning processes with the County’s Phase II UGA planning process for the Southwest.

The Planning Department’s comments are broken down by issue area. We hope that the specific suggestions contained within the body of this letter are viewed as constructive and addressed in a cooperative spirit.

General Comments:

There is some confusion as to whether or not the DEIS is also intended to be the City’s Draft General Policy Plan. Public hearing notices allude to this as does the Fact Sheet within the introduction to the DEIS. However, the actual title of the document and text within the DEIS suggest that the DEIS is being used as a scoping document to aid in development of the General Policy Plan and that the two documents will be separate. If this is not the case, and the General Policy Plan is to be contained within the DEIS, it would be helpful to specifically label and centrally organize the sections considered part of the plan. Also, if the full extent of the City’s Phase I General Policy Plan is already contained within the DEIS, the detail seems to be incomplete. Specifically, the document is missing specific policies, explanatory text and required technical information. Believing this not to be the case, we anticipate that the City will be refining its General Policy Plan and releasing it for public review within the remainder of its Phase I planning process.

While analyzing localized environmental impacts is an essential component and purpose of the City’s DEIS, all impacts related to the City’s three growth alternatives also need to be analyzed from a regional perspective. The EIS should provide more focused analysis of the regional environmental impacts implied by the three growth alternative scenarios.
Land Use Alternatives:

We applaud the land use designations developed for the Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives. They are well defined and an excellent revision of the existing designations presented in the No Action alternative. For the proposed residential designations it would be helpful if a minimum or range of densities was provided for each category.

It appears that neither the High Growth or the Moderate Growth land use alternatives assume any residential development potential for commercially designated areas within proposed centers. It is also unclear as to whether or not this will be allowed as part of the proposed Activity Center Overlay. While both alternatives have a mixed use designation it appears to be limited in scope, especially for the Moderate Growth alternative. To better meet the SCT Population and Employment forecasts the City might consider promotion of mixed use development within a greater percentage of all of its proposed center areas especially near proposed transit stations, the Community College and Civic Center areas. Land use policies allowing for and encouraging mixed use development are also suggested.

While the population density of 60 dwelling units/acre, represented as MF3 in the High Growth alternative, may be appropriate for some areas within the Subregional Center, the extent to which it is proposed may be excessive when viewed in the context of the overall character and quality of growth described in the Lynnwood Legacy Plan. To better accommodate the SCT Population and Employment forecasts within the High Growth alternative, we suggest the City look at other methods which would preserve the overall character of existing residential areas while promoting a greater variety of housing types and opportunities (consistent with Land Use Objective 3 and Housing Objective 2). Some of these methods might include: 1) establishing minimum allowable densities for the proposed residential land use designations on pg. 26; 2) slightly increasing the average residential densities within the SF1 and SF2 designations and allowing smaller lot single family residential, duplexes, and triplexes and accessory dwelling units; 3) allowing for residential infill development at SF2 densities within SF1 designated areas; 4) increasing the amount of mixed use and higher density residential development within commercially and residential designated areas especially near the Edmonds Community College, along Highway 99 and in the Civic Center Area; 5) providing for densities between 20 to 60 units per acre with a maximum density defined by various floor area ratio limitations differing between centers areas; 6) allowing for residential density bonuses if a residential project provides for certain amenities (e.g. open space/plaza) or affordable housing types (this concept is possibly addressed by the proposed Activity Center Overlay designation).

Proposed Centers:

Land Use Objectives 13 through 16, while providing for a general centers concept, seem to lack the necessary direction related to desirable size, density, intensity, scale and mix of uses that will be used to guide development and land use designations in the areas. Specific land use, transportation, and urban design criteria consistent with the adopted the SCT Urban Centers paper and the notion of enhancing transit and pedestrian compatibility would be helpful in describing what is being planned within the City’s proposed centers.

Consistent with ideas developed within the proposed Highway 99 Streetscape Improvements Guidelines, Land Use Objective 12 might be reworded or expanded to address the concept of nodal development along Highway 99.

The ability of local agencies to prioritize redevelopment of and facilitate capital improvements within proposed centers area may be a key factor in ensuring the ability of proposed centers areas to accommodate projected population and employment growth. As such, Capital
Facilities Objective 5 might be further strengthened by adding the following: "Identify and prioritize capital facility improvements...".

**Land Use, Population and Employment:**

Given both the importance of and necessity for interjurisdictional coordination related to SCT population and employment forecasting and UGA planning, it would be worthwhile if the City developed a land use objective related to the City’s commitment to participate in the the SCT Population and Employment Reconciliation and UGA planning process.

To better facilitate coordination between the City and County in the development of land use plans for the County’s unincorporated area it would be helpful to know which unincorporated areas the City has included within its ultimate planning area (future extent of annexation) and what type of land use it generally anticipates for those areas. A map showing the scope of the City’s planning area and proposed land use designations would be helpful.

**Housing:**

In Table 12 (pg. 92), it seems apparent that most of the City’s population growth under the Moderate and especially the High Growth alternatives, will be accommodated within multi-family residential developments. In fact, it appears that the Moderate and High Growth alternatives have plans for only 100 single family units more than the Current Trends Alternative. The allocations within this table seem to be inconsistent with the notion of promoting a diversity of housing types (consistent with Land Use Objective 3 and Housing Objective 2). However, it is also unclear whether townhouses and the intermediate densities proposed under the SF2 designation within the Moderate and High Growth alternatives are being considered single or multi-family in this table. While centers development will result in a greater percentage of mixed use and multi-family housing types, we also encourage the City to consider providing a greater diversity of single family housing types at higher densities such as townhouses, smaller lot single family houses, accessory dwellings, duplexes and tripilxes.

**Parks, Recreation and Open Space:**

The Planning Department is impressed with the ambitious parks level of service standard (10 acres/1000 people) being proposed by the City which are well above existing National and City standards. It would be useful for the City’s Parks, Recreation and Open Space Objectives to specifically address the need to connect trails and parks to community trails and parks outside the City (Objective 8) and to coordinate the City’s parks planning efforts with the 1993 Countywide Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan (Objective 10).

In addition to connecting trails and park areas between the City and other jurisdictions the notion of linking wildlife corridors in order to avoid habitat fragmentation (as discussed in the Plants and Animals section of the DEIS) should be mentioned in the form of an objective.

Lastly, the City might consider the need to develop a greenbelt of open space areas (referred to in supplemental County-wide Planning Policy OS-2), landmarks and entryways to better define the City boundaries.
Natural Environment:

To provide a policy basis for the City’s adopted Sensitive Areas Ordinance (SAO), stormwater design/planning regulations and SEPA review, the City might consider the addition of a goal, objectives and policies specifically relating to the natural environment issues and GMA critical areas.

Air Quality:

The evaluation of the alternatives’ impacts on air quality includes the following statement (pg. 55): “Air quality impacts associated with fireplace smoke would likely be much higher under the High Growth Alternative than under either of the other alternatives.” This conclusion is based on the higher number of total dwelling units under this alternative. However, the primary difference between the High and Moderate Growth alternatives is in the number of high density multi-family units, and since these types of units are generally not equipped with wood-burning fireplaces, the impacts of these two alternatives should be similar in this instance. The potential regional effects are not mentioned here, as they are in the energy section. Higher density development in Lynnwood rather than more sprawling patterns of growth in outlying areas may actually reduce the overall number of wood-burning appliances.

Transportation:

The DEIS does not clearly state what level of service (LOS) standard the City is using for its impact analysis. This would be helpful since the DEIS does show LOS calculations for selected City intersections for each of its growth alternatives. Based upon the City’s proposed LOS standard, the DEIS should also show future capacity needs along with costs and a financial strategy for addressing those needs.

The arterial transportation system shown on Figure 13 (pg. 108) differs from the currently adopted County arterial plan. Coordinating between the County and City arterial systems as detailed transportation plans are developed is a primary concern of the County. As such, it would be helpful for the County to know the City’s basis for the arterial system shown on Figure 13. Also, the arterials located in the unincorporated area should be consistent with the County’s arterial plan.

On pg. 112, what is the basis for assumptions regarding non-single occupant vehicle increases and transit mode share increases for each of the growth alternatives? Are these assumptions based on Puget Sound Regional Council forecasts?

On pg. 114, it is unclear which employment forecasts are used for the transportation analysis and also if the forecasts used for the analysis are the same as those shown in Table 3 (pg. 39). If the agreed upon SCT targets for population and employment were not used it would be important to note the reasons why.

In light of the limited variability between the principal arterial intersection LOS in relation to the three growth alternatives (pg. 114 and Table 20), it may be useful to examine the LOS along the minor arterials as well. Also, on pg. 116, why did the City chose to use the generalized intersection capacity shown in Table 20 rather than intersection delay as its LOS measurement? Utilizing intersection delay, as measured by the Highway Capacity Manual, would generate a more sensitive result.
On pg. 117, while it is true that congestion can cause problems for bicycling as an alternative to the automobile, congestion can also make bicycling more attractive if bicycle routes are provided in less congested areas.

Public Services and Utilities:

The analysis of stormwater drainage impacts (pps. 142-44) does not adequately address the variable impacts that might be expected from the three growth alternatives. Within an urban or highly developed suburban context like Lynnwood, changing the land use intensity may not have a significant impact on stormwater run-off. For example, the effect of increasing densities from 20 to 60 du/acre over a given acreage, the primary difference between the Moderate Growth and the High Growth alternatives, could be expected to have a negligible effect on the stormwater from that area, although the population-holding capacity is tripled. The net impact on a regional basis may, in fact, be positive since fewer lower-density units would be required from outlying land now in rural or resource use.

Urban Design:

The Aesthetics, Light and Glare section of the DEIS emphasizes the need for urban design policies, standards and guidelines within the City’s General Policy Plan. The Planning Department also recommends that the City consider the addition of an Urban Design Goal, Objectives and Policies to its General Policy Plan drawing from the Lynnwood Legacy Project, the Highway 99 streetscape Guidelines, the Residential Development Handbook for Snohomish County Communities and the Sno-Tran Guide to Land Use and Transportation.

Conclusion:

We hope our comments are constructive and useful to your planning effort. We also look forward to continuing to work with you towards adoption and implementation of your plan.

Sincerely,

Stephen Holt
Planning Director

cc: Karen Miller, Councilmember District #4
    Al Schwepppe, Councilmember District #3
    Joni Earl, Deputy County Executive
    Dennis Derickson, Principal Planner
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY PLANNING (STEPHEN HOLT)

1. The Draft EIS is not intended to be the City's general policy plan. The Draft EIS was prepared to evaluate the land use alternatives and the basic policy goals and objectives being considered as the foundation of the City's ongoing comprehensive planning process (these are described at pages 25 through 46 of the DEIS). The Draft EIS and comments received from agencies and individuals have been used to help further develop and refine the alternatives and goals, and to develop more detailed land use, housing, transportation, public facility, utility and parks/recreation/open space policies. This has resulted in the issuance of a draft General Policy Plan that is now available from the City. For further information on the phased approach to comprehensive plan development being undertaken by the City of Lynnwood, please see Integrating SEPA and the Comprehensive Planning Process at pages 24 - 25 of the Draft EIS.

2. It is difficult to respond to a general concern about regional environmental impacts absent identification of specific areas of concern. The Draft EIS does discuss regional impacts on air quality (page 52), energy resources (page 66), regional planning (pages 71-76), population (page 90), employment growth (page 93), and other elements of the environment. Please see also the responses to comments number 11 and 19, below, regarding regional air quality and stormwater impacts.

   It should also be noted that the Lynnwood comprehensive plan is being developed within the context of a regional planning program. To the extent that the General Policy Plan is consistent with Vision 2020 and the Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County (see DEIS pages 71-76), environmental documents prepared for those efforts can be consulted for a better understanding of regional context and impacts.

3. Comment noted. Minimum densities may be considered in the next phase of comprehensive planning.

4. Comments noted. Policies clarifying the City's intention with regard to residential and mixed use development within activity centers have been included in the draft General Policy Plan. Residential development would be encouraged within the Subregional Center, the Highway 99 Corridor Activity Center and the Community College Activity Center (GPP Objectives 5, 10 and 11 and Policies 5.1, 5.2, 10.6, 11.2, 11.4, 11.11 and 12.8). Within these Activity Centers, residential development could occur in conjunction with Office Commercial or Regional Commercial development (GPP Policy 3.3).
5. Comments noted. Please note that the numbers used to identify objectives in the Draft EIS have been altered as goals, objectives and policies were refined and developed for the draft General Policy Plan.

6. Comments noted. The general centers concept described in the Draft EIS has been refined through development of the draft General Policy Plan. Please see GPP Land Use Objectives 10 through 14 and related policies.

7. The City of Lynnwood has not designated an ultimate planning area or identified areas for future annexation during this first phase of comprehensive plan development. The City is working in cooperation with Snohomish County and the cities of southwest Snohomish County to develop proposals for the unincorporated area, through the Growth Management Coordinating Committee (GMCC). (Please see GPP Land Use Objective 17 and related policies.) The City anticipates considering these proposals for incorporation into its comprehensive plan once they are developed. In the interim, the City will continue to consult the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and the Alderwood and Paine Field subarea plans for land use guidance as it considers specific annexation requests.

8. The term "single-family," as used in Table 12 and throughout the Draft EIS, refers to traditional detached dwelling units on individual lots and duplexes. Other forms of attached housing are included under the term "multi-family." The housing diversity supported by the General Policy Plan may not be evident from these broad categorizations. However, the draft General Policy Plan includes policies supporting housing diversity (GPP Housing Policy 2.1) and regulations and incentives that may include density bonuses, cluster housing, zero-lot-line housing, accessory housing units and revised development standards to promote housing affordability (GPP Housing Policy 2.4). These policies will be further refined and developed in the second phase of Lynnwood's comprehensive planning program.

As indicated by Table 13 at page 92 of the Draft EIS, housing would be less diverse under the High Growth Alternative than under the Moderate Growth or Current Trends alternatives. This is due largely to the lack of undeveloped residential land in Lynnwood (see Figure 10, page 80 DEIS) and the resulting need to rely on higher density housing types to accommodate higher levels of growth.

9. Comments noted. The draft General Policy Plan includes objectives and policies calling for linkages between Lynnwood’s trail system and the regional trail network (GPP Parks, Recreation and Open Space Policy 5.2), inter-jurisdictional coordination in providing programs and facilities (Policies 2.6, 7.2 and 7.4) and coordination of planning efforts with Snohomish County and other jurisdictions (Objective 7 and related policies). GPP Parks, Recreation and Open Space Objective 3 and related policies promote measures to preserve habitat areas, including the preservation of linkages and corridors between park and open space lands (Policy 3.2).
10. The policy basis for Lynnwood’s Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance is provided by the Purpose section of the Ordinance itself (Lynnwood Municipal Code 17.10.010). This policy basis will be recommended for incorporation into the General Policy Plan.

11. Comments acknowledged. There would likely not be a significant difference in the local level of wood smoke emissions between the Moderate Growth and the High Growth alternatives. Regionally, emissions could be lower under the High Growth alternative if the result is less low density residential development in unincorporated or rural areas.

12. The City has not established a transportation level-of-service-standard at this time. The draft General Policy Plan establishes general criteria for the development of a level-of-service standard as part of the second phase of the comprehensive planning process (see GPP Transportation Objective 3 and related policies). Future capacity needs and costs will be determined at that time.

13. A corrected Figure 13 is provided on the following page. This Figure has been revised to accurately reflect the County’s arterial plan for unincorporated areas. Coordination between the County and the City in developing detailed transportation plans is also important to the City, as reflected by GPP Transportation Objective 3 and related policies.

14. The 3.0 percent non-SOV (single occupant vehicle) mode split assumption for the Current Trends (No Action) alternative is based on current ridership data provided by Community Transit (Letter from Charles Prestrude, May 12, 1994). Additional calculations performed by the City indicated current non-SOV use at 2.8 percent of all trips. This figure was rounded up to 3.0, under the assumption that some limited additional mode shifting will take place in the future (even with continuation of current development patterns) as congestion worsens and through commute trip reduction, transit improvement and other efforts.

The 7.5 percent mode split assumption for the High Growth alternative was based upon information contained in Table 3-11, Regional Transportation Project Travel Forecasting Results, February 1992, prepared by the Regional Transportation Project and Metro. This figure was reduced by 1.5 percent, resulting in the 6.0 percent mode split assumption for the Moderate Growth alternative, based upon research conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute for the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) regarding transit station trip capacity.

15. The Draft EIS erroneously states that assumed employment growth outside the City of Lynnwood was based on historic growth. Employment growth outside the City was actually based on the Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) targets for all alternatives. Population and employment growth within the City was based on Draft
EIS Table 3. Therefore, population and employment figures used to analyze the High Growth alternative are consistent with the SCT targets.

16. A new Appendix B providing existing traffic conditions and future impact data for both principal and minor arterial intersections has been included in the Final EIS. As with the more limited data provided in the Draft EIS, this information shows limited variability in traffic impacts among the three alternatives. The data do, however, indicate that congestion is a much greater problem on arterials serving both local and regional needs, than on arterials serving primarily local needs.

Data regarding the source of vehicular trips using Lynnwood arterials emphasize this point, and provide a partial explanation of the lack of variability in principal arterial impacts among the three alternatives. Table 20A, below, indicates that a significant proportion of vehicle trips impacting Lynnwood arterials have neither origin nor destination in Lynnwood. Based upon Lynnwood’s transportation modeling, it is estimated that 43 percent of all trips in Lynnwood have external origins and destinations. This figure is projected to grow to greater than 50 percent by 2012 under any of the land use alternatives. This high pass-through traffic component would not be directly affected by changes to land use patterns and development intensities in Lynnwood.

Table 20A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips</td>
<td>50,365</td>
<td>76,122</td>
<td>78,039</td>
<td>80,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/Internal</td>
<td>10,971</td>
<td>10,018</td>
<td>11,687</td>
<td>13,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/External</td>
<td>9,033</td>
<td>13,090</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>11,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/Internal</td>
<td>8,869</td>
<td>13,956</td>
<td>13,191</td>
<td>12,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External/External</td>
<td>21,492</td>
<td>39,058</td>
<td>40,738</td>
<td>42,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include I-5, I-405, or SR 525.
Source: Lynnwood Public Works Department, based on analysis provided by Bell-Walker Engineers.
17. The City used a volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) method to measure intersection congestion rather than the intersection delay method. The V/C method was determined to be more appropriate to the general planning phase of developing the City's comprehensive plan. As the City enters the second phase of comprehensive planning, which will involve development of a comprehensive transportation element, other analytic methods will be considered.

Table 20 from the Draft EIS has been revised to show the actual V/C ratios upon which the LOS ratings for individual intersections are based (V/C ratios have also been included in Appendix B). Please note also that these Tables have been corrected on the basis of improved transportation modeling completed since issuance of the Draft EIS. This additional information does not change the analysis of relative transportation impacts included in the Draft EIS.

18. Comment noted.

19. Comments acknowledged. There would likely not be a significant difference in the local level of stormwater impacts between the Moderate Growth and the High Growth alternatives. Regionally, impacts could be lower under the High Growth alternative if the result is less development in unincorporated or rural areas.

20. Comments noted. The draft General Policy Plan promotes the development of urban design standards and guidelines. See, for example, Land Use Objective 16 and related policies.
I note with interest light rail included in a long term Lynnwood plan. Light rail like socialism has never worked and well I think cost us mucho.

I enclose raw notes on alternate plan for Lynnwood. Forgive my writing. If I can help, call me or contact me.

776-2920  Bob Hartz
1906-60th Ave. Lynwood, Wa. 98037
Quality of life. Kill thousands.

Birds gone - catter squawks, looks of care.

Living/making a career?

Need civic activism - one lot or more each.

Edmonds/Lynnwood - the unique city of parks and bird sanctuaries, quiet then from the bird.

Birds control the insects - green behid.

Music festival - a round - perfect cared.

Subsidized printed, i.e., newspaper, book, postcard.

More signs and site - people love music - support with taxes here. Those who volunteer - that's how such a place would act.

Trustee diner, profit for business, and medical care.

Image quality of life (in the Edward city) for youth with music festival, subsidize music.

Lynnwood would become peak of music festival each yr.

Need an artist adviser(s)?

Fountain - well system?

Citizen landscaping maintenance groups.

1st step - city. Groups perhaps.
SEEMS TO FOCUS ON GMA 'quality of life' ISSUES:

Birds

Music

Nuisance issues, like noise abatement

Criminal Justice issues; youth discipline, citizen fear

Advocates: *Lynn-O-Rama music festival
* getting a bird specialist (ornithologist advisor)
* citizen landscape committee
* likes fountains
* suggests hostels
* suggests study groups for various issues

Wants visitors and shoppers to stay here

Dislikes light rail
set, Reikes said only seven beetles were caught in three months. Those bugs were then tagged and released about 15 miles away. The cost to taxpayers to capture the beetles is expected to increase about $250,000 over the 20-year life of the landfill.

-Matt Maile in Fort Smith, Ark., Southwest Times Record

GROUP SEX OKAY?

The new sexual-offense policy at Antioch College in Ohio requires students to ask for verbal consent before kissing another member of the Antioch community. The policy, however, may not be as draconian as it seems, for it explicitly permits sex among several persons at once. The official rules state:
- "If one person wants to initiate moving to a higher level of sexual intimacy in an interaction, that person is responsible for getting the verbal consent of the other person(s) involved before moving to that level."
- "If someone has initially consented but then stops consenting during a sexual interaction, she/he should communicate withdrawal verbally and/or through physical resistance. The other individual(s) must stop immediately."
- "If sexual contact and/or conduct is not mutually and simultaneously initiated, then the person who initiates sexual contact/conduct is responsible for getting verbal consent of the other individual(s) involved."

-Time

NO MERCY

Joe Konewko, a cop from Westchester, Ill., was fishing in northern Minnesota where the Mississippi River begins. He was having little success until he hooked something really big—himself.

"It was kind of stupid," he concedes. "I was in a small boat when I saw that my tackle box was going to fall off the seat in front of me, so I reached to grab it with my free hand. But there was a lure hanging out, and when I grabbed for the box, I got the lure's hook instead. It really dug into my hand."

After letting out a howl and wrapping his bloody hand with a rag, Konewko motored to the lodge where relatives were staying.

"My sister-in-law is a nurse, but she couldn't get the hook out. She said we had to go to a hospital. We went into the emergency room where the nurse said: "There is nothing we can do, unless it is a life-threatening situation. This is an Indian hospital." I couldn't believe it. I'm in a hospital emergency room, my hand bleeding, my blood pressure shooting through the ceiling, and she says they can't help me because I'm not an Indian."

So we drove 20 minutes to another hospital. All my life, I believed right is right, wrong is wrong, and fair is fair. But here we have a hospital that is paid for by the federal government. And it discriminates. It not only discrim-

inates, but the government says that it has to discriminate. Can you believe that?"

-Mike Royko in Chicago Tribune

SMOKE FREE

LEROY KELLEY might rightly have had a smile on his face after he pleaded guilty in a Snohomish County courtroom to charges of stealing two packs of cigarettes from a Lynnwood, Wash., grocery store.

South District Court Judge Robert Schillberg fined the 27-year-old Kelley $5, then paid the fine himself to make a point about the hazards of smoking. "I think the store's more culpable than he is" for selling cigarettes, Schillberg said during the man's sentencing, telling Kelley, "Let's get it off your record. It's a waste of time."

(Also on Kelley's record, although it was not brought up in court during the case, were prior convictions for shoplifting, third-degree rape, malicious mischief, assault and resisting arrest. He also is a registered sex offender.)

Snohomish County Sheriff's Deputy Matt Onderbeke, who arrested Kelley, asks, "Do we let people off for stealing steak because it causes cholesterol problems?"

-Jolayne Houtz in The Seattle Times

EXTINCTING" STANDARDS

The Bridge is a publication written by students at New York City's LaGuardia Community College. Some stories contain grammar and spelling errors that leave one embarrassed about the standards of the city's university system. Most disturbing about a recent issue, however, was the hatred expressed. For example:

"Jews don't own the United States, but yet some act as if they do. Who do these people think they are! Their race was almost extinct. Now they are trying to 'extinct' Blacks out of everything, including existence."

The piece closes: "Before Jesus Christ was crucified he was whipped, tortured, scolded, cut, punched, kicked, spat on, and just downright treated like an animal after he helped those same people, those people were Jewish. Coincidence, I think not."

The question is not whe
tially subsidized newspaper should be prevented from publishing material like that. Such papers should have editors who recognize that rank anti-Semitism—not to mention just plain ignorance—doesn't belong in any paper, even as "opinion."

-Scott McConnell in New York Post

Sign in a farm-equipment dealer's repair shop: "We do three types of jobs—Cheap, Quick and Good. You can have any two. A good quick job—won't be cheap; a good cheap job—won't be quick; a cheap quick job—won't be good."

-Quoted in Farmer's Digest
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF BOB HARRIS

Comments Noted.

The feasibility of light rail and other high capacity transit options is being evaluated on a regional basis under the guidance of the recently established Regional Transit Authority.
Mr. J. Robert Henderson, AICP
BRYANT G. HARRISON
ASST. PLANNING DIRECTOR
CITY OF LYNNWOOD

SIR:

I AM A LYNNWOOD PROPERTY OWNER, I HAVE READ YOUR PROPOSALS FOR THE CITY'S NEW COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, I WOULD CALL YOUR ATTENTION TO WHAT I CONSIDER AN OVERSIGHT FOR THE FUTURE USE OF MY PROPERTY, PARCELS 81 & 82 OF LID 90-2. MY PROPERTY IS BORDERED BY 48TH ST. ON THE WEST, AND 168TH ST. ON THE SOUTH. THE SOUTH SIDE OF 168TH ST. AT THIS POINT HAS A COMMERCIAL ZONING WITH 48TH ST. ACTING AS A "NATURAL BARRIER". ALL OF THE WEST SIDE OF 48TH ST. AT 168TH IS ZONED AND IMPROVED MULTI-FAMILY, ALL PROPERTY EAST OF 48TH ST. WITH THE EXCEPTION OF MY PROPERTY IS ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL. I AM ENCLOSING A PLAT MAP THAT GRAPHICALLY ILLUSTRATES THIS OVERSIGHT. I AM REQUESTING THAT YOU DESIGNATE PARCELS 81 & 82 LID 90-2 GENERAL COMMERCIAL IN ALL THREE OF YOUR PROPOSALS FOR A NEW COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. IF I NEED TO FILE AND IF YOU WILL ACCEPT A PETITION FOR A REZONE OF THE EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN PLEASE NOTIFY, I WILL DO THIS IMMEDIATELY. IN REVIEWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF COSTS OF LID 90-2, THE PERCENTAGE INCREASE ON MY PROPERTY WAS 103%, RIVALLED ONLY BY TWO OTHER PROPERTIES, BOTH COMMERCIAL.

RESPECTFULLY

JAMES MARKEZINIS
18826 FREMONT AVE N
SEATTLE, WA. 98133

546-3843
745-1590
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF JAMES MARKEZINIS

By way of clarification, the decisions currently being considered by the City Council and being evaluated by this EIS include comprehensive plan land use designations, but not zoning designations. Decisions on zoning will occur as part of the third phase in the City's comprehensive planning program (see cover memo of this Final EIS). However, decisions being made now about land use designations will have a direct bearing on future zoning decisions.

The City Council can consider your letter as it makes its final decisions regarding the future land use plan. The Council could decide that a commercial land use designation is more appropriate for your property, under any of the land use alternatives. In any event, you may submit an application for rezone at any time. The proper application forms and procedures can be obtained from the Lynnwood Planning Department at 20519 60th Avenue West (670-6645).
June 29, 1994

City of Lynnwood
Planning Commission
Attn: Lynn Silsbee, Chair
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, WA 98036

RE: Cedar Valley Industrial Area

Dear Planning Commission Members,

The Land Use Committee of the Economic Development Council of Snohomish County has been in communication and correspondence with your Planning Department staff regarding the proposed comprehensive plan amendments and rezones for the Cedar Valley Industrial Area. The EDC is very supportive of the Washington Growth Management Act goals of encouraging economic development, containing urban growth and providing for industrial development where services and housing can support such job bases. The EDC further recognizes and supports the designation of Lynnwood as an employment center in Snohomish County under the GMA plan. The EDC supports a concept of "no net loss of industrial land" as a key economic development strategy for Snohomish County. To implement this policy, we strongly encourage the City of Lynnwood not to reduce the amount of industrial land located in the Cedar Valley Industrial Area.

We are quite concerned that one parcel of approximately three and one half acres purchased for expansion by an existing employer (Connelly Skis, Inc.) with an annual payroll of $2.7 million and annual gross sales of $15.5 million is proposed to be changed from Light Industrial to Single Family Residential. This change not only represents a net loss of industrial land within the Lynnwood Planning Area, but also suggests that this employer needs to relocate elsewhere to accommodate expansion needs.

We understand that the City is also considering a rezone of the properties in this area from Light Industrial to Business and Technical Park, thereby eliminating the possibility of one or more of the existing land owners and employers from expanding their existing businesses and rendering existing uses non-conforming. We urge the City to either keep the existing Light Industrial zoning in this area and ensure that the revised City of Lynnwood Comprehensive Land Use Plan designate all such properties for Light Industrial use, or amending the Zoning Code to allow light manufacturing uses in the Business and Technical Park zone.
We continue to be interested in the planning process in the City of Lynnwood, especially as it affects maintaining and expanding employment and business opportunities with the city. We offer these recommendations for discussion at your June 30th study session and subsequent public hearing.

Sincerely,

John E. Thoresen
President

cc: Frank Figg, Chairman, EDC Land Use Committee

jt/jm
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY (JOHN E. THORESEN)

On June 23, 1994 Lynnwood Planning Director J. Robert Henderson informed the Economic Development Council that the City would be unable to extend the Draft EIS comment period due to the difficult planning schedule faced by the City. Mr. Henderson indicated comments received or postmarked on or before June 24, 1994 would be included in the Final EIS.

However, any comments received after that date have or will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration as it deliberates on the General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Map.
June 21, 1994

Mayor and City Council
City of Lynnwood
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Washington 98046

Re: Proposed changes in zoning

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

The Elizabeth A. Lynn Trust is one of many small businesses with an office in the Lynnwood area. Tom Stephens, manager of Connelly Skis, informed me of proposed changes in the zoning for the City of Lynnwood as a result of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I know that these proposed changes greatly concern Mr. Stephens and possibly could have a very negative impact on the future of their operation both now and in the future. I would hate to see that happen.

As an individual conducting business out of an office located on Cedar Valley Road, I am also very concerned with the proposed changes. Cedar Valley Road has a number of small businesses and companies classified as light industrial who have found a good "niche" in this area and their success is dependent on their location and its zoning.

I am also worried that zoning changes to this area will cause an additional burden to already over congested roads and intersections.

I am aware that zoning issues can be very complex and have numerous ramifications for all parties involved. Although this proposed zoning change may not effect me or our business directly at this point in time, I feel an obligation to inform you of my concerns and ask that you reconsider the proposed changes.

Respectfully,

ELIZABETH A. LYNN TRUST

Diane E. Titch
Administrator
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF THE ELIZABETH A. LYNN TRUST
(DIANE E. TITCH)

Comments noted. Please see also responses to comments of Thomas J. Stephens,
Connelly Skis.

The Draft EIS evaluates the general impacts to traffic that would occur as a result of the
land use changes contemplated under the three land use alternatives (DEIS pages 107-
118). Additional details on transportation impacts are provided by Appendix B of this
Final EIS.
June 23, 1994

Lynnwood Environmental Review Committee
19100 44th Avenue W.
Lynnwood, WA 98046-5008

RE: City of Everett Comments on Lynnwood’s Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Committee Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your General Policy Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As two cities in southwest county it is apparent that we share more similarities than differences in the challenges we face under requirements of the Growth Management Act. And, given the proximity of our respective city boundaries, yours on the north and ours on the south, it is all the more important that we maintain a constructive dialogue. For these reasons it seems prudent to make the following proposals now that our GMA Policy Plans are coming into focus.

Firstly I suggest we look at factors concerning the location of our ultimate city limit boundaries. It is apparent that our boundaries will move closer together at an accelerated rate now that we know the land between us will be within the Urban Growth Area. A preliminary look at infrastructure, sensitive areas, density projections etc. would give us perspective on growth policies in the area.

Some issues we hope to address, and which we can work together on, are fair share housing and hard to site facilities. Finally, the preceding discussion could provide a constructive forum to address how we as cities wish to proceed with the population / employment reconciliation process.

We hope to begin to work with you on these mutually important issues in the near future. Don’t hesitate to call if you have any questions or additional ideas.

Sincerely,

Paul Roberts, Director
Planning and Community Development
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF EVERETT PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (PAUL ROBERTS)

Comments noted. The City of Lynnwood agrees that coordination of planning and land use activities is becoming increasingly important, and looks forward to continued cooperation with the City of Everett and other neighboring jurisdictions.
June 21, 1994

City of Lynnwood
Environmental Review Committee
19100 44th Avenue West
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Washington 98046-5008

Re: DEIS for City General Policy Plan

Dear Committee Members:

Connelly Skis is a local manufacturer with a world wide market. While we could be located any place, we like and want to stay in Lynnwood. Our roots are here. We have about 100 employees who like this area. And jobs in our community are important. Employment opportunity is an important factor to be considered under the GMA [see RCW 36.70A.020(5)]. In short, economic development is to be encouraged. Unfortunately, the present DEIS proposals have the opposite effect on us.

Over 10 years ago there was an attempt to downzone our Light Industry zoned property to single family residential. The City Council appropriately rejected this effort then. [see my attached notes provided to Planning Commission on June 16, 1994] Nothing has really changed since then. Making these three and a half acres residential is not likely to significantly make or break the city's residential population goal under the GMA [see pp 89-90, DEIS], but it would significantly and adversely impact our viability. This should be evaluated in the DEIS.

At the time of the rejected downzoning, we agreed to certain setbacks to assure our ability to be a good neighbor - just as we are now. We today still stand
by those commitments. But since then the City has also adopted many additional ordinances and regulations that assure compatible development. These factors appear to have been ignored in evaluating the impacts of zoning alternatives for our property.

The Current Trends proposal retains the Light Industrial designation. This is as it should be. The Moderate Growth Alternative appears to downzone our property to SF2. This still provides LI next to SF2 so no substantive difference results - except a loss of our industrial base. Besides there appears no way that this one action is the critical element for providing city wide "adequate" housing. The High Growth Alternative makes even less sense because it downzones our property to SF2 just as with the Moderate Growth Alternative. Thus, this local action does not tend to achieve population goals and does negate employment goals. This should be discussed in the DEIS.

What is more bothersome is the DEIS says desirable development patterns should be retained under any scenario [p 2, DEIS]. We know of no factual basis to conclude our property is undesirable and should be downzoned. Since the City Council rejected such an approach in the early 1980's. While the DEIS (p 3) projects employment growth, this cannot be achieved in the manufacturing sector by downzoning our property to SF2. Our use of the property for LI won't cause incompatibilities with the surrounding area. The ability to have manufacturing jobs in Lynnwood means people can live closer to their jobs, thereby reducing travel time and congestion.

Our property use for LI is generally consistent with existing development, the Lynnwood Policy Plan and certainly with the GMA goal.
June 21, 1994
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We have been a good neighbor. We believe in Lynwood. We want to stay. We need your help.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Thomas J. Stephens
President
CONNELLY SKIS, INC.

TJS/kw
Enclosure
cc:  Mayor Tina Roberts
     Sharon Rutherford
     Bill Hubbard
     Jim Smith
     William D. Blackburn
     Ned E. Daniels
     George V. Janecke
     Mike McKinnon
CONNELLY SKIS INC

PROPERTY REZONING AND ITS EFFECTS ON CONNELLY SKIS AS OUTLINED IN DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

SUBJECT:  - Proposed zoning change of Connelly's vacant property, being an entire city block located between 55th and 56th and bordered on North by 206 and South by 208th, from light industrial to medium density housing, under both Moderate and High Growth Alternatives.

- Proposed zoning change of Connelly's developed property, located at 20621 52nd West, from light industrial to business technical, under both Moderate and High Growth Alternatives.

ACQUISITION  - Vacant property was purchased 16 years ago to provide future expansion for Connelly Skis.

Existing production facility was acquired in 1974 and operations commenced at that time.

REZONE 1981  - The purpose was to update the City Comprehensive Plan map and the zoning map which were in conflict. The zoning map indicated light industrial for the Connelly property while the Comprehensive Plan map indicated multiple family residential. An attempt was made to down zone the property to residential.

- Council voted 5 to 2 in favor of retaining L.I. zoning on Connelly property and to make the zoning map and the Comprehensive Plan map agree.

- Extensive transitional greenbelt, setbacks and landscaping requirements were agreed to by Connelly at that time and we still agree with that concept.

(Attached is a conceptual plan developed at that time.)

FACILITIES:  - Connelly's business has grown over the years and in 1989 we provided for expansion by leasing 12,000 square feet to house our distribution facilities. The intent, at that time, was to construct a new facility.

- Connelly determined in 1990 the need to expand and preliminary meetings were held with the Planning, Building and Fire Departments with favorable results.

ECONOMICS:  - Economic conditions prevented advancement of the plan at that time.
NEIGHBOR:  
- Connelly has been a good neighbor in the community since 1974 and has not experienced problems with its neighbors or public officials.

- Connelly's present industrial site is bordered on the West by single family housing and on the North by the Cedar Valley Elementary School. We have had good relations with them over the years.

SALES:  
- Connelly averages 15.5 million dollars in annual sales. Its products are sold principally outside the State of Washington with 20% of sales going to foreign purchasers.

PAYROLL:  
- We provide, on average, employment for 90 to 100 people.

- Annual payroll averages over 2.7 million Dollars. Our position is that our company is a provider of real employment in the community with job creation resulting from financial flows originating outside Washington State.

DEIS:  
- Further studies of the DEIS has only confirmed our initial reaction. We view it as negative in terms of our future plans and our ability to grow within this community.

DEIS CONCERNS - Seems to stress need for more housing at expense of having a place for Connelly's employees to work. Most of Connelly's employees can be expected to give up (leave) their local housing units if we are forced to relocate outside this area. Did the consultants take this type of impact into consideration? We do not know how many other businesses would be impacted like we could be, but doubt that our situation is unique.

IMPACTS OF ADOPTING MODERATE OR HIGH GROWTH ALTERNATIVE:

- Vacant Site

Since entire block could be used for industrial, it is easy to create buffers to existing residential areas across the streets to the North and East of our block. We believe that new, to be built industrial building(s) would create substantially better and more aesthetically pleasing buffers than using the block for residential. New residential structures would be oriented toward the existing older industrial complex to the west across 56th; not an environment most of us would choose to call home.

- Existing Production Facilities

Adopting either alternative would cause our use and existing facilities to become nonconforming. Such a designation eliminates any on site expansion capabilities including adding second floor office space and using existing ground floor office area for expanded manufacturing. Our employees, local management and our national parent company work hard every day to increase our product's world wide share. This means we must be able to accommodate future business and facility growth. Normally this also means increased employment. A Business Technical designation
apparently precludes automotive and truck repair operations. Changes proposed under both Moderate and High Growth Alternatives make many of our neighbors to the south nonconforming. Hopefully this was not the intent of staff or the consultants. Having a nonconforming designation is of real concern as it eliminates expansion and/or rebuilding in the event of a serious fire. Please do not prevent Connelly from future expansion in the City of Lynnwood.

- Solutions

Under any of the Alternatives, do not take away our ability to expand on either of our properties. Do not make our use nonconforming. Keep the current zoning in place under all three Alternatives.
CONNELLY SKIS, INC. - SITE PLAN

56TH AVE WEST

55TH AVE WEST

This plan is conceptual in nature and while it shows intended uses, it does not show the exact scope of construction to take place on any portion of the property. The building, parking and site plans may be amended anytime by the developer.

TOTAL sq.ft.
SCALE: 1 INCH = 40 FEET
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF CONNELLY SKIS, INC. (THOMAS J. STEPHENS)

1. Comments noted. Designation of the referenced 3.5 acres as Single Family 2 (SF2) could ultimately result in the existing manufacturing facility being replaced by up to 28 residences housing roughly up to 65 people. This is not a significant share of the City's population target.

2. The Draft EIS does not evaluate how existing commitments and regulations contribute to compatibility between specific properties. This level of detail is clearly beyond the scope of an EIS for a non-project action, such as development of a General Policy Plan (see SEPA Rules, WAC 197-11-442). However, these are certainly appropriate issues for the City Council to consider in its deliberations on the Plan and Future Land Use Map.

3. As noted under No. 1, above, designation of this site for residential use would not be a significant factor in achieving the City's population target. While the number of jobs at issue would not be a significant share of total employment targets for the City, these jobs do represent a sizable share of the existing and projected light industrial sector jobs within the community.

4. Comments noted.
June 21, 1994

The Hon. Tina Roberts, Mayor
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P. O. Box 5008
Lynnwood WA 98046

Dear Mayor Roberts and Council Members:

Although I have addressed my personal concerns regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in a separate letter to you, as the Personnel Manager for Connelly Skis I want to comment from my professional position. I have been employed at Connelly Skis for nearly twenty years (yikes!). My long term association with this company has allowed me the unique perspective and the privilege to observe an honest and ethical company doing business in a socially responsible manner and taking a genuine interest in its employees and the community.

Although founded in Seattle in 1965, the company "grew up" in Lynnwood, establishing itself as a leader in the international water sports industry since its move to Lynnwood in 1974. Most of Connelly's managers started out as hourly workers who were promoted over the years into positions of supervision and management. The average length of service for all employees is eight years and forty percent of the workforce has been here over ten years.

Connelly has been involved with and supported the efforts of United Way, the Snohomish County Blood Bank, the Private Industry Council and its contractors, and the local school system, particularly the high schools and community college. Hiring practices have focused on the growing immigrant populations through the Employment Security Department Refugee Forum and other special needs population. These things have been done not just because it's good business but because they're the right things to do.

Down zoning the properties at 20621 52nd Avenue West and between 55th and 56th, from 206th to 208th, would seriously impact Connelly's ability for future growth in this community and could jeopardize the jobs of many people who have made career commitments to this company and to this community. It appears that Lynnwood City Government has been unaware of the impact that rezoning the Connelly properties would have on so many. Therefore, I strongly urge the Council to re-evaluate the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the proposed rezoning with a view to retaining businesses/employers of the caliber of Connelly Skis in the community. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dana L. Sprouse
Personnel Manager
CONNELLY SKIS, INC.
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF CONNELLY SKIS, INC. (DANA L. SPROUSE)

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Connelly Skis, Inc, (Thomas J. Stephens), above, and the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, below.
June 23, 1994

Mayor and City Council
City of Lynnwood
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Washington 98046

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am concerned about the proposed changes in the zoning of the City of Lynnwood as a result of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Planning Commission is taking areas of the city that are zoned light industrial and changing some of these to residential or business technical.

I work for Connelly Skis in Lynnwood. We are one of the largest manufacturers of performance water skis in the world. We employ over 100 people. I have worked for Connelly Skis for seven years and I know that many of the employees have worked here much longer than that. I live in Arlington but I commute to the Lynnwood area for work. Many times my shopping and automotive maintenance is done right in the Lynnwood area because of the convenience of being so close to work. My wife and I have really established our roots here. I am proud to be associated with the area and with Connelly Skis. Our product is recognized all over the world as a fine quality product; hand built in Lynnwood, Washington USA.

Our company is growing. Connelly owns an undeveloped site in Lynnwood which could be used for expansion. With the new zoning, Connelly Skis could be forced to move out of the area because of expansion limitations. This could cause me to lose my job unless I am willing to relocate to Connelly Skis' new location.
June 23, 1994
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It's difficult to find a job in such a shaky economy and I prefer to stay in the Lynnwood area. We are well established and I like the community.

Please reconsider the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and all the people and business it will effect.

Thank you for listening.

Wayne Hanzel
12229 Jordan Road
Arlington, Washington 98223
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF WAYNE HANZEL

Comments noted.

The City of Lynnwood received over twenty letters commenting on the Draft EIS from employees of Connelly Skis, Inc., expressing concern about the land use designations proposed by the Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives. Wayne Hanzel's letter is generally representative of these concerns.

The following discussion provides a general description of concerns expressed by Mr. Hanzel and other Connelly Employees, and responses to those concerns. To avoid unnecessary repetition, responses to the letters of Mr. Hanzel's co-workers (which follow) will refer back to this discussion, as appropriate.

Comment: The Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives would change the designation of property owned by Connelly Skis from Light Industrial to Single Family 2 (SF2) and Business Technical, thus limiting the ability of Connelly to expand in the future, or possibly to rebuild existing facilities if damaged.

Response: Specific limitations on land uses, expansion of existing facilities and repair to damaged "nonconforming" facilities will not be finally determined until the third phase of Lynnwood's comprehensive planning program, when actual zoning designations and provisions are established. However, it is likely that if the existing plant is designated SF2 by the Future Land Use Plan, limitations on future expansion or repairs in the event of substantial damage would be significant. In the case of the currently undeveloped property east of 52nd Avenue, the proposed Business Technical (BT) designation would allow research and development and small scale fabrication activities that may or may not be consistent with Connelly's expansion plans.

It should be noted that The City Council is not required to choose one or the other land use alternative in total. The Council may modify any of the alternatives prior to adopting one, and may take some aspects of one alternative and combine it with aspects of another.

Comment: If limitations are placed on Connelly's ability to expand or rebuild in the event of significant damage, the company may choose to relocate. This would result in the loss of over 100 jobs and a loss of overall economic activity. Connelly employees, even those who are not residents of the community, currently provide support for other Lynnwood businesses.

Response: Environmental impact statements are generally not required to evaluate economic impacts (see SEPA Rules, WAC 197-11-448). An EIS is to evaluate environmental impacts, which are to be considered along with other issues (such as economic or social impacts) when government decisions are made. The fact that the
EIS does not analyze the impacts of lost wages or job displacement does not mean these are not important issues. These issues will be considered by the Lynnwood City Council, along with environmental, legal and other factors, in its decision-making.
June 20, 1994

The Hon. Tina Roberts, Mayor
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P. O. Box 5008
Lynnwood WA 98046

Dear Mayor Roberts and Council Members:

I have been an employee of Connelly Skis for the last twenty years and during that time have enjoyed the environment I have had to work in. Our location has always seemed ideal to me, not too far from all the services, surrounded by trees and in a quiet residential area. I've particularly enjoyed the grade school next door and the kids and their sticker collecting. I've been proud that as a manufacturing facility we have always been a good neighbor.

I was dismayed to learn of the action being considered by the City in rezoning Connelly's property. It was always my impression that Lynnwood was proud to have an international company with the quality reputation of Connelly located here. I've always been secretly a little smug telling people, "Yes, all the Performance Connelly Skis in the world are made right here!"

Of course, human nature being what it is, and being pretty selfish, I also considered how any actions taken to rezone our location could change the circumstances, convenience and quality of my life. Although I live outside Lynnwood, in the county, I do my shopping and use professional services here in Lynnwood because of the convenience of making my stops right after work.

I'm not sure that I understand all the reasons behind your new plans but I want you to know that whatever you end up doing, the effect is to PEOPLE!

Thanks for listening.

Sincerely,

Dana L. Sprouse
25220 Meadow Way N.E.
Arlington WA 98223
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF DANA L. SPROUSE

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Tina Roberts, Mayor
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, WA 98046

Dear Mayor Roberts and City Council,

I am writing you concerning the proposed rezoning of the Lynnwood property owned by Connelly Skis, Inc. I will not pretend to know or understand zoning. All I know is that if the proposed rezoning of our property affects my job, I am very concerned. I have worked for Connelly Skis for 20 years, and consider this my career. I now live on Bainbridge Island, and if the company had to relocate I can only assume it would have to be farther away. I could not commute much farther than I already travel and make it work. I have five people at home that I support and my job is of utmost importance to me and my family. Please consider the ramifications to those of us who have lived or worked in Lynnwood for a long time, before you start making changes.

Thank you,

Ken Horne
8140 N.E. Baker Hill road
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF KEN HORNE

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
The Hon. Tina Roberts, Mayor
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall

Dear Mayor Roberts and Council Members,

I have worked at Connelly SKLS located in Lynnwood for over 18 years. My place of residence is located in North King County between Lake Forest Park and Kenmore.

I am involved in the manufacturing end of the business. It is my understanding that thru your rezoning proposals, you could likely change the direction of future growth and plans for our company.

I have spent tens of thousands of dollars in goods and services in your city during this time. I shop here, I bank here and go to my dentist and doctors only because it is convenient to do so before, during and after work. I have bought breakfasts, lunches and dinners in your area for 18 long years. I’ve had my cars serviced hundreds of times, bought tires, gas, gone bowling, shopped at Fred Meyers - the list goes on.

If this company relocates due to your questionable rezoning plans, I can assure you there would be no need of reason for myself and -
Family and friends to spend our money in your city any longer.

I can only hope your grand plans have taken this into account. You already are having problems with drugs and murder, i.e. Soo Lake Murder, does this plan help your goals of being a decent, economically sound city?

I will be interested to see what values you place as priority in your effort to improve your community.

Sincerely,

William R. Behrens
19112 64th Ave N.E.
Seattle, Wa. 98155
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF WILLIAM R. BEHRENS

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL,

I was informed today about a proposed re-zoning in an area that will, I believe, affect me and my family as well as a number of fellow employees.

I have worked for Connelly Skis in Lynnwood for nearly 19 years. This area has a number of light manufacturing companies all of which I think have contributed to Lynnwood's economic welfare.

A change of zoning that could inhibit growth of businesses and at the same time increase population and traffic is a serious concern to me and all here at Connelly, so I urge you all to think out very carefully what far reaching affects this move could cause.

Sincerely,

Laddie L. Pajus

5802 - 143rd St. SE
Everett 98208
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF LADDLIE L. PAYS

Comments noted.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on population and traffic were evaluated by the Draft EIS at pages 87-95 and 107-118, respectively. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
JUNE 22, 1994

THE HON. TINA ROBERTS, MAYOR
LYNNWOOD CITY COUNCIL
P.O. BOX 5008
LYNNWOOD, WA 98046

MAYOR ROBERTS AND MEMBERS OF THE LYNNWOOD CITY COUNCIL:

IT WAS WITH EXTREME DISMAY AND FRUSTRATION THAT I READ THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND THE PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES THAT COULD AFFECT MY COMPANY. LIKE MANY OF MY LONG TIME CO-WORKERS (I HAVE BEEN AT THE LYNNWOOD LOCATION OF CONNELLY SKIS, INC. FOR OVER 15 YEARS NOW), I FEEL ANY REZONING OF EITHER OF OUR PROPERTIES WOULD HAVE A DEVASTATING EFFECT ON OUR ABILITY TO GROW AND PROSPER IN THE FUTURE.

ALTHOUGH I NO LONGER LIVE IN LYNNWOOD PROPER, I SHOP HERE, EAT HERE AND FREQUENT MANY OF THE RETAIL BUSINESS LOCATED HERE. BASICALLY, I DUMP A TON OF MONEY IN THIS TOWN AND I WANT SOMETHING BACK FOR MY EFFORTS.

REZONING OUR PROPERTY WILL PREVENT CONNELLY SKIS FROM EXPANDING, CAUSING US TO MOVE OUR BUSINESS OUT OF THE AREA. DEPENDING UPON WHERE WE RELOCATE, IT COULD FORCE ME AND MY 100 OR SO CO-WORKERS TO LOSE OUR JOBS.

AS OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS, YOU MUST EXAMINE THE DESIRE FOR MORE APARTMENTS AND ASSOCIATED TRAFFIC CONGESTION, CRIME, NOISE AND POLLUTION VERSUS THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENT OF QUALITY, LIGHT MANUFACTURING PLANTS SURROUNDED BY EXTENSIVE TRANSITIONAL GREENBELTS AND SETBACKS. WE ARE ALL AWARE OF THE IMPACT OF INCREASED POPULATION DENSITY AS WE ATTEMPT TO DRIVE FROM POINT "A" TO POINT "B" ALONG 196TH. "SCRIBER LAKE SHOOTINGS" WILL BECOME THE NORM RATHER THAN THE EXCEPTION AS HUMANITY IS PACKED A LITTLE TIGHTER.

PLEASE RECONSIDER THE ZONING CHANGES AS THEY IMPACT CONNELLY SKIS, INC. AND THINK TWICE ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF GROWTH LYNNWOOD CAN ACTUALLY ABSORB.

SINCERELY,

[Signature]

PAUL S. DENNY
17807 7TH AVE W.
LYNNWOOD, WA 98012
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF PAUL S. DENNY

Comments noted.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on population, traffic congestion, police service needs, noise and other forms of pollution were evaluated by the Draft EIS. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Dear Mayor Roberts and City Council Members:

I am writing to you concerning the proposed zoning change in Lynnwood. I have been an employee of Connelly Skis for 2 years and feel that I have a great opportunity for advancement in this company. However, if the proposed zoning change is approved and the company is forced to relocate, my co-workers and I will no longer have this opportunity. Many of my co-workers have made this their career and if Connelly relocates they will be forced to find new employment and greatly effect their standard of living. Be re-zoning this area of Lynnwood and closing these businesses many people, who are long time Lynnwood residents, will be forced to change their employment and possibly to relocate.

I feel that by rezoning this area of Lynnwood it will add to the amount of unemployment already in Lynnwood and also increasing the competition for the few job openings in this area. By increasing the amount of housing and decreasing the amount of readily available jobs, people will also have to lengthen their commute, therefore, adding the already outrageous traffic problem in Lynnwood.

I also feel that by increasing housing a large part of the wooded area in Lynnwood will be destroyed. This area is home to a wide variety of wildlife, much of which is currently being wiped out of Lynnwood. Having lived in Lynnwood for nine and a half years, I have seen much of this wildlife being pushed out due to development. I feel that further development would only push the remaining wildlife out of this area.

I write this letter only to ask that you reconsider the zoning changes because of the many negative effects I believe it will have on the Lynnwood community. I appreciate your reconsideration on these changes.

Thank you,

Patrik E. Corey
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF PATRIK E. COREY

Comments noted.

The Moderate Growth and High Growth alternatives would actually increase the City's capacity to accommodate more jobs. However, the vast majority of these jobs would be in non-manufacturing sectors of the economy.

Please see pages 60-64 of the Draft EIS for a discussion of impacts on wildlife.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF BARBARA A. PAYS

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
June 22, 1994

Mayor and City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Washington 98046

Re: Property Rezoning and its Impact on Connelly Skis

Dear Mayor Roberts and Council Members:

As an employee of Connelly Skis for the last 17 years, I am writing to express my concern over changes in zoning that impact Connelly Skis. Our present plant is zoned light industrial and the proposal is to change it to business/technical. Our nearby property, which we have for future expansion, is zoned light industrial. The proposal is to change it to medium density housing.

Changing the zoning for our current plant would mean that we couldn't expand, or if more than 50% of the plant were to be destroyed by fire, etc., we could not rebuild. If this zoning is changed, it would make sense for us to move while we have time to plan for moving. If we were to stay and a major fire occurred, it would take much longer to find another site on which to build and to obtain all of the necessary approvals.

Our vacant property has businesses directly across the street, including light industrial. This site allows for future growth and is only blocks from our current facility. Strict landscaping requirements now exist in the event that the property is developed.

Connelly Skis definitely benefits Lynnwood. We employ about 100 people at our Lynnwood plant. Connelly is not only employing a lot of people, but
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Connelly employees are spending a lot of money in Lynnwood, which creates employment for many others. (I know that I do most of my shopping in Lynnwood.)

Connelly has been a good corporate citizen and has had good relations with our neighbors, including an elementary school and residences.

I hope that you will leave the zoning as it presently is. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Stuart R. Pearl
19615 62nd Ct. NE
Seattle, Washington 98155

SRP/kw
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF STUART R. PEARL

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Mayor and City Council
City Of Lynnwood
P.O. Box 5006
Lynnwood, Washington 98046

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers

I am concerned about the proposed changes in the zoning of the City of Lynnwood as a result of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Specifically the planning commission is taking area's that are now zoned light industrial and changing some of these to residential or business technical.

I work for Connelly Skis, and have for the last 20 years here at our Lynnwood facilities. We are one of the largest producers of water skis in the world. Currently over 20% of our sales go to overseas customers and the majority of the rest is shipped all over America. This business provides work for myself and 100 other employee's. The proposed changes impact me personally because the rezoning may force Connelly to move out of the Lynnwood area. Property the Company has owned for over 15 years for expansion is now being changed from light industrial to residential. Without the ability to grow it puts our business in a very difficult position. This property is right across the street from other light industrial businesses on 56th and 208th street. Our current developed property located at 20621 52nd West will change from light industrial to Business Technical under both the Moderate and High Growth plans offered by the planning commission. This will not allow us to expand our current facilities with additional office space if we wanted to do so. The proposed changes by the planning commission stress housing at the expense of Connelly, it's employee's and other businesses located in the same area of south Lynnwood.

Are you aware that the No Growth Alternative is really a growth plan since it still allows for a 9% increase in population within the City of Lynnwood. I am sure that everyone on the City Council is concerned about the issues of traffic congestion. This is especially a problem at many area's along 196th Street from Highway 99 to the Freeway and along Highway 99 itself. Has the City made adequate plans to accommodate even a 9% increase in population? How does the City pay for the costs associated with such growth?

I have seen Lynnwood expand alot in the last 20 years and many changes have taken place. The proposals offered by the planning commission are important to the resident's of the area and very important to the businesses that are located here. Please reconsider the zoning changes as they impact Connelly Skis and think twice about the amount of people you want within the city itself.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

Gordon L. Holmes
9224 187th Street S.W.
Edmonds, Washington 98020
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF GORDON L. HOLMES

Comments noted.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on traffic were evaluated by the Draft EIS at pages 107-118. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS.

Development of the General Policy Plan and Future Land Use Map is the first phase in preparing adequate plans to accommodate additional population and employment growth. More detailed planning for transportation, public facilities and other needs related to growth will be conducted following the City Council's decision on the General Policy Plan.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
FROM: LYNNWOOD - TREAS
TO: PLANNING
JUNE 20, 1994

The Hon. Tina Roberts, Mayor
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P.O. Box 5058
Lynnwood, WA 98037

Dear Mayor Roberts and Council Members:
I have been an employee of Lynnwood Ski's for the last two years and during that time have enjoyed the environment. I have had to work in... our location has always seemed ideal to me, not far from all the services.
Do you know... all the performance Lynnwood Ski's in the world are made in here... Lynnwood!
I don't know all the reasons behind your new plans, but I believe that it will be effective to people.

Sincerely,

Bach Minh Le
18604 57th Ave W. #1
Lynnwood, WA 98037
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF BACH MINH LE

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
To Mayor Tina Roberts
Lynnwood City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, Wa 98046

Dear Mayor Roberts and Fellow Council Members.

I am an employee of the Connelly Water Skis Company located at 20621 52nd West here in Lynnwood. I have been steadily employed by Connelly for the past 15 years. Although I do not live in the immediate Lynnwood area, 90% of my income is spent on goods and services purchased within this community.

I am writing this letter to express my concerns regarding the recently published Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the proposed rezoning of various properties from light industrial to business technical and residential as noted in both the moderate growth and high growth land use alternatives. The proposed rezoning of the Connelly properties, located at 20621 52nd west and between 55th and 56th, from 206th to 208th to Business Technical and residential respectively, not only threatens the future growth and expansion of Connelly Skis, it threatens my livelihood and my future plans as well. If the proposed zoning changes are implemented, as written, the impact on Connelly would be twofold. First the manufacturing processes, currently in place at the developed Connelly site, could become non-conforming. Secondly the undeveloped site could not be used for present or future expansion. In either event Connelly would be forced to move its operation out of the area and, depending upon where they relocate could impact me personally. Connelly Skis employs approximately 100 people, most of whom live in this area. They too would be forced to move or find new jobs.

I propose that the council reexamine the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the proposed zoning changes to insure that they do not force Connelly Skis, or other businesses as well, to leave the area taking away jobs that are badly needed in today's shaky economy.

Sincerely,

Gail Ackert
P.O. Box 249
Freeland, Wa 98249
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF GAIL ACKERT

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Dear Mayor and Council Members,

Being an employee of Connelly Ski's Inc., for the last twenty years and working in the City of Lynnwood during this time, I was obviously interested in the content of the recently published draft environmental impact statement and its subsequent rezoning changes under both the moderate and high growth proposals. I'm specifically concerned with the impact it will have on my employer, Connelly Ski's Inc.

After reviewing the draft, it is my impression that while addressing the issue of accommodating future population growth in Lynnwood both the moderate and high growth plans have not considered the potential negative ramifications that may come from the rezoning that these two proposals require.
All I'm asking at this point is for the Planning Committee to consider the needs of the existing businesses in the future before finalizing any growth plans.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jim W
357 1/2 Fulton
Seattle, WA 98109
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF JIM WEBIN

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
DEAR MAYOR & COUNCIL MEMBERS

THANK YOU FOR WORKING AS HARD AS YOU DO.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

RECEIVED
JUN 23 1994
CITY OF LYNNWOOD
Executive Department

WILLIAM BUTTERY
Production Supervisor.
Connelly Skis
20 yrs
3 kids & a wife of 14 yrs.
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF WILLIAM BUTTENOI

Comments noted.
Major Roberts and other Council Members

I am writing on behalf of the City's proposed rezoning of Industrial property—in particular Connelly's area.

I have worked at Connelly for the past 14 years. I live in Everett, but my doctors, shopping etc. is done in Lynnwood because of travel distance convenience.

I would appreciate your reconsidering rezoning as it would greatly affect me and my family.

This is were I work, make my living with no plans to make a change. I would not like to start over again in another area. Thank you

Nancy Bailey
3935 High St
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF NANCY BARBEE

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
June 23, 1994

Mayor Tina Roberts
19100 44th Ave W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Dear Ms. Roberts:

I am writing this letter in opposition to the proposed zoning changes under consideration by the Council, which would have the effect of punishing Connelly Skis Inc., for being located in Lynnwood.

For twenty years, Connelly has been just the type of light industry that communities all over the country are to trying to attract. The company brings millions of dollars into the community from all over the world, employs 90 to 100 people and manufactures popular non-polluting outdoor recreational products. The company provides additional sub-contract work to smaller shops and to local programs that provide training for persons with disabilities. Connelly employees serve on community boards and participate in local services groups.

Through the years Connelly has taken seriously its responsibility to be an exemplary corporate citizen and a good neighbor to others who live, work and go to school in the area. Connelly took steps in 1981 to secure the right for future development by presenting plans to the Council (which were approved) that would provide extensive greenbelts and appropriate setbacks and landscaping requirements.

Changing the zoning of Connelly's vacant property to "medium density housing", and its developed property to "business technical" would virtually prohibit any further development of capacity for the company. This represents a stranglehold on a company that must be able to respond to consumer demand or lose its market share and eventually die.

It seems shortsighted at best to turn around and penalize this company that has served as a model business/employer within this community. At this point, we should be doing what we can to retain clean, quiet, and socially responsible companies like Connelly in the community instead of making it impossible for them to do business.

Sincerely,

Phil McConnell
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF PHIL MCCONNELL

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Minor Roberts & Fellow Council Members

I am writing this letter to express my concern regarding the recently published Draft Environmental Impact Statement and the proposed rezoning of various properties.

I am an employee of the Connelly Water Supply Co., located at 20621 S. 200 W. West here in Lynnwood. I have been working at Connelly for the past 5 years. I eat lunch at Lynnwood, I shop at Lynnwood during lunchtime & on the way home. It is a short distance commute from home to work. This is what I like the most.

The proposed rezoning could force me to either give up my job and seek employment elsewhere. That is what I don't want to happen.
I propose that the council reexamine the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the proposed zoning changes to insure the they do not force Connelly Skis to leave the area taking away jobs that are badly needed in today's shaky economy.

Sincerely,

Chun Mi Huang
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF CHUN NI HUANG

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
June 21, 1994

Mayor and City Council
Lynnwood City Hall
P.O. Box 5008
Lynnwood, WA 98046

Dear Mayor Roberts and Fellow Council Members:

Today I've learned of the recently published Draft Environmental Impact Statement and I am concerned about the proposal to rezone various properties.

I am an employee at Connelly Skis located in the City of Lynnwood. I find this an ideal location. I live in Mountlake Terrace. Now that I work at Connelly, I find my commute shorter than when I worked in North Seattle. Working in Lynnwood has made it easier to do my shopping after work before I pick up my two young children from day care. I have only been with the company a little over a year, I take great pride in working for a top producer of water skis that is sold all over the United States as well as internationally.

The proposed changes of zones which Connelly properties are located at, 20621 52nd west and between 55th and 56th, from 206th to 208th to Business Technical and residential respectively, threatens not only the future growth and expansion of Connelly but my future plans and my job. If the proposed zoning changes becomes reality, the manufacturing facilities located at the developed Connelly site would become non-conforming. The undeveloped site could become unusable for present or future expansion. Either way, Connelly would be forced to move its operation out of the area and depending upon where they relocate, could force me to relive the uncertainty of last year, when my previous employer relocated out of state. This time, I won't have my husband's employment to lean upon, as he is employed at Connelly Skis, too.

Though, I don't understand all the reasons behind the Draft and the proposed zoning changes, which don't include solutions to an increased traffic congestion, I hope the Council will reexamine its plans and remember that it is impacting people as well as the community. Besides, I'm being selfish but I like Connelly's location and would prefer to stay with them for a long time.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rodolf
4105 236th St SW #K101
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF ELIZABETH RODOLF

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Dear Mayor and Council Members

I am an employee of Connelly Skis and have been for 11 years.

I am writing to you to express my concern over your rezoning proposal. The proposal would possibly force Connelly to relocate in another state. I depend on my job to support myself and my mother and grandmother. I have spent the past 10 years taking care of my mother. She has had numerous medical problems and had to leave her job because of her illnesses. Because of this, I have had to give up my savings and most of my personal time to take care of her. My job has been the only constant in my life and losing it would be a devastating blow in my life.

Changing the zoning laws not only would affect me, but affect other lives whose businesses are affected.
The other negative of changing the zoning laws would be greatly increased traffic. Traffic in the area is bad enough, changing the laws would double or even triple the amount of traffic. Most residents who live in the Lynnwood area would not be pleased by that.

Another problem is increased crime by bringing in more multi-family units. Other cities I’ve heard who have changed these zoning laws have had these similar problems.

So in closing, I ask that you please re-evaluate your proposal. Not only for the crime and traffic problems, but for the jobs and lines that will be changed in an already shaky economy.

Thank you,

[Signature]
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF GREGG WAATI

Comments noted.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on traffic were evaluated by the Draft EIS at pages 107-118. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS. Impacts on police service needs were discussed at pages 119-121 of the Draft EIS.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Dear Sirs:

In regards to the rezoning of Lynnwood, we would just like to say it's a bad idea. We lived in Lynnwood happily for 18 years on 50 Ave. West. With the reconstruction on this street and the increased traffic flow that it caused, we decided to move from the area.

We can imagine the increase of traffic in the area if rezoning passes to allow more apartments and condos to be built. The businesses mean a lot of jobs to the Lynnwood area. Wages and taxes, money spent on rents and retail sales for Lynnwood. Let's leave Lynnwood's small businesses alone. Do not let the rezoning issue pass.

Sincerely,

Ron & Charlene Casey

R & 1 Box 234 Raywood 98577
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF RON AND LAURA CAREY

Comments noted.

The effects of the General Policy Plan and the Future Land Use Plan alternatives on traffic were evaluated by the Draft EIS at pages 107-118. Additional information on traffic congestion is included in Appendix B of this Final EIS.

Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
June 23, 1994

Mayor Tina Roberts
19100 44th Ave W.
Lynnwood, WA 98036

Dear Ms. Roberts:

I am writing in regard to the proposed change in zoning that could impact Connelly Skis developed property, as well as their vacant property designated for expansion.

Connelly has had a very positive impact on our community. They have provided good stable employment for approximately 100 employees, they have excellent community relations, and have paid their fair share of taxes to maintain our community services. In short they have been what most communities spend a great deal of money to attract to their area. Indeed many economic development groups are actively seeking such businesses and offer special subsidies to entice them to their community.

Connelly has also been an active member in making our community a better place for it's citizens. As you probably know, Work Opportunities is a program providing Vocational Rehabilitation services for persons with disabilities. Connelly has provided employment opportunities for a number of persons with disabilities. They have also contributed their employees time and effort as well as monetary contributions to a number of community organizations to help make our community a better place for all citizens. Indeed, Connelly has clearly demonstrated the real meaning behind the term "Good Neighbor".

I would urge your careful consideration of any change in zoning that would adversely effect the growth and continuation of such an asset to our community. If we are to maintain and enhance the quality of life in our community we need businesses such as Connelly, who have clearly demonstrated their ability to be a good neighbor and at the same time have positive impact on the economic well being of our entire community.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Hatch
Executive Director
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OF WORK OPPORTUNITIES (MICHAEL E. HATCH)

Comments noted. Please see also the response to comments of Wayne Hanzel, above.
Errata
ERRATA

FIRE SERVICE

During the review of the DEIS, minor corrections to the Fire Service Section were developed by the Fire Chief and are hereby incorporated in the FEIS.

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 a mutual Automatic 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. The Civic Center Headquarters Fire Station #4 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 Fire Engines, one aid car, and one aerial ladder truck. The Blue Ridge Fire Station #2 is located at the corner of 68th Avenue W. and 188th S.W. and is equipped with two 1,500 gpm pumps Fire Engines and one aid car. The department employs a total of 32 career firefighters, and 23 chief officers, 1 staff person, 2 technical fire inspectors, and 46 17 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 calls for service. 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 department is planned for 1994-95; the department plans to add a 2-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 inspections, emergency, and fire-related calls increase, it would become necessary to expand fire protection emergency 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 fire fighting 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. The department uses established response time goals to determine the need for more personnel. Staffing would need to be adjusted as the response goals were not being achieved.

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. Currently, the neighboring departments are discussing the feasibility of merging services.

**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.
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DISTRIBUTION LIST

Federal
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Environ. Protection Agency

State
Dept. of Community Dev. (DCD)
Dept. of Ecology (2)
Dept. of Fisheries
Dept. of Natural Resources
Dept. of Transportation (WSDOT)
Dept. of Wildlife-Region 4 OFC

Regional Agencies
Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
Community Transit
Regional Transit Authority
Alderwood Water Dist.
Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency
Puget Sound Water Quality Authority
METRO

Counties
Planning & Community Dev. Dept.
Snohomish County PUD #1
SNOTran
Snohomish County Public Works

Cities
City of Edmonds
City of Mountlake Terrace
City of Brier
City of Everett
City of Mukilteo
City of Mill Creek
City of Bothell
Town of Woodway

Other Draft EIS Recipients
The Boeing Company
Everett Herald
Enterprise Newspapers
Edmonds Community College
Everett Library
Edmonds Public Library
Edmonds Community College Library
Other Draft EIS Recipients (cont.)
Edmonds School District 15
GTE
Snohomish Master Builders Assoc.
South County Chamber of Commerce
Washington Natural Gas Co.

City of Lynnwood
Mayor
City Council (7)
Planning Commission (6)
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board (7)
City Attorney
Planning Department
Public Works Department
Parks & Recreation Department
Police Department
Fire Department
Lynnwood Library

Individuals
John Anderson, member Environmental Review Committee
Thomas Stephens, President Connelly Skis
Larry W. Ingraham, President, Harmon & Associates Real Estate
John E. Thoresen, President, Snohomish County. Economic Development Council

Note: All other persons that submitted written or oral comments received written notification of the issuance of the final EIS.
APPENDIX B

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS AND PROJECTED SERVICE LEVELS FOR PRINCIPLE AND MINOR ARTERIAL INTERSECTIONS

The Draft EIS for the Lynnwood General Policy Plan summarized the results of the City's transportation impact modeling and projections for the three alternatives. The summary, presented in Table 20 of the Draft EIS, presented modeling results only for intersections involving principle arterials. In their comments on the Draft EIS, the Snohomish County Planning Department suggested that additional impact information for minor arterial intersections might be helpful in distinguishing the alternatives in terms of traffic impacts. This additional information is presented in the following tables.

The first table (5 pages) provides existing (1992) PM peak hour traffic counts, capacities, volume/capacity ratios, LOS and additional information for arterial intersections and arterial segments. The second table (7 pages) provides projected future (2012) PM peak hour traffic counts, capacities, volume/capacity ratios, LOS and additional information for the same arterial intersections and segments.
## Existing Arterial Segments and Intersections

### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Arterials</strong></td>
<td>S.of 212th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99</td>
<td>S.of 208th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 208th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 188th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 176th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 168th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 168th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CORRIDOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 44th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44TH/212TH</td>
<td>212th to I-5 Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/1-5 NB RAMPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/200TH</td>
<td>200th to 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CORRIDOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 196th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. of 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76TH/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.of 76th (W. of 64th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68TH/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64TH/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. of SR 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60TH/196TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.of 52nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## EXISTING ARTERIAL SEGMENTS AND INTERSECTIONS

### PM PEAK TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52ND/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. of 44th</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>A 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,092</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,697</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.OF 36th</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>A 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB I-5/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,458</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. of 36th</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>A 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196TH/POPLAR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,267</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196TH/25TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>F+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196TH/24TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td>2,876</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minor Arterials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Range 3 to 5</th>
<th>Range 30 to 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.of OVD</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVD to SR-99</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99/168TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99 to 44th</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/168TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Range 3 to 5</th>
<th>Range 30 to 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVD to 60th</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th to SR-99</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99/176TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99 to 44th</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/176TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td>1,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Range 3 to 5</th>
<th>Range 30 to 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.of SR99</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99 to 62nd</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52ND/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.of 44th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.of 36th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36TH/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSECTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Arterial Segments and Intersections

### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200th</td>
<td>W. of SR-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-99/200TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of SR 99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. of 50th/52nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48TH/200TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44TH/200TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. of 44th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,588</td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212th</td>
<td>W. of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR-99/212TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,903</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. of 52nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52ND/212TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of 52nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44TH/212TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,932</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of 44th</td>
<td></td>
<td>840</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB</td>
<td>E. of 36th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of 33rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. of 28th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMB/184TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of 184th</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,169</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36th</td>
<td>S. of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36TH/AMB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of AMB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36TH/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,542</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of 188th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36TH/184TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of 184th</td>
<td></td>
<td>920</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. of Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. of 164th</td>
<td></td>
<td>907</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Arterial Segments and Intersections
### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>SEGMENT</th>
<th>INTER. (Y)</th>
<th>1992 PM PEAK</th>
<th>EXIST. LANES</th>
<th>EXIST. CAP.</th>
<th>1992 V/C</th>
<th>1992 LOS</th>
<th>SPEED LIMIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36TH/164TH</td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>5,429</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44TH</td>
<td>44TH/I-5-NB RAMPS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,517</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,632</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 188th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44TH/188TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,771</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 188th</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of Maple</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44TH/176TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 176th</td>
<td></td>
<td>830</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 172nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44TH/168TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,086</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,011</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEGMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CORRIDOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd (50th)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 212</td>
<td></td>
<td>826</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52ND/212TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52ND/200TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 200th</td>
<td></td>
<td>984</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52nd</td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>928</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52ND/168TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVD 76TH</td>
<td>E.of 76th</td>
<td></td>
<td>903</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76TH/208TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 208th (S.of 196th)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Arterials</td>
<td>Range 3 to 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180th</td>
<td>W.of 60th</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>466</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188th</td>
<td>W.of 60th</td>
<td></td>
<td>689</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60th</td>
<td>S.of 208th</td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 196th</td>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of SR99</td>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Existing Arterial Segments and Intersections

#### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64th</td>
<td>N.of 188th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 200th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64TH/196TH</td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 188th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 176th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th</td>
<td>N.of 196th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 196th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ridge</td>
<td>N.of 188th(to OVD)</td>
<td>Range 2 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Range 25 to 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>E. of 44th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 196th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th</td>
<td>N. of 194th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48th</td>
<td>N.of 200th</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48TH/196TH</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,454</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.of 180th</td>
<td></td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.of 188th</td>
<td></td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FUTURE ARTERIAL SEGMENTS AND INTERSECTIONS**

**PM PEAK TRAFFIC CONDITIONS**

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD. V/C | HIGH V/C | *92* LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| **Principal Arterials** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SR 99  | S.of 212th | | 4,388 | 4,322 | 4,315 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.43 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/212TH | Y | 6,595 | 6,497 | 6,525 | 12 | 12 | 6,384 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 1.02 | C | F | F | F |
| | S.of 208th | Y | 4,945 | 4,868 | 4,843 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.48 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/208 | Y | 6,257 | 6,325 | 6,353 | 13 | 14 | 7,699 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.83 | B | D | D | D |
| | S. of 200th | Y | 4,877 | 5,019 | 5,091 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.51 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/200TH | Y | 6,587 | 6,705 | 6,688 | 12 | 12 | 6,384 | 1.03 | 1.05 | 1.05 | F | F | F | F |
| | S.of 196th | Y | 5,016 | 5,203 | 5,161 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.52 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/196TH | Y | 8,785 | 8,981 | 9,048 | 14 | 16 | 9,250 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.98 | E | E | E | E |
| | N.of 196th | Y | 5,464 | 5,659 | 5,807 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.58 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/188TH | Y | 6,463 | 6,553 | 6,646 | 9 | 11 | 5,712 | 1.13 | 1.15 | 1.16 | F | F | F | F |
| | N.of 188th | Y | 5,927 | 5,974 | 6,057 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.61 | A | A | A | B |
| | SR-99/180TH | Y | 7,044 | 7,149 | 7,236 | 8 | 10 | 5,926 | 1.19 | 1.21 | 1.22 | F | F | F | F |
| | N. of 180th | Y | 6,594 | 6,652 | 6,722 | 8 | 10 | 7,000 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.67 | B | B | B | B |
| | SR-99/176TH | Y | 7,055 | 7,088 | 7,210 | 12 | 14 | 6,368 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.13 | E | E | F | F |
| | N. of 176th | Y | 5,223 | 5,243 | 5,287 | 5 | 7 | 10,000 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.53 | A | A | A | A |
| | SR-99/168TH | Y | 7,323 | 7,526 | 7,587 | 16 | 16 | 7,696 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.99 | B | E | E | E |
| | SR-99/164TH | Y | 8,384 | 8,445 | 8,471 | 8 | 10 | 5,624 | 1.49 | 1.50 | 1.51 | E | F+ | F+ | F+ |
| **INTERSECTIONS** | | | 7,166 | 7,252 | 7,307 | | | 6,783 | 1.08 | 1.09 | 1.10 | D | F | F | F |
| **SEGMENT** | | | 4,715 | 4,771 | 4,809 | | | 8,889 | 0.47 | 0.48 | 0.48 | A | A | A | A |
| **TOTAL CORRIDOR** | | | 5,940 | 6,012 | 6,058 | | | 7,836 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.79 | B | C | C | C |

| 44th | 44TH/212TH | Y | 4,288 | 4,345 | 4,461 | 12 | 12 | 4,932 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.90 | A | D | D | E |
| | 212th to I-5 Ramp | | 1,954 | 1,954 | 2,189 | 5 | 5 | 6,400 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.34 | A | A | A | A |
| | 44TH/I-5 NB RAMP | | 2,782 | 2,784 | 3,087 | 9 | 9 | 5,632 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.55 | A | A | A | A |
| | Ramp to 200 | | 2,654 | 2,691 | 2,856 | 6 | 7 | 6,800 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.42 | A | A | A | A |
| | 44TH/200TH | Y | 4,987 | 5,148 | 5,449 | 14 | 16 | 5,927 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.92 | C | D | D | E |
| | 200th to 196th | Y | 2,421 | 2,576 | 2,702 | 5 | 7 | 6,800 | 0.36 | 0.38 | 0.40 | A | A | A | A |
| | 44TH/196TH | Y | 5,463 | 5,798 | 5,964 | 12 | 14 | 5,072 | 1.08 | 1.14 | 1.18 | D | F | F | F |
| **INTERSECTIONS** | | | 4,380 | 4,519 | 4,740 | | | 5,391 | 0.82 | 0.85 | 0.89 | B | D | D | D |
| **SEGMENT** | | | 2,343 | 2,407 | 2,582 | | | 6,667 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.39 | A | A | A | A |
| **TOTAL CORRIDOR** | | | 3,362 | 3,463 | 3,661 | | | 6,029 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.64 | A | A | A | B |

Funded lanes used for future.
### FUTURE ARTERIAL SEGMENTS AND INTERSECTIONS

#### PM PEAK TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-------|---------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------|---------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| 196th  | W. of 76th |       | 3,567              | 3,555          | 3,584       | 5           | 5           | 6,400       | 0.56      | 0.56    | 0.56    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 76TH/196TH | Y     | 4,627              | 4,687          | 4,713       | 10          | 10          | 3,986       | 1.16      | 1.18    | 1.18    | C        | F         | F        | F        |
|        | E. of 76th (W. of 64th) | | 2,930              | 2,811          | 2,850       | 5           | 5           | 6,400       | 0.46      | 0.44    | 0.45    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 68TH/196TH | Y     | 4,294              | 3,880          | 4,042       | 10          | 12          | 3,984       | 1.08      | 1.00    | 1.01    | C        | F         | E        | F        |
|        | 64TH/196TH | Y     | 4,074              | 4,049          | 4,072       | 10          | 11          | 3,922       | 1.07      | 1.07    | 1.07    | D        | F         | F        | F        |
|        | W. of SR 99 |       | 3,681              | 3,640          | 3,731       | 5           | 7           | 6,800       | 0.54      | 0.54    | 0.55    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | SR-99/196TH | Y     | 8,785              | 8,981          | 9,048       | 14          | 16          | 9,250       | 0.95      | 0.97    | 0.98    | E        | E         | E        | E        |
|        | E.of SR99  |       | 3,268              | 3,388          | 3,355       | 5           | 7           | 6,800       | 0.48      | 0.50    | 0.49    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 60TH/196TH | Y     | 3,859              | 4,076          | 4,029       | 10          | 10          | 4,454       | 0.87      | 0.92    | 0.90    | B        | D         | E        | E        |
|        | E.of 52nd  |       | 3,502              | 3,509          | 3,641       | 5           | 5           | 6,800       | 0.52      | 0.52    | 0.54    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 52ND/196TH | Y     | 3,790              | 3,964          | 3,964       | 7           | 7           | 4,764       | 0.80      | 0.83    | 0.83    | A        | C         | D        | D        |
|        | 48TH/196TH | Y     | 4,259              | 4,344          | 4,494       | 10          | 10          | 4,454       | 0.96      | 0.98    | 1.01    | C        | E         | E        | F        |
|        | W. of 44th |       | 3,285              | 3,650          | 3,633       | 5           | 5           | 6,800       | 0.48      | 0.54    | 0.53    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 44TH/196TH | Y     | 5,463              | 5,798          | 5,964       | 12          | 14          | 5,092       | 1.07      | 1.14    | 1.17    | D        | F         | F        | F        |
|        | 40TH/196TH | Y     | 4,214              | 4,387          | 4,603       | 10          | 10          | 4,454       | 0.95      | 0.98    | 1.03    | B        | E         | E        | F        |
|        | W. OF 36th |       | 3,707              | 3,880          | 4,037       | 5           | 7           | 6,800       | 0.55      | 0.57    | 0.59    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 36TH/196TH | Y     | 5,977              | 6,069          | 6,243       | 13          | 15          | 7,798       | 0.77      | 0.78    | 0.80    | C        | C         | C        | D        |
|        | SB I-5/196TH |       | 5,648              | 5,681          | 5,698       | 6           | 9           | 7,628       | 0.74      | 0.74    | 0.75    | C        | C         | C        | C        |
|        | E. of 36th |       | 3,549              | 3,522          | 3,522       | 5           | 5           | 6,849       | 0.62      | 0.62    | 0.62    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
|        | 196TH/POPLAR |       | 4,635              | 4,701          | 4,699       | 8           | 10          | 6,849       | 0.68      | 0.69    | 0.69    | E        | B         | B        | B        |
|        | 196TH/28TH | Y     | 4,588              | 4,565          | 4,662       | 12          | 14          | 4,656       | 0.99      | 0.98    | 1.00    | F        | E         | E        | F        |
|        | 196TH/24TH | Y     | 2,788              | 2,753          | 2,741       | 10          | 11          | 4,656       | 0.60      | 0.59    | 0.59    | E        | A         | A        | A        |
| INTERSECTIONS |       | 4,786              | 4,860          | 4,927       |               |               | 5,416       | 0.90      | 0.92    | 0.93    | D        | E         | E        | E        |
| SEGMENT |         | 3,436              | 3,494          | 3,544       |               |               | 6,700       | 0.51      | 0.52    | 0.53    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |   | 4,111              | 4,177          | 4,235       |               |               | 6,058       | 0.71      | 0.72    | 0.73    | B        | C         | C        | C        |

**Minor Arterials**

| STREET   | SEGMENT   | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------|----------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| W.of OVD |           | 1,445             | 1,646          | 1,668       | 5           | 5           | 1,600       | 0.90      | 1.03    | 1.04    | A        | E         | F        | F        |
| OVD to SR-99 |        | 1,874             | 2,133          | 2,094       | 5           | 5           | 6,400       | 0.29      | 0.33    | 0.33    | A        | A         | A        | A        |
| SR-99/168TH | Y       | 7,323             | 7,526          | 7,587       | 16          | 16          | 7,696       | 0.95      | 0.98    | 0.99    | B        | E         | E        | E        |
| SR-99 to 44th |       | 1,447             | 1,480          | 1,509       | 5           | 5           | 6,400       | 0.23      | 0.23    | 0.24    | A        | A         | A        | A        |

[Funded lanes used for future.]
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### Future Arterial Segments and Intersections

#### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD. V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|----------|
| 44TH/168TH | Y       | 1,976     | 2,027             | 2,040         | 8           | 9           | 4,086       | 0.48        | 0.50      | 0.50     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| INTERSECTIONS |          | 4,650     | 4,777             | 4,814         | 5,891       | 0.72        | 0.74        | 0.74        | A         | C        | C        | C        | C        |
| SEGMENT |          | 1,689     | 1,753             | 1,757         | 4,800       | 0.47        | 0.53        | 0.54        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |          | 3,119     | 3,265             | 3,285         | 5,346       | 0.60        | 0.63        | 0.64        | A         | B        | B        | B        | B        |
| 176th | OVD to 60th | 528       | 532               | 532           | 2           | 3           | 2,000       | 0.26        | 0.27      | 0.27     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 60th to SR-99 |          | 1,269     | 1,293             | 1,335         | 2           | 3           | 2,000       | 0.63        | 0.65      | 0.67     | B        | B        | B        | B        |
| SR-99/176TH | Y       | 7,055     | 7,088             | 7,210         | 6,368       | 1.11        | 1.11        | 1.13        | E         | F        | F        | F        | F        |
| SR-99 to 44th |          | 1,263     | 1,298             | 1,427         | 4           | 4           | 4,000       | 0.32        | 0.32      | 0.36     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 44TH/176TH | Y       | 2,373     | 2,446             | 2,583         | 2,500       | 0.95        | 0.98        | 1.03        | B         | E        | E        | E        | F        |
| INTERSECTIONS |          | 4,714     | 4,767             | 4,897         | 4,434       | 1.03        | 1.05        | 1.08        | D         | F        | F        | F        | F        |
| SEGMENT |          | 1,020     | 1,041             | 1,098         | 2,667       | 0.40        | 0.41        | 0.43        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |          | 2,867     | 2,904             | 2,997         | 3,550       | 0.72        | 0.73        | 0.76        | A         | C        | C        | C        | C        |
| 188th | W.of SR99 | 933       | 761               | 718           | 3           | 5           | 2,400       | 0.39        | 0.32      | 0.30     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| SR-99/188TH | Y       | 6,463     | 6,553             | 6,646         | 5,712       | 1.13        | 1.15        | 1.16        | F         | F        | F        | F        | F        |
| SR-99 to 52nd |          | 965       | 1,015             | 1,037         | 3           | 5           | 2,400       | 0.40        | 0.42      | 0.43     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 52ND/188TH | Y       | 2,532     | 2,726             | 2,763         | 2,672       | 0.95        | 1.02        | 1.03        | D         | E        | F        | F        | F        |
| W.of 44th |          | 1,492     | 1,605             | 1,673         | 3           | 5           | 4,800       | 0.31        | 0.33      | 0.35     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 44TH/188TH | Y       | 3,541     | 3,649             | 3,877         | 3,824       | 0.93        | 0.95        | 1.01        | C         | E        | E        | F        | F        |
| W.of 36th |          | 1,741     | 1,813             | 1,946         | 6,400       | 0.27        | 0.28        | 0.30        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 36TH/188TH | Y       | 4,149     | 4,316             | 4,809         | 4,656       | 0.89        | 0.93        | 1.03        | A         | D        | E        | E        | F        |
| INTERSECTIONS |          | 4,171     | 4,311             | 4,524         | 4,216       | 0.97        | 1.01        | 1.08        | C         | E        | F        | F        | F        |
| SEGMENT |          | 1,283     | 1,299             | 1,344         | 4,000       | 0.34        | 0.34        | 0.35        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |          | 2,727     | 2,805             | 2,934         | 4,108       | 1           | 1           | 1           | A         | B        | B        | C        | C        |
| 198TH | 28TH/198TH | Y       | 1,022     | 998              | 1,114        | 12           | 3,800       | 0.27        | 0.26      | 0.29     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| E. of 28th |          |          |                   |               |             |             |             |             |           |          |          |           |           |           |           |
| 198TH/POPLAR | Y       | 4,469     | 4,484             | 4,601         | 3           | 9           | 3,800       | 1.18        | 1.18      | 1.21     | F         | F         | F         | F         |
| E. of Poplar |          | 800       | 763               | 834           | 3           | 5           | 3,400       | 0.24        | 0.22      | 0.25     | A         | A         | A         | A         |
| INTERSECTIONS |          | 521       | 515               | 544           | 1,850       | 0.14        | 0.14        | 0.15        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| SEGMENT |          | 3,087     | 3,149             | 3,293         | 3,981       | 0.77        | 0.78        | 0.82        | C         | C        | D        | C         | D         |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |          | 1,809     | 1,832             | 1,919         | 2,916       | 0.46        | 0.46        | 0.48        | A         | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 200th | W. of SR-99 | 906       | 804               | 794           | 2           | 5           | 2,400       | 0.38        | 0.34      | 0.33     | A        | A        | A        | A        |

Funded lanes used for future.
### Future Arterial Segments and Intersections

**PM Peak Traffic Conditions**

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST LANTES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP | NO ACT V/C | MOD V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|
| SR-99/200TH | Y | 6,587 | 6,705 | 6,688 | 12 | 12 | 6,384 | 1.03 | 1.05 | 1.05 | F | F | F | |
| E. of SR 99 | 1,614 | 1,540 | 1,517 | 3 | 5 | 2,600 | 0.62 | 0.59 | 0.58 | A | B | A | A |
| W. of 50th/52nd | 1,685 | 1,777 | 1,841 | 3 | 5 | 2,400 | 0.70 | 0.74 | 0.77 | C | C | C |
| 48TH/200TH | Y | 2,851 | 2,910 | 3,001 | 8 | 8 | 2,672 | 1.07 | 1.09 | 1.12 | D | F | F | F |
| 44TH/200TH | Y | 4,987 | 5,148 | 5,449 | 14 | 16 | 5,927 | 0.84 | 0.87 | 0.92 | C | D | D | E |
| W. of 44th | 2,584 | 2,620 | 2,702 | 3 | 5 | 6,800 | 0.38 | 0.39 | 0.40 | A | A | A | A |
| INTERSECTIONS | 4,808 | 4,921 | 5,046 | 4,994 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.03 | D | E | F | F |
| SEGMENT | 1,697 | 1,685 | 1,714 | 3,560 | 0.52 | 0.51 | 0.52 | A | A | A | A |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR | 3,253 | 3,303 | 3,380 | 4,272 | 0.75 | 0.76 | 0.77 | B | C | C | C |

| 212th | W.of SR99 | 1,531 | 1,574 | 1,601 | 4 | 5 | 2,400 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.67 | A | B | B | B |
| 212TH | Y | 6,595 | 6,497 | 6,526 | 12 | 12 | 6,384 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 1.02 | C | F | F | F |
| E. of SR99 | 2,048 | 2,023 | 2,061 | 4 | 5 | 2,400 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.86 | A | D | D | D |
| W.of 52nd | 2,310 | 2,341 | 2,374 | 4 | 5 | 3,600 | 0.64 | 0.66 | 0.66 | A | B | B | B |
| 52ND/212TH | Y | 3,360 | 3,450 | 3,590 | 4 | 5 | 4,000 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.90 | A | D | D | D |
| E.of 52nd | 2,547 | 2,611 | 2,749 | 4 | 5 | 3,600 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.76 | A | C | C | C |
| 44TH/212TH | Y | 4,288 | 4,345 | 4,461 | 12 | 12 | 4,932 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.90 | A | D | D | E |
| E.of 44th | 1,931 | 1,938 | 1,968 | 4 | 5 | 2,400 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.82 | A | D | D | D |
| INTERSECTIONS | 4,748 | 4,764 | 4,869 | 5,105 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.94 | B | E | E | E |
| SEGMENT | 2,073 | 2,097 | 2,151 | 2,880 | 0.73 | 0.74 | 0.75 | A | C | C | C |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR | 3,411 | 3,431 | 3,505 | 3,993 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.85 | A | D | D | D |

| AMB | E. of 36th | 3,383 | 3,206 | 3,318 | 4 | 4 | 4,800 | A | A |
| E.of 33rd | 3,700 | 3,572 | 3,634 | 5 | 5 | 6,400 | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.57 | A | A | A | B |
| E.of 28th | 3,700 | 3,572 | 3,634 | 5 | 5 | 6,400 | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.57 | A | A | A |
| AMB/184TH | Y | 5,025 | 5,043 | 5,206 | 12 | 12 | 5,213 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 1.00 | A | E | E | E |
| N.of 184th | 4,744 | 4,779 | 4,845 | 5 | 5 | 6,400 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.76 | A | C | C | C |
| INTERSECTIONS | 5,025 | 5,043 | 5,206 | 5,213 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 1.00 | A | E | E | E |
| SEGMENT | 2,957 | 2,889 | 2,949 | 5,600 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 0.50 | A | A | A | A |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR | 3,991 | 3,966 | 4,078 | 5,407 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.76 | A | C | C | C |

| 36th | S.of 196th | 623 | 573 | 609 | 4 | 4 | 1,600 | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.38 | A | A | A | A |
| 36TH/196TH | Y | 5,977 | 6,069 | 6,243 | 13 | 15 | 7,798 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.80 | C | C | C | D |
| N.of 196th | 1,870 | 1,843 | 2,018 | 5 | 5 | 6,800 | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.30 | A | A | A | A |
| 36TH/AMB | Y | 10 | 10 | | | | | | |

Funded lanes used for future.
### FUTURE ARTERIAL SEGMENTS AND INTERSECTIONS

#### PM PEAK TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

| STREET       | SEGMENT   | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD. V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---------|----------|
| N. of AMB    |           |           | 2,258              | 2,238          | 2,414        | 5            | 5            | 6,800       | 0.33      | 0.33     | 0.36     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 36TH/188TH   | Y         | 4,149     | 4,316              | 4,809          | 12           | 12           | 4,666        | 0.89       | 0.93     | 1.03     | A        | D        | E        | F        |
| N. of 188th  |           | 1,761     | 1,901              | 2,076          | 5            | 5            | 6,800        | 0.26       | 0.28     | 0.31     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 36TH/184TH   | Y         | 2,810     | 2,940              | 3,229          | 11           | 11           | 4,070        | 0.69       | 0.72     | 0.79     | A        | B        | C        | C        |
| N. of 184th  |           | 2,320     | 2,311              | 2,446          | 5            | 5            | 6,800        | 0.34       | 0.34     | 0.38     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| N. of Maple  |           | 2,814     | 2,872              | 2,915          | 5            | 5            | 2,400        | 1.17       | 1.20     | 1.21     | A        | F        | F        | F        |
| S. of 164th  |           | 2,797     | 2,879              | 2,850          | 5            | 5            | 2,400        | 1.17       | 1.20     | 1.19     | A        | F        | F        | F        |
| 36TH/164TH   | Y         | 5,259     | 5,305              | 5,230          | 10           | 12           | 4,200        | 1.25       | 1.26     | 1.25     | B        | F        | F        | F        |
| INTERSECTIONS |          |           | 3,639              | 3,726          | 3,902        | 4,145        | 0.72         | 0.74       | 0.77     | A        | C        | C        | C        | C        |
| SEGMENT      |           |           | 2,063              | 2,088          | 2,180        | 4,800        | 0.56         | 0.57       | 0.59     | A        | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |         |           | 2,851              | 2,907          | 3,046        | 4,472        | 0.64         | 0.65       | 0.68     | A        | B        | B        | B        | B        |
| 40th         |           |           |                    |                |              |              |              |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 194th to 200th |        |           | 489                | 510            | 554          | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.31      | 0.32     | 0.35     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 44TH         |           |           |                    |                |              |              |              |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 44TH/I-5-NB RAMP |      |           | 2,782              | 2,784          | 3,087        | 9            | 9            | 5,632       | 0.49      | 0.49     | 0.55     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| N.of 196th   |           | 1,824     | 1,872              | 1,964          | 5            | 5            | 6,800        | 0.27       | 0.28     | 0.29     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| S. of 188th  |           | 1,887     | 1,932              | 2,031          | 4            | 5            | 6,000        | 0.31       | 0.32     | 0.34     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 44TH/188TH   | Y         | 3,541     | 3,649              | 3,877          | 10           | 12           | 3,824        | 0.93       | 0.95     | 1.01     | C        | E        | E        | F        |
| N. of 188th  |           | 1,684     | 1,726              | 1,839          | 2            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.70       | 0.72     | 0.77     | C        | C        | C        | C        |
| N. of Maple  |           | 1,818     | 1,875              | 1,950          | 2            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.76       | 0.78     | 0.81     | B        | C        | C        | D        |
| 44TH/176TH   | Y         | 2,373     | 2,446              | 2,583          | 6            | 9            | 2,500        | 0.95       | 0.98     | 1.03     | B        | E        | E        | F        |
| N. of 176th  |           | 1,467     | 1,482              | 1,580          | 2            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.61       | 0.62     | 0.66     | A        | B        | B        | B        |
| N. of 172nd  |           | 1,363     | 1,369              | 1,416          | 2            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.57       | 0.57     | 0.59     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 44TH/168TH   | Y         | 1,976     | 2,027              | 2,040          | 8            | 9            | 4,086        | 0.48       | 0.50     | 0.50     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| INTERSECTIONS |          |           | 2,668              | 2,727          | 2,897        | 4,011        | 0.71         | 0.73       | 0.77     | A        | C        | C        | C        | C        |
| SEGMENT      |           |           | 1,359              | 1,387          | 1,458        | 2,733        | 0.48         | 0.49       | 0.52     | A        | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| TOTAL CORRIDOR |         |           | 2,014              | 2,057          | 2,177        | 3,372        | 0.60         | 0.61       | 0.65     | A        | B        | B        | A        | B        |
| 52nd (50th)  |           |           |                    |                |              |              |              |            |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| N.of 212     |           | 1,281     | 1,335              | 1,406          | 3            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.53       | 0.56     | 0.59     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| 52ND/212TH   | Y         | 3,360     | 3,450              | 3,590          | 4            | 5            | 4,000        | 0.84       | 0.86     | 0.90     | A        | D        | D        | D        |
| 52ND/200TH   | Y         | 3,074     | 3,225              | 3,227          | 10           | 10           | 3,669        | 0.84       | 0.88     | 0.88     | B        | D        | D        | D        |
| N. of 200th  |           | 1,206     | 1,211              | 1,180          | 3            | 3            | 2,400        | 0.50       | 0.50     | 0.49     | A        | A        | A        | A        |
| S. of 200th  |           | 1,076     | 1,180              | 1,204          | 2            | 3            | 1,600        | 0.67       | 0.74     | 0.75     | A        | B        | C        | C        |
| 52ND/168TH   | Y         | 3,569     | 3,860              | 3,903          | 10           | 10           | 3,984        | 0.90       | 0.97     | 0.98     | A        | D        | E        | E        |

Comments and Responses:

Funded lanes used for future.
## FUTURE ARTERIAL SEGMENTS AND INTERSECTIONS

### PM PEAK TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| OVD    | E.of 76th | Y         | 1,105              | 1,147         | 1,086        | 2            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.55      | 0.57    | 0.54     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
| 76TH   | 76TH/208TH | Y         | 1,411              | 1,506         | 1,536        | 6            | 6            | 1,500       | 0.94      | 1.00    | 1.02     | B       | E        | F       | F       |
|        | N.of 208th (S.of 196th) | Y         | 1,327              | 1,423         | 1,469        | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.83      | 0.89    | 0.92     | B       | D        | D       | E       |
| 76TH/196TH | Y       | 4,627     | 4,687              | 4,713         |              | 10           | 10           | 3,984       | 1.16      | 1.18    | 1.18     | C       | F        | F       | F       |
|        | N.of 196th  | Y         | 1,282              | 1,565         | 1,556        | 2            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.64      | 0.78    | 0.78     | A       | B        | C       | C       |

### Collector Arterials

| STREET | SEGMENT | INTER (Y) | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------|---------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 180th  | W.of 60th | Y         | 343                | 378           | 375          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.21      | 0.24    | 0.23     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | W.of SR99 | Y         | 286                | 276           | 273          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.18      | 0.17    | 0.17     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | E.of SR99 | Y         | 558                | 605           | 566          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.35      | 0.38    | 0.35     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
| 188th  | W.of 60th | Y         | 928                | 765           | 729          | 2            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.46      | 0.46    | 0.46     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | W.of SR99 | Y         | 933                | 761           | 718          | 2            | 3            | 2,400       | 0.39      | 0.32    | 0.30     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | E.of SR99 | Y         | 556                | 563           | 604          | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.35      | 0.35    | 0.35     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | S.of 196th | Y         | 885                | 931           | 914          | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.44      | 0.47    | 0.46     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | S.of 196th | Y         | 665                | 730           | 746          | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.42      | 0.46    | 0.47     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | N.of 188th | Y         | 741                | 606           | 626          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.46      | 0.38    | 0.39     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | N.of 200th | Y         | 1,041              | 1,044         | 1,033        | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.65      | 0.65    | 0.65     | A       | B        | B       | B       |
| 64TH/196TH | Y       | 4,074     | 4,049              | 4,072         |              | 10           | 11           | 3,792       | 1.07      | 1.07    | 1.07     | D       | F        | F       | F       |
|        | N.of 196th | Y         | 485                | 582           | 520          | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.24      | 0.29    | 0.26     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | N.of 188th | Y         | 864                | 1,002         | 971          | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.54      | 0.63    | 0.61     | A       | A        | B       | B       |
|        | S.of 176th | Y         | 619                | 715           | 615          | 3            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.39      | 0.45    | 0.36     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | S.of 196th | Y         | 1,292              | 1,193         | 1,212        | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.65      | 0.60    | 0.61     | A       | B        | A       | B       |
| 68TH/196TH | Y       | 4,294     | 3,980              | 4,042         |              | 10           | 12           | 3,984       | 1.08      | 1.00    | 1.01     | C       | F        | E       | F       |
|        | N.of 196th | Y         | 1,159              | 939           | 974          | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.58      | 0.47    | 0.49     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
|        | S.of 188th | Y         | 1,159              | 939           | 974          | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.58      | 0.47    | 0.49     | A       | A        | A       | A       |
| Blue Ridge | N.of 188th(to OVD) | Y | 728                | 727           | 747          | 2            | 2            | 1,600       | 0.46      | 0.45    | 0.47     | A       | A        | A       | A       |

Funded lanes used for future.
## Future Arterial Segments and Intersections

### PM Peak Traffic Conditions

| STREET | SEGMENT       | INTER | NO-ACTION PM PEAK | MODER. PM PEAK | HIGH PM PEAK | EXIST. LANES | FUNDED LANES | FUTURE CAP. | NO ACT V/C | MOD. V/C | HIGH V/C | "92" LOS | NO-ACT LOS | MOD LOS | HIGH LOS |
|--------|---------------|-------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|----------|
| Maple  | E. of 44th    |       | 650               | 685            | 638          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.41       | 0.43     | 0.40     | A       | A       | A         | A       | A        |
|        | 24th          |       | 1,014             | 994            | 985          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.63       | 0.62     | 0.62     | A       | B       | B         | B       | B        |
| 40th   | N. of 194th   |       | 995               | 1,051          | 1,114        | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.62       | 0.66     | 0.70     | A       | B       | B         | B       | B        |
| 48th   | N. of 200th   |       | 813               | 779            | 827          | 3            | 3            | 2,000       | 0.41       | 0.39     | 0.41     | A       | A       | A         | A       | A        |
|        | 48TH/196TH    | Y     | 4,259             | 4,344          | 4,494        | 10           | 10           | 4,454       | 0.96       | 0.98     | 1.01     | C       | E       | E         | F       |           |
|        | S. of 180th   |       | 780               | 821            | 856          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.49       | 0.51     | 0.54     | A       | A       | A         | A       | A        |
|        | N. of 188th   |       | 831               | 844            | 901          | 2            | 3            | 1,600       | 0.52       | 0.53     | 0.56     | A       | A       | A         | A       | A        |

Funded lanes used for future.