

From: [Plancom](#)
To: [Rachael Markle](#); [Steve Szafran](#); [Easton Craft](#); [David Maul](#); [William Montero](#); [Paul Cohen](#); [Lisa Basher](#); [Jack Malek](#); [Laura Mork](#); [Miranda Redinger](#); [Julie Ainsworth-Taylor](#); [Susan Chang](#); [Donna M. Moss](#)
Subject: FW: Comments on the 145th Final EIS and Development codes
Date: Thursday, July 07, 2016 3:40:11 PM

From: Dave Lange[SMTP:UMBRELLAHOUSE@GMAIL.COM]
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 3:40:05 PM
To: Plancom; Rachael Markle
Subject: Comments on the 145th Final EIS and Development codes
Auto forwarded by a Rule

I would like to quote a communication with a Traffic Engineer familiar with the number used in the Traffic Study. *The traffic analysis included all new and existing population and jobs in the study area.* This means it accounts for any new traffic coming out or going into the rezone area when appropriately zoned. Allowing several “easy” residential-only buildings and not starting on the actual MUR structures will clog the streets faster.

One of the commissioners made a comment in the last meeting that a horseshoe of MUR45 and MUR35 around an R6 station would be bad. If we include actual mixed use in the MUR45 that problem disappears at the station as well as the long row of structures out to Aurora. There were Council thoughts that the last pieces joining the upzone would be the MUR70 and none would start until the station was operational. Allowing non-mixed use and smaller R48 structures in an attempt to jumpstart MUR70 will kill the future walking area around the station while increasing the external car trips around the boundary.

The concept of a Planning Commission that focuses on buildings short term and ignores the Community Development side of the Department title is so wrong. The Commission needs to be the reasoning body for all sides of an plan, expecting the Council to overturn bad decisions is unreasonable when so many of the Council depend on the Commission’s deep research. As a city we are trying to grow out of our Bedroom for Seattle mode and create a thriving, vibrant community. Hiding the Final EIS for 145th until the day of its introduction to the Planning Commission was a problem in the 185th process and appears to have continued down to 145th. Instead of what the citizens were expecting with the new public involvement process in the Comp Plan.

The final 185th EIS mentions Table 3.3-4 on page 3-124 with a dispersed land-use mode with numbers from alternative 4. It shows 70% external car trips which will estimate the traffic in the upzone density without sufficient businesses for errands and employment.

Given the tight coupling of a draft EIS and final EIS around here, I am going out on a limb (or is cantilevered deck the more appropriate term here?) and suggest the final EIS is missing a chapter on business background and forecast. The study should have sought out businesses that could be interested in space in the rezone area and see what their interest level, schedule and requirements would be. It appears the city fell for the Transit Oriented

Development definition and completely missed the business requirement to develop it successfully while maintaining our carbon quotient and existing roadways widened for transit and multimodal travel. Strangely the Traffic team in Public Works has a fuller understanding. Won't there be an EIS level impact if a potential EIS forecasts a 7 lane road instead of a 3 lane road, not to mention the impact on garage parking? Isn't that a valuable input into the process? Part of business chapter should also study whether station areas are impacted by highway ramps (aka existing conditions) and whether station areas or business centers/urban villages (locating a business) are better locations for new density.

Thanks for reading,

Dave Lange

Shoreline