

City of Lynnwood
Five-year Comprehensive Plan Update



Non-project SEPA Review
State Environmental Policy Act

5TH Iteration
November 1, 2000

| CONTENTS | page |
|---|--------|
| 1. Background | 3 |
| 2. Need and Objectives | 4 |
| a. Problems to be addressed and Anticipated Actions | 4 |
| b. Primary Objectives of the 5-year Plan Update | 6 |
| c. Known or Key Env. Issues, Controversy or Concern | 7 |
| 3. Previous Documentation | 9 |
| 4. Alternative Approaches | 11 |
| 5. Public, Agency & Tribal Involvement | 11 |
| 6. Existing Environment | 14 |
| 7. Broad Impacts | 18 |
| 8. Key Issues/Questions, Alternatives etc. | 20 |
| a. #1: Citywide Land Use Plan Adjustments | 20 |
| Land Use Alternative #1 | 21 |
| Land Use Alternative #2 | 22 |
| Land Use Alternative #3 | 25 |
| Land Use Alternative #4 | 27 |
| The "Preferred Land Use Alternative" | 30 |
| b. #2: Future Development of new CBD | 34 |
| c. #3: Incorporation of College District Plan | 35 |
| d. #4: Single-family Neighborhood Preservation | 36 |
| e. #5: Resolution of Conflicting Urban Growth Areas | 38 |
| f. #6: Encourage redevelopment to industrial | 39 |
| 9. Total Proposal Evaluation | 40 |
| 10. Consistency with Plans, Policies & Law | 41 |
| 11. Unavoidable Impacts | 43 |
| 12. Monitoring and Follow-up | 44 |
| Appendix A – Environmental Elements | 45 |

1. BACKGROUND:

- (a) Agency:** City of Lynnwood
PO Box 5008
Lynnwood WA 98046-5008
Phone: (425) 670-6655
FAX: (425) 771-6585
E-mail: rthough@ci.lynnwood.wa.us
- Contact:** Ron W. Hough, Planning Manager

(b) Designated Responsible Official:

Lynnwood Environmental Review Committee (ERC)
Darryl Eastin, Senior Planner
(at Agency address)
Phone: (425) 670-6652

(c) Name and Description of Proposal:

Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan – Five-year Update:

The City of Lynnwood adopted its current Comprehensive Plan in 1995 and is now conducting the first five-year review and update. The Plan was previously adjusted through the City's annual amendment process, which resulted in a number of minor changes to the Plan map and policies over the past four years.

The five-year review is an opportunity to open the entire Plan to a public review of the City's long-range vision and the primary goals that direct us toward the vision. It's also the time for public discussion of the goals, objectives and policies of each individual element of the Plan and make appropriate adjustments. Statistical data, projections, etc., will also be updated with available information.

During this update, the City will consider dividing certain elements into smaller more focused elements. For example, the Parks and Recreation element contains sections on cultural, historic and environmental resources. We will consider creating new (optional) elements to focus more directly on some or all of those areas. We will also consider the creation of a new Economic Development Element and an Implementation Element.

Zoning Adjustments – to achieve Plan/Zone Consistency:

Since the City's Zoning Map is closely related to the Comprehensive Plan and is the primary implementation tool, it must be consistent with the Plan. This is not only a good idea – it's required by state law.

To eliminate existing conflicts and maintain Plan/Zone consistency, the City intends to adopt a new citywide Zoning Map that is directly consistent with the updated Comprehensive Plan. Necessary zoning adjustments will be nearly automatic in their application. A Plan/Zone Consistency table, provided in the

Implementation Element of the Plan, leaves little doubt about which zone(s) should apply to each Plan designation.

Because zoning is intended to implement the Plan, the impacts of land use proposals and decisions will be considered during the Plan update process. A series of public hearings will also be conducted to allow public comments on the proposed zoning adjustments. However, the primary consideration of the zoning process will be to ensure that the proper zones are being applied and not to reconsider earlier planning decisions.

During the zoning hearings, it's possible that new information may surface that could result in a proposal to change the Plan rather than the zone. If that occurs, the impacts of that proposal will be considered in the context of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and the appropriate zoning will follow.

(d) Jurisdiction or area where the proposal is applicable:

The Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan is a twenty-year Plan for growth and development within the corporate limits of the City of Lynnwood. The Plan also includes a preliminary Urban Growth Areas map. However, pending completion of a "Municipal Urban Growth Areas" (MUGA) study that is currently in progress, the City will not propose any UGA adjustments during this update process.

(e) Legal authority or mandate:

The Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.130) requires cities and counties to conduct five-year reviews of their comprehensive plans. This is the first such review of Lynnwood's 1995 Comprehensive Plan.

It is also suggested that five-year reviews be combined or coordinated with the County's required ten-year review of population projections, densities and Urban Growth Areas. In approximately 2002, Snohomish County will review its UGAs and allocate population growth based on the results of the 2000 Census and the projections of the Office of Financial Management (OFM). By completing its five-year review earlier, Lynnwood will be in a position to provide better land use and buildable lands information on which the County can base its allocations.

2. NEED AND OBJECTIVES:

(a) Problems to be addressed and the Anticipated Action:

The following is a summary of the problems, opportunities and needs to be addressed during the City's five-year Comprehensive Plan Update. In some cases, the Plan will address an opportunity more than a problem and the solution may be described as a "Need for Action" or an "Anticipated Action", depending on the particular situation:

1. Plan/Zone Inconsistencies:

Problem: A number of Plan/Zone inconsistencies date back to the adoption of the City's 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Some were corrected but many others remain. The 5-year update is a good time to correct those conflicts and also ensure that changes made this year are accompanied by consistent zoning.

Need for Action: State law required Plan/Zone consistency. The continuation of these conflicts will trigger technical and legal problems in the future. The five-year update will fine-tune the Comprehensive Plan and provide a solid basis for adoption of a new and consistent citywide Zoning Map. The re-zoning process is integral and considered Part II of the Plan Update process.

2. Residential Preservation:

Concern: Older single-family neighborhoods, especially those in "fringe" areas abutting non-residential uses, are often less desirable for residential use because of the adverse impacts of noise, traffic, etc. As the property values fail to keep pace with other residential areas and their desirability as a residential area decreases, these properties are often targeted for acquisition, rezone and redevelopment for non-residential uses, such as commercial or industrial. There is a fear of this kind of encroachment of non-residential land uses and traffic into established Lynnwood neighborhoods. If such encroachment is allowed to occur, it could further erode property values, neighborhood desirability, and also adversely affect the quality of life.

Need for Action: The City Council has determined that low-density single-family neighborhoods are among Lynnwood's primary assets. They are high priorities for protection and preservation. Although very few properties have been converted from single-family to non-residential uses in recent years, the Plan needs to contain strong protective measures that clearly "draw the line" against possible encroachment of non-residential land uses. [Also see #5 below]

3. Incorporation of the College District Plan:

Opportunity: A new master plan for the Edmonds Community College campus and a related subarea plan were recently prepared and recommended for adoption by the Planning Commission. The Plan includes proposals for mixed uses and other land use changes in the College District neighborhood, as well as needed traffic improvements, design guidelines and a design review process.

Need for Action: This subarea plan has gone through an extensive process of public participation, hearings, traffic analyses, etc., and includes land use recommendations that are directly related to the five-year Plan Update. The College District Plan can be processed independently of the Plan Update (as a subarea plan) or integrated into the larger process. In either case, there is a need to follow through with the final review and decisions.

4. A New Central Business District:

Opportunity: Lynnwood has no traditional Central Business District but has identified a general area within which a subarea plan will be prepared to guide the development of a new CBD. A visioning process was completed during the summer of 2000 to guide the preparation of a subarea plan for the future CBD.

Anticipated Action: The five-year Plan update will anticipate the future location and general concept of a new CBD, based on early discussion and

visioning. It will also provide support for the CBD subarea plan and establish supporting objectives. It will also take a closer look at existing land use Plan designations within the future CBD area and remove any designations that may be inappropriate in the future CBD or that may obstruct the subarea planning process.

5. Housing & Neighborhood Preservation:

Problem: The City Council feels that Lynnwood has provided considerably more than its "fair share" of affordable housing over the years, particularly multiple-family units. It feels that single-family detached homes are vitally important and we need to expand that component of the housing stock. To do so, the Council adopted Land Use Policy 2.14 in 1999 that favored an increase in the proportion of single-family homes throughout the City to ensure that our housing balance would better mirror that of surrounding jurisdictions.

Anticipated Action: The five-year update will take a closer look at issues of neighborhood delineation and preservation, residential infill, and the need for other forms of housing, including "affordable" housing. It will propose the best possible method of preserving as much single-family residential development as reasonably possible while minimizing the potential for new multi-family development in order to increase the proportion of single-family homes from its present level of about 54 percent of the housing stock. The "preferred alternative" Comprehensive Plan will give an appropriate level of consideration to this Council priority as well as all other Plan policies.

6. Transportation LOS and Concurrency:

Opportunity: A policy to implement a "concurrency management system" was adopted in 1995 but not yet fully implemented. Lynnwood has not adopted a concurrency management system (ordinance) but intends to review, during the 5-year update process, its current practice of using SEPA as its primary concurrency management tool. This is also a good opportunity to review the City's traffic LOS and consider how non-motorized transportation considerations might be integrated into the Transportation or Parks elements of the Plan.

Anticipated Actions: The City will review the transportation Level of Service (LOS) program and make any necessary adjustments to types of streets and times of day for various levels. The Plan will include objectives and policies related to future changes to the LOS system and other transportation needs.

7. Environmental Protection:

Opportunity: Lynnwood has a number of environmental safeguards and regulations in place, including a Critical Areas Ordinance. We are anticipating possible changes to those regulations as a result of the ESA 4(d) rule regarding chinook salmon. The nature and extent of those changes are not yet known. The City intends to add an Environmental Resources Element to its Comprehensive Plan, but not until we understand the full impacts and expectations of the final ruling.

Anticipated Action: Because of current uncertainties, a new Environmental Resources Element will not be added this year. In the meantime, the City will review and amend, as necessary, all environmental objectives and policies in the current Plan and continue to accumulate environmental data for inclusion in the Environmental Resources Background Report and, later, the new Plan element.

(b) Primary Objectives of the Five-year Plan Update:

- To comply with the state's five-year plan update requirement.
- To review and adjust the City's long-range vision of Lynnwood in 2020.
- To ensure that leading goals and objectives support the vision.
- To update data, projections, statistics, etc., as available.
- To resolve known problems and issues.
- To develop and adopt new elements that address specific subjects.
- To establish a foundation for economic development planning.
- To add an Essential Public Facilities Siting Process to the Plan.
- To address new transportation requirements of HB 1487 (LOS Bill).
- To involve the public in the Plan review and update process.
- To provide a buildable lands basis for the County's next population allocation.
- To include growth management and annexation policies in the Plan.

(c) Known or Key Environmental Issues or Areas of Controversy or Concern:

1. ESA salmon listing and related 4(d) rules.

New environmental rules, resulting from the listing of certain species of salmon as threatened, are being developed as we review our Comprehensive Plan. It's impossible to know how to adjust the Plan to address future rules that are likely to also affect zoning and other development regulations. These concerns can be addressed in a later annual Plan Amendment process.

2. Traffic – Impacts and public perceptions:

Lynnwood's streets, particularly arterials, carry a great deal of traffic. Much of it is attributed to local business, shopping and commuters. The City is surrounded by other communities and experiences a considerable amount of flow-through traffic, particularly on Highway 99 and 196th Street, that is the result of growth and development in other communities. There are local perceptions that neighborhood traffic is terrible, the street system is overburdened, and the City simply can't handle any more traffic. However, with some exceptions, most local streets are operating within adopted Levels of Service standards and designed capacities. The City is concerned about the public's perceptions and understanding of traffic matters as well as the ability of traffic system to function adequately as growth continues around us. Transportation alternatives will be reviewed with an eye for those that will lessen the impacts of local traffic, especially in residential neighborhoods, possibly through the use of traffic calming strategies.

3. Pedestrian vs. the Automobile:

Lynnwood grew rapidly as an auto-oriented suburban community. Traffic is a major concern – as is the lack of a pedestrian-friendly environment

other than the Alderwood Mall. Arterials are essentially "rivers of traffic" that tend to divide the community and are very difficult for pedestrians to cross. The challenge is how to keep traffic moving efficiently while also improving the environment for pedestrians and cyclists, and focusing on other non-motorized alternatives. The fact that Lynnwood is nearing full development could be an obstacle to the application of new traffic/pedestrian concepts to well-established development patterns.

4. Impervious Surfaces:

Lynnwood is relatively rich in commercial and business development. Alderwood Mall, strip malls and other business areas consist of large buildings served by expansive areas of paved parking. The result is a high percentage of impervious surface and excessive stormwater runoff in some areas of Lynnwood. Flooding has been a problem in some areas and there is a concern that the continuation of similar development will lead to more problems, including pollution from parking areas and streets, loss of aquifer recharge, etc. Although Lynnwood has adopted a Comprehensive Flood & Drainage Management Plan (1998) and regulations to handle stormwater and protect critical areas, there are always lingering concerns and opportunities for improvement.

5. Loss of Wetlands and Wildlife Habitat:

Citizens have expressed concern for the loss of trees, wetlands and local wildlife habitat. Lynnwood is not the rural area it was forty years ago. Today it is the central city in a large Urban Growth Area and is expected to plan for and accommodate additional urban growth. The protection of forest resource lands and habitat for major species of wildlife that are not compatible with an intense urban area was not a high priority in the 1995 Comprehensive Plan and is not a primary objective of the GMA (in urban areas). At the same time, certain types of wildlife are compatible with urban areas and should be considered.

The City's Sensitive Areas Ordinance helps identify and protect those sites that are most sensitive and provides a reasonable compromise between developing all available land and leaving everything as open space.

The Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife provided the following comments (summarized) on the City's draft Comprehensive Plan:

- Stream buffers: Lynnwood's required buffers are very small and significant improvements will be necessary. The City is urged to adopt WDFW's stream management recommendations, which are based on the best available science on stream protection.
- Stormwater management: Increased impervious surfaces and related frequency and severity of flooding are among the most severe causes of damage to salmon habitat in urban areas. WDFW "strongly urges" Lynnwood to limit the amount of impervious surface area through regulations and/or incentives.
- Bald eagles: Bald eagles were not taken off the list of threatened and endangered species. They are still protected. WDFW notes that protection of large trees near urban water bodies would benefit bald eagles by

providing perch trees for use by foraging eagles, and new nest sites to replace existing nest trees that are lost over time. Lynnwood is beginning a review of its tree preservation regulations. The initial public discussion was held on Oct. 25, 2000 at a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and Park Board. WDFW's comments will be considered in that review and in subsequent reviews and revisions to other environmental regulations.

- Wetland buffers: Wetlands are extremely valuable habitats for fish and wildlife. WDFW recommends that the Wash. Dept. of Ecology buffer recommendations be adopted – as follow:

| | High-intensity Land Use | Low-intensity land Use |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Category I wetlands | 300 ft. | 200 ft. |
| Category II wetlands | 200 ft. | 100 ft. |
| Category III wetlands | 100 ft. | 50 ft. |
| Category IV wetlands | 50 ft. | 25 ft. |

The Comprehensive Plan's environmental objectives and policies will be supplemented in a future new Environmental Resources Element, which may involve (or result in) the review and update of existing environmental regulations and policies. In the meantime, wetland and habitat issues will continue to be addressed and mitigated through the City's existing regulations and development review process.

3. PREVIOUS DOCUMENTATION:

- (a) Identify and describe any similar or related plan, regulation, policy, etc., currently in effect governing this geographic area and that contains the means to further the primary objective of updating the existing Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map.**

1. 1995 Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan
2. Lynnwood Zoning Code
3. Other land use regulations (Lynnwood Municipal Code)
4. College District Plan and Implementation Program (proposed – not adopted)
5. Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan
6. Lynnwood Comprehensive Sewer Plan (1999)
7. Lynnwood Water System Comprehensive Plan
8. Lynnwood Comprehensive Flood & Drainage Management Plan (1998)

(b) Is this proposal likely to result in an amendment to or replacement of such existing regulation, policy or plan? Describe.

Yes. The five-year Comprehensive Plan Update will lead to adoption of a revised Comprehensive Plan as well as a new and consistent citywide Zoning Map.

Adoption of year 2000 Plan amendments is scheduled to take place in December, 2000. However, it is likely that only part of the new Plan will be adopted at that time. The remaining portions, that might be affected by zoning changes, will be carried into 2001 for additional Plan and Zoning public hearings leading to adoption of the new Plan and new Zoning Map in Sept., 2001.

Other documents listed in (a) above will not be directly amended or replaced but will become reference background documents in support of the Comprehensive Plan. It's also probable that some Plan objectives or policies will lead to amendments to the Zoning Code.

(c) List any environmental documents (SEPA or NEPA) that have been prepared for items identified in 3a above. Identify the type of document, lead agency, and issue date.

The following documents were prepared for the Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan and subsequent annual amendments. City of Lynnwood was lead agency.

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 1. EIS for 1995 Lynnwood Comprehensive Plan. | Issued: July 18, 1994 |
| 2. Addendum to EIS for 1995 Comprehensive Plan. | Issued: Sept. 20, 1995 |
| 3. DNS for 1995 Comp. Plan Amendments. | Issued: Sept. 14, 1995 |
| 4. DNS for 1996 Comp. Plan Amendments. | Issued: Oct. 10, 1996 |
| 5. DNS for 1997 Comp. Plan Amendments. | Issued: Aug. 13, 1997 |
| 6. DNS for 1998 Comp. Plan Amendments. | Issued: June 22, 1998 |
| 7. DNS for 1999 Comp. Plan Amendments Study List | Issued: Aug. 26, 1999 |
| 8. DNS for 1999 Plan Amendments (Consistency) | Issued: Aug. 26, 1999 |
| 9. DNS for 1999 Plan Amendments (Spec. properties) | Issued: Aug. 26, 1999 |
| 10. Mitigated DNS for EdCC Areawide Plan | Issued: Oct. 23, 2000 |

(d) Do the SEPA documents in 3c adequately analyze any or all of the impacts from the alternatives being considered?

Yes, with the exception of Land Use Alternative #4. Several citywide land use alternatives have been developed and studied. Because the City is nearly completely developed, its land use patterns have already been well established and reflected in the 1995 Comprehensive Plan. The alternatives now being considered include relatively minor adjustments to that Plan. The environmental impacts of the Comprehensive Plan were well documented in the 1995 EIS. The changes we are now considering are expected to be relatively minor in comparison and are addressed in this document.

4. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES:

(a) Describe any legal or other mandate that requires a particular approach.

- The state requires five-year reviews and updates of comprehensive plans.
- All amendments to comprehensive plans must comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Act and related statutes.
- All Plan amendments must maintain internal and external consistency.
- Zoning must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Plan amendments must provide for early and continuous public participation in the planning process.
- The City Council has approved a schedule leading to adoption of the new Plan (or parts thereof) in December, 2000. The schedule includes several public work sessions and five public hearings.

(b) If there is no mandated approach, what types of approaches could reasonably achieve the objectives?

Not applicable

(c) Why was the approach presented in the proposal selected?

- State requirements for Plan amendments were to be complied with.
- The City needed to fill some voids, such as the development of vision statements, a Citizen Involvement Program, Essential Public Facilities, etc. The approach met the requirements for annual amendments but also provided an ongoing program for continuous public involvement that is more commonly found in the development of a new comprehensive plan.
- Regular Planning Commission meetings were used as a convenient public forum for study and public discussion of problems, opportunities, visions, goals, objectives and other Plan proposals.
- The approach provided an open working relationship between City staff, the Planning Commission and the public.

5. PUBLIC AGENCY AND TRIBAL INVOLVEMENT:

(a) Who are the known primary stakeholders?

- **City of Lynnwood** – Including the Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission, Parks Board, Arts Commission, Historic Commission, Library Board, and the Plan Update Task Force (staff).

- **The Community** – Includes the citizens, property owners and business community of Lynnwood. Also includes service clubs, community organizations, interested non-profit organizations, and others.

(b) What other jurisdictions are involved, and for what reasons?

- **Edmonds School District** – needs to know the City's residential growth plans and projected number of school-aged children that will be generated as a result.
- **Edmonds Community College** – recently developed a new campus master plan and was involved in the subarea plan for the adjacent neighborhoods. The college would like to see their plans adopted and integrated into the City's Comprehensive Plan, as originally intended.
- **Community Transit and Sound Transit** – are interested in how the City's growth and change might affect ridership, bus routes and demands on their services.
- **Snohomish County** – will be interested in the City's inventory of buildable lands, its ability to accommodate additional population, and its policies pertaining to essential public facilities, annexation and others.
- **Cities of Edmonds and Mountlake Terrace** – are abutting communities that need to know about Lynnwood's land use plans, possible traffic generation, and other potential effects on their communities.
- **Public Utilities and Services** – need to know Lynnwood's growth plans so they can plan for the adequate provision of their services. If needed services cannot be provided, the City needs to know that and adjust accordingly.

(c) What types of processes will be used for soliciting, evaluating, and documenting inputs from stakeholders, agencies, tribes and the public?

One of the first steps in the update process was to develop a Citizen Involvement Program. This program was first developed for the update process itself and later adjusted for application to the annual Plan Amendment process as well. The program was first presented to the Planning Commission at a public meeting on December 9, 1999 and later taken to the City Council for general approval. It was later included in the "Introduction" section of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Citizen Involvement Program was designed around three basic policies:

Policy A: The City of Lynnwood shall exceed the mandates of Washington State in our program to involve the public in the review and update of our Comprehensive Plan.

Policy B: The City shall encourage public participation in all phases of the planning process and offer extensive opportunities for communication and involvement, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Establish the Planning Commission as the primary public forum where all Plan-related discussions are open to public observation and, whenever appropriate, public involvement.
- Conduct community meetings for discussion and exchange of ideas.
- Conduct neighborhood meetings in schools or other suitable facilities for the convenience of attendees and to facilitate informal discussion.
- Conduct "open house" type meetings for discussions with staff, review of maps and proposals, and to disseminate hand-out information.
- Publicize early in the process to allow adequate time for response.
- Seriously consider and respond to all comments received.
- Encourage written and verbal comments.
- Consider establishing a 24-hour telephone and/or e-mail address "hot-line" for public comments.

Policy C: The City shall use, as appropriate, the following methods to advertise meetings, inform the public, and disseminate planning information:

- Newspaper Display Advertisements
- Newspaper Legal Notices
- Direct mail lists (of interested or affected people and organizations)
- Press Releases to local newspapers
- Cable Access Television station public notices
- Cable Access – Special Program (or video) on Comprehensive Planning
- City Website – Info on the Plan review process and involvement opportunities
- Bulletin Boards in public places
- Advertising signs

(d) If different from above, describe the processes used in addressing the public's and other interested parties' concerns and comments.

- All comments that are received will be documented and included with the staff reports when their related issues go to either the Planning Commission or City Council. Verbal testimony will be recorded in the meeting minutes and written comments received at meetings will be acknowledged and entered into the record.
- Staff provides written responses to most comments.
- This SEPA document provides additional information and assists in the understanding of the issues being discussed. It has been distributed to the Planning Commission and City Council, other City departments, and made available to citizens attending the public meetings. The document was also distributed for review and comment by other agencies, the Tulalip Tribe and other interested parties.

6. EXISTING ENVIRONMENT:

- (a) **Generally describe the existing environmental landscapes (i.e., status or quality of ecosystem) likely to be affected if the proposal is implemented. Include a description of the existing environment where resulting "on the ground" activities may occur and adjacent areas and facilities likely to be impacted. The following should be included, as appropriate:**
- ◆ **Primary physical features**
 - ◆ **Development level and infrastructure**
 - ◆ **Percent impervious surfaces (approximate)**
 - ◆ **Unique features, including historic and cultural sites, potential or existing critical areas, resource lands**
 - ◆ **Endangered or Threatened Species in or near the area.**

General Description:

Lynnwood is a relatively new city, incorporated in 1959. Over the past 40 years its population has grown to 33,000 and it has become a commercial, economic and transportation center in Snohomish County.

Lynnwood is located in the southwestern corner of Snohomish County, is central to the County's largest Urban Growth Area and abuts the cities of Edmonds and Mountlake Terrace. It is at the intersection of the I-5 and I-405 freeways and home to Alderwood Mall, which is within one of three "subregional centers" in Snohomish County, as designated by Puget Sound Regional Council. Lynnwood has an abundance of commercial retail and other business development, primarily in the vicinity of Alderwood Mall but also along Highway 99, 196th Street and other arterials.

Residential:

Beyond its retail districts, Lynnwood is a residential community of attractive and stable neighborhoods, composed mainly of single-family homes and balanced with a good variety of housing opportunities in multiple-family structures.

The city is nearly built out and very little vacant land remains for new subdivisions. Consequently, much of the future residential development is expected to come in the form of redevelopment and in-fill of small vacant sites within existing neighborhoods.

In 1999, the City Council determined that Lynnwood has a disproportionate share of multi-family dwellings. The Council adopted Land Use Policy 2.14 to increase the proportion of single-family homes. That policy was seriously considered in all land use alternatives and weighed against other community needs, priorities, objectives and policies.

Parks, Recreation & Open Space:

Public parks and recreational facilities are provided throughout Lynnwood. The City has adopted a level of service (LOS) of 10 acres of parks and open space per 1,000 residents.

In addition to City parks, Lynnwood residents also have access to a municipal golf course, swimming pool, recreation center and a number of recreational facilities provided through the local school district and other providers. Local residents also have access to local and regional pedestrian/bicycle trails through City owned open space.

Economic Development:

Lynnwood's central location has resulted in the growth of its "subregional" center and many other thriving commercial areas within the City. This has resulted in an abundance of low-paying retail and service jobs. At the same time, the City is much lower than "average" in higher-paying industrial sector job opportunities.

A new Economic Development Element is being developed this year to provide a better foundation of information for further economic development planning. The Economic Development Element will promote zoning amendments to allow different mixes of compatible uses in the same building or on the same development site in appropriate locations, as well as other forms of land use and development that may be somewhat innovative or new to Lynnwood.

Culture and History:

Lynnwood is a relatively young suburban community. It grew without a traditional downtown composed of sites and structures of historical significance. However, Lynnwood does have a history and the current Comprehensive Plan includes a list of sites and structures of historical interest.

A new Cultural and Historic Resources Element is now being developed for the Comprehensive Plan to better focus on these areas of interest. The "cultural" part of the element acknowledges the City's role in hosting a variety of cultural festivals and community events as well as permanent cultural art displays.

The City's Parks and Recreation Department has purchased a site southeast of Lynnwood for the development of a new "Heritage Park" and expects to complete the process of annexing the site into the City in 2001. The plan is to move some of the remaining historical structures to that site in the next year or two for restoration and preservation.

Environment:

1. General:

Lynnwood is located in an area of gently rolling hills and valleys with no unusually prominent natural features. The only exception is Lund's Gulch which is located at the northwestern corner of the City and continues to the marine shoreline of Puget Sound. This area is partially within the City limits. The City is nearly entirely developed and has very little remaining "natural" or forested areas. A significant percentage of the City's land area is now covered with buildings, asphalt and other impervious surfaces. Because of the large amount of commercial and multiple-family development, Lynnwood's proportion of impervious surface is higher than would be found in a community having less commercial development and

mostly single-family homes. This is a condition that is not likely to change as a result of the 5-year update of the Comprehensive Plan.

Through the application of its land use regulations, including zoning, subdivision and the Sensitive Areas Ordinance, Lynnwood has allowed development while also saving some important wetlands, sensitive areas and other open space. Much of the environmentally sensitive land is located along Scriber Creek and its tributaries.

Lynnwood is also within, or partially within, at least five watersheds – Swamp Creek, Scriber Creek, Lund's Gulch, Hall Creek and Puget Sound. Stormwater run-off is always a serious consideration in the design and operation of new developments.

Species that can best tolerate human activities, noise, and other urban disturbances will survive and adapt to life in cities and other urban areas. The City also understands that the preservation of forests, wetlands and riparian areas, where possible, will contribute to a healthy environment.

According to a 1998 report by R.W. Beck, wildlife habitat was found to be poor to fair within the Lynnwood study area. Extensive development has already eliminated most of the suitable habitat. Extensive wildlife corridors no longer exist. Habitat is isolated and available to a very small number of wildlife.

Considering Lynnwood's high volumes of traffic, congestion and close proximity to major freeways, air quality is a concern, particularly at congestion points. The agency primarily responsible for monitoring and regulating air quality in this area is the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

2. Habitat:

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) publishes lists of priority habitat species (PHS) and species of concern (SOC). The PHS list includes habitats and species that need special consideration for conservation. Priority Species include all State Endangered, Threatened, Sensitive and Candidate species that are listed in the Washington Administrative Codes. Additionally, the PHS list includes vulnerable species that are susceptible to decline and species of recreational, commercial or tribal importance. Priority Habitat includes habitats that harbor diverse or unique animal species or unique vegetation.

The following species, listed by the WDFW, are known to exist within the region. Additional study will be needed to determine whether or not these are found within the City limits of Lynnwood and, if so, to identify their local habitat areas. This type of information is currently addressed on a case-by-case basis, primarily through the development review process and SEPA.

Great Blue Heron:

The Blue Heron depends on undisturbed stands of trees near fresh or salt water bodies. Residents of Hall Lake have observed Blue Herons, and they have been

known to use both Swamp and Scriber Creek watersheds. The Blue Heron is listed as susceptible to significant population declines.

Wood Duck:

The Wood Duck depends on tree cavities adjacent to sloughs, lakes, beaver ponds and other shallow open water and wetland areas. They are listed as a wildlife species of recreational importance that are vulnerable to habitat loss or degradation. They are most commonly seen in the Scriber Creek area.

Colombian black-tailed deer:

These deer depend on deep forest for cover, and have been observed in the Swamp Creek wetlands and Lund's Gulch. They are listed as a wildlife species of recreational importance that are vulnerable to habitat loss or degradation. Deer are not considered "urban" wildlife and are in danger of losing all habitat in the Lynnwood area due to urbanization of all thick forestlands. To preserve a sufficient amount of deer habitat and promote their survival within a growing urban area may be contrary to growth needs and urbanization priorities, particularly outside the Lund's Gulch area.

Bald Eagle:

The Bald Eagle depends on rivers and estuarine zones for foraging food. They need plentiful fish populations to feed on and uneven aged coniferous forests for nesting. However, they also nest in isolated large trees near bodies of water (WDFW). Although their numbers have been increasing, they are listed as native wildlife species legally designated as threatened. Bald eagles have been seen in the Lund's Gulch area and other urban areas of western Washington.

3. Other Candidate/Threatened Species:

The following species are listed as Candidate or Threatened species. They may be found in some locations within our region but are not known to exist within the City of Lynnwood specifically.

- Little willow flycatcher
- Northern red-legged frog
- Spotted frog
- Bull trout

(Source: Information gathered from the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan for the City of Lynnwood and the Biology/Wetland Report of SR 525 from WSDOT Environmental Affairs Office, March 1998)

4. Federal Threatened and Endangered Species:

Bald Eagles are protected by the federal Endangered Species Act and the state bald eagle protection rules. As previously noted, they have been seen on their migratory route in the Lund's Gulch area.

Chinook salmon were recently listed as threatened by the National Marine Fisheries Service. Bull trout were also listed as threatened by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Coho, chum and sockeye salmon have been listed as threatened in other areas of the Pacific Northwest. Steelhead

trout have also been listed as threatened, and according to NMFS they will be protected in a separate Federal Register document. The City will review and address the new regulations within the coming months.

Additional inventories may be necessary to more accurately identify and map critical areas and habitat related to the various species of fish that may potentially occupy local creeks. Those and related issues are currently addressed through the City's environmental regulations and through the environmental review of new development proposals.

Growth and Infrastructure:

Lynnwood developed rapidly as a tidal wave of suburban sprawl swept through the region. Since the development was rather recent, much of the City's utility and street infrastructure is still relatively new and in good condition. Most areas of the City are served by all major utilities, including fiber optic cable, with capacity for expansion.

Transportation:

As Lynnwood continues to grow, we will need to find new alternatives to the growing traffic problems. The Seattle area, which includes Lynnwood, ranked 3rd worst in the country for traffic problems in a 1998 study. The transportation element should address concurrency issues such as creating bus routes and other alternative modes of transportation (other than single-occupant vehicles) for new developments in Lynnwood.

7. BROAD IMPACTS

(a) In meeting the primary objective (2b of this form), is it likely that the non-project action will direct (or encourage) an agency to develop or construct projects? Describe:

- Since Lynnwood is nearing build-out within its City limits, the Plan will direct and encourage future growth (mostly private sector) to be primarily in the form of redevelopment and in-fill on vacant sites.
- No major public projects, highways, buildings, bridges, etc., will be necessary to accommodate the anticipated amendments in this update of the City's Comprehensive Plan.
- Changes in the Plan, and corresponding changes to development regulations, are intended, in part, to encourage private sector development that is consistent with the City's long-range vision, goals and objectives. Most changes will be designed to make possible and expedite those types of developments.

(b) In meeting the primary objective, is it likely that the non-project action will encourage physical changes to the natural or built environment?

Describe:

- Changes to the Comprehensive Plan are expected to be minor adjustments – not likely to result in significant changes in the direction the current Comprehensive Plan was set in changing and improving the urban built environment.
- Most of the natural environment within the City is either already built upon, or is protected through public ownership or regulation. Changes to the Comprehensive Plan will not affect the potential for future development and protection of any remaining natural areas.

(c) What is the location (geographic area) where changes will be directed or encouraged? Include the area directly affected, as well as adjacent or other areas where changes will be indirectly encouraged.

- Following consideration of several citywide land use plan alternatives, the Lynnwood Planning Commission recommended a “Preferred Alternative” to the City Council on August 24, 2000.
- The Commission acknowledged the fact that Lynnwood is nearing build-out and has very little remaining vacant and buildable land within the City limits. Most of the scattered parcels of vacant land are planned and zoned for low-density single-family residential use and nearly all will remain that way.
- The recommended alternative is very similar to the current (1995) Comprehensive Plan. Proposed land use changes are minimal.
- The most significant deviation from the 1995 Comprehensive Plan is the Commission’s recommendation to increase the City’s industrial development opportunities by increasing the industrial land inventory. The area most affected by this change will be in the southern portion of the City, in an area already impacted by industrial development. The changes were designed to minimize adverse impacts on nearby residential land uses and to preserve established neighborhoods.
- Most of the City’s potential changes were already envisioned and permitted in the current Comprehensive Plan and the existing zoning. The revised Plan may provide additional support to those planned changes, but will not alter them in any significant way.

(d) Will this action constrain certain activities, or development, but not preclude all activities or developments? Briefly describe:

- The intent of the Plan Amendment process is not to preclude all activities or all types of development from any particular site, nor to preclude any particular land use that might be necessary within an urban community.
- Minor adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan’s land use designations will (if adopted) lead to zoning adjustments that will restrict future residential

development and encourage a transition to light industrial uses in certain areas. It's also possible that the adopted changes may preclude additional multi-family development while promoting additional single-family development. Various degrees of change were considered by the Planning Commission as it studied four citywide land use plan alternatives and various options within those alternatives. In all cases, changes in current constraints on activities and development are expected to be minimal and intended to be in the best interests of the community as a whole.

8. KEY ISSUES/QUESTIONS, ALTERNATIVES, IMPACTS & MITIGATION

The following key issues begin with a review of the four citywide land use alternatives that were developed over a period of approximately six months. The alternatives and key issues were based on public input and discussions hosted primarily by the Lynnwood Planning Commission. The discussions focused on a review of the issues, opportunities and needs specifically associated with each of the elements of the 1995 Comprehensive Plan and identified areas that needed to be updated or otherwise adjusted. The conclusion of the Planning Commission's work is the recommended citywide "Preferred Alternative" which was recommended to the City Council on August 24, 2000 and which is now undergoing Council review, discussion and public hearings.

This section will describe the four land use alternatives and the final Preferred Alternative and identify the environmental concerns of each, as well as other pros and cons that led to the Commission's recommendation of the Preferred Alternative – which is primarily a combination of earlier Alternatives #1 and #3.

Following the discussion of the citywide land use alternatives will be an analysis of more specific issues that were addressed through this 5-year Plan review and update process.

Appended to this document is a summary listing of the "Environmental Elements" contained in WAC 197-11-444 – adjusted to emphasize those that may apply to this non-project review. Not all items under all 16 categories were applicable to each of the following issue discussions. However, those that may be impacted by a particular issue or proposal will be addressed.

(a) Key issue/question #1 – Citywide Land Use Plan Adjustments:

What adjustments are necessary and appropriate to the citywide Land Use Plan to provide the best future for Lynnwood over the next twenty years?

The review and update process began with some generally understood residential land use objectives that were considered throughout the process:

- The Plan should preserve and protect established single-family home neighborhoods and seek opportunities to build more single-family homes.
- The Plan should be flexible enough to allow medium- and high-density residential development within certain designated areas, such as the Subregional Center, the future Central Business District and the College District – assuming adoption of the recommended College District Plan.

Opportunities and Alternatives:

The following additional issues were considered in several Land Use Alternatives to achieve the City's long-range objectives. Each will be discussed in the following section on "key issues":

Key Issue #2: Future development of a new Central Business District:

Key Issue #3: Incorporation of the College District Subarea Plan.

Key Issue #4: Preservation of established single-family neighborhoods.

Key Issue #5: Resolution of conflicting urban growth areas.

Key Issue #6: Encourage redevelopment to increase industrial base.

Citywide Land Use Plan Alternatives:

Land Use Alternative #1:

This alternative was very similar to the 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Adoption of this alternative would confirm that the 1995 Plan is still valid and not in need of significant changes.

New Development: Proposed changes consist of minimal adjustments resulting in negligible changes in potential new development. This alternative could result in 2,070 new dwellings, of which 38% (782 units) would be multi-family and about 62% single-family.

Redevelopment: Land Use policies adjusted slightly to better encourage the redevelopment of older areas, particularly properties that may include nonconforming or outdated land uses or buildings.

Changes in Land Use: Virtually no changes from the current Plan. However, the Lynnwood Parks & Recreation Department has purchased several parcels of property since 1995, including 28.36 acres within the City in the northwest corner surrounding Lund's Gulch Creek. This land will be designated open space to preserve the quality of the habitat surrounding the stream. Only positive impacts are expected.

Changes in Density or Intensity of Use: Virtually no changes would occur in density or intensity if this alternative is adopted. The only significant change would be the addition of a new high-density residential Plan designation. This new "MF-3" designation will support densities

higher than 20 units per acre and would be applied only to sites that are already zoned for high densities (would eliminate a Plan/Zone conflict).

Changes in Management Practices: The Plan text, regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, will be revised to consolidate policies, eliminate redundancy and make objectives measurable. Those changes will make the Plan and its proposals more predictable, leading to better management and implementation.

Likely Impacts from Changes: The potential impacts of the 1995 Comprehensive Plan were addressed in that document's EIS. Since Alternative #1 is essentially a "no change" alternative, the impacts will be no greater than originally identified.

Potential Mitigation Measures for these Impacts: None required beyond current SEPA environmental review and normal site plan review during the permitting process.

Land Use Alternative #2:

This alternative is based on a City Council determination that the City's well-being will be enhanced and stabilized if we can provide a greater proportion of single-family homes – preferably owner-occupied – in neighborhoods that are quiet, safe and protected from encroachment of other uses. In pursuit of this objective, Alternative #2 would adjust residential land categories in the direction of single-family development and decrease the amount of buildable multi-family residential land. A new SF-2 area in northeast Lynnwood is included in this alternative. It would potentially add 24 new single family homes on smaller (7,200 sq. ft.) lots. However, because there is very little remaining vacant residential land, these changes would have very little overall effect on the City's total housing stock.

New Development: Very little change in development opportunities citywide. Most vacant and perhaps some underutilized multi-family sites (Option 2b) would be reclassified for single-family development with the intent of raising the proportion of single-family homes citywide

Housing Impacts: This Plan alternative is based on the City Council's perception that Lynnwood is already providing more than its fair share of "affordable housing" (by definition) and needs to encourage additional single-family home development. This alternative would increase the number of available sites for single-family home construction, while reducing opportunities for apartments and other higher-density multi-family development. It would result in an increase of 1,906 dwellings, of which 27% (509 units) would be multi-family and 73% single-family.

Most Lynnwood households cannot afford to purchase a typical new single-family home. In essence, this alternative represents a shift toward the provision of additional new housing opportunities for upper-income households with the unintended result of reducing affordable housing options for lower-income households. [See: "Changes in Land Use" below]

Aesthetics: Lynnwood's apartment complexes have been blamed for a number of aesthetic and environmental problems, including lack of maintenance, litter, excessive traffic, noise and a transient population that has little interest or concern about the community. The perception is that single-family homeowners are more likely to care about the community, vote in elections, support local activities, etc. These neighborhoods tend to be more quiet and peaceful. Some have tree-lined streets, most homes have large yards, and these neighborhoods are generally considered to be more aesthetically pleasing than are the apartment neighborhoods. Alternative #2 places the greatest emphasis on preserving and expanding these neighborhoods.

Earth, Air, Water and Plants: This alternative would slightly reduce the possible impacts to these environmental elements because it would reduce overall residential density. More single-family homes (rather than multi-family homes) will preserve more open space, have more vegetation and less impervious surface, will reduce stormwater runoff and may be more beneficial to natural systems, streams, etc.

Recreation: Since the City's parks, recreation and open space Levels of Service are based primarily on population, a shift toward more single-family homes will reduce the need for new park and recreation facilities. In addition, the large yards of single-family homes provide home recreation opportunities not available in higher density developments.

Transportation: Lower density residential development will generate fewer automobile trips – although this effect will be negligible.

Redevelopment: Opportunities for redevelopment will not change significantly from the 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Most redevelopment will be non-residential and undertaken in older areas. Since Lynnwood is a relatively new community, "older areas" are difficult to find and land acquisition, demolition and other redevelopment activities are expensive compared to the development of vacant lands.

Changes in Land Use: The most significant changes in land use will be in the reduction of multi-family development sites and increase in single-family development opportunities.

A potential for about 298 new Medium Density Multi Family dwellings and 67 Low Density Multi-family units would be replaced by the Low Density Single Family (SF1) designation with a potential of 87 new homes. The net change would be a reduction of 278 potential dwellings. In addition, changing 35.6 acres of SF1 to SF2 (Medium Density Single Family) would add 24 new single family homes. Much of the area designated for change to SF2 is currently in the development stages at the current SF1 density, so any change to SF2 in this area would be fairly insignificant until the land redevelops again.

College District Plan: Land uses proposed in the College District Plan include a new mixed use district related to Edmonds Community College. This district would change the character of a small portion of the

neighborhood through the replacement of approximately 20 single-family homes with a new mixed use district of small retail commercial, offices and higher-density multi-family uses upstairs and behind the businesses. This Plan has been studied, its environmental review completed, and recommended by the Planning Commission for adoption. Therefore, it was included in each of the citywide land use alternatives.

Changes in Density of Use: This alternative would produce a slight shift in the balance of the City's housing stock toward single-family — from 55.1% to 56.4%. More importantly, the trend toward higher densities and multi-family dwellings, most of which are rentals, would be reversed.

Changes in Management Practices: The Plan text, regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, will be revised to consolidate policies, eliminate redundancy and make objectives measurable. Those changes will make the Plan and its proposals more predictable, leading to better management and implementation.

Summary of Impacts of this Alternative:

- Reduced opportunities for multi-family housing development.
- Increased gap between local wages and local housing costs.
- Increased opportunities for single-family home development.
- Slight reduction in "planned density" in established neighborhoods.
- New mixed use development opportunities in the College District.
- Positive effects on earth, water, air and plants, transportation and recreation, resulting from slightly decreased residential density.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Reduced densities would be off-set by anticipated multi-family development as a component of mixed use projects in the College District and future Central Business District.
- The trend in other southwest Snohomish County communities is toward more multi-family development as an increasing proportion of their housing stock. Those cities, and the unincorporated UGA, are moving closer to Lynnwood's existing housing type balance.
- A high percent of Lynnwood's housing stock will continue to be apartments, condominiums and other lower-cost forms of housing. This alternative would result in relatively minor adjustments to the Plan and would not require further mitigation.
- Since this alternative moves in the direction of less intense development, it will result in slightly reduced impacts to air, earth, water, plants, transportation and recreation and, therefore, no mitigation of impacts to these environmental elements is necessary.

Will the Intent be Met if the Land Use Changes Occur? The expressed intent of the City Council was originally to attain a balance of approximately 60% single-family homes to 40% multiple-family dwelling units. The current balance is about 54% — 46% respectively. It would be virtually (and perhaps politically) impossible to change the Plan and Zoning designations on enough properties to achieve a citywide 60/40 ratio during the 20-year planning period while also achieving other

community objectives. However, it is possible to move a small step in that direction and adoption of this alternative would be that first step.

Land Use Alternative #3:

Alternatives #3 and #4 both respond to the identified need for additional industrial opportunities in Lynnwood. Alternative #3 would convert a minimal amount of land to industrial designations in the southern portions of Lynnwood, but tends to be more protective of stable residential neighborhoods than the more aggressive Alternative #4.

In addition to the light industrial proposals, this alternative also incorporates the College District Plan and a new SF-2 area in northeast Lynnwood which would potentially add 24 new single family homes on smaller (7,200 sq. ft.) lots.

New Development: In most areas of Lynnwood, opportunities for new residential development would not be affected by this alternative. The only affect would be on scattered in the southern part of the city where selected parcels are proposed for changes from commercial and residential to light industrial. Some of those changes would affect scattered vacant lots while others include scattered single-family dwellings and an older nonconforming mobile home park.

Redevelopment: There would be some redevelopment of older residential or commercial areas that are poorly located or already impacted by incompatible land uses. If approved, the proposed changes in Plan and Zoning would expedite the redevelopment process.

Changes in Land Use: Alternative #3 would expand the light industrial opportunities the general area between Highway 99 and 56th Avenue. Properties selected for these changes include some vacant lots, poorly located commercial uses and scattered residential lots that are not part of larger established neighborhoods. Fifteen acres of Business/Technical Park would be converted to Light Industrial, consistent with the current zoning, to remove Plan/Zone conflicts. Since the zoning of those properties has been "Light Industrial" for at least five years and many include industrial uses, the impacts of the change will be positive.

Changes in Density of Use: Most residential uses in this area are single-family homes and a nonconforming mobile home park. This transition would change the designations of a number of properties from residential to Light Industrial but would have only a very slight and insignificant effect on citywide residential density.

Environmental Impacts: The general perception is that industrial development brings more intense use of the land, more truck traffic, higher levels of storm water runoff, less vegetative cover and likely use of hazardous chemicals. Many industrial areas are also less aesthetically pleasing. These characteristics are not necessarily applicable to industrial development in Lynnwood. One reason is that Lynnwood does not have a "heavy" industrial zone of the kind that would be expected to attract

larger polluting industries of the "smokestack" variety. Both the "Light Industrial" and "Business/Technical Park" zones favor light-weight neighborhood-friendly businesses and offices – often in park-like developments. City code requirements for the protection of critical areas, buffering and landscaping are effective in minimizing environmental impacts and ensuring that new developments are functional, attractive and good neighbors. Environmental impacts will be negligible.

Economic Impacts: This land use alternative helps meet the need for a better industrial employment base in Lynnwood and a better balance of family wage jobs and locally affordable housing. Economic impacts will be positive in the long run.

Housing Impacts: Although some homes would be expected to transition to industrial uses under this alternative, the percent is very small and the homes that would be affected are not considered to be part of a strong neighborhood unit. They are mostly scattered, poorly located and already impacted by incompatible development. Thus, the overall impact of the industrial proposals on the City's housing stock will be insignificant. In fact, this alternative should result in positive impacts to the immediate area through the removal of some homes that are deteriorated or located in a poor residential environment, and the redevelopment of a site currently occupied by a nonconforming mobile home park.

This alternative also has some relatively minor housing impacts in other parts of Lynnwood. The College District area currently includes 54 single-family dwellings that were inconsistent with the 1995 Comprehensive Plan and could be phased out as a result of multi-family, mixed use or commercial development. The likely result would be a slight increase in "affordable" housing opportunities. Also, a proposed SF-2 area in northeast Lynnwood would potentially add 24 new single family homes on smaller (7,200 sq. ft.) lots. Although this is a relatively insignificant change from "large lot" to "small lot" single-family, the result would be a small increase in single-family home development opportunities. However, since virtually no new single-family homes in Lynnwood are being built for sale at prices under \$200,000, these homes are not expected to be available to those who need "affordable" housing.

Changes in Management Practices: The Plan text, regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, will be revised to consolidate policies, eliminate redundancy and make objectives measurable. Those changes will make the Plan and its proposals more predictable, leading to better management and implementation.

Likely Impacts from the Changes:

- Some older homes that have been impacted by industrial encroachment and related traffic would be removed, resulting in an improved environment for the continued growth of businesses as well as an improved residential environment in protected neighborhoods.

- Immediate changes in Plan and Zoning will create a small number of nonconforming uses and may make a positive contribution to the accelerated redevelopment of those affected properties.
- Industrial development is typically served by truck traffic, which may contribute to neighborhood noise and air pollution.
- A change in use from single-family residential to light industrial may result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface. Residential development restricts lot coverage to approximately 35% per lot. Greater coverage will not necessarily be the result of either of the industrial zones, particularly on small lots. Both zones require considerable setbacks as well as buffering and landscaping.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Possible phased approach to zoning to prevent nonconformities.
- Loss of lower-income residential homes could be off-set by increased multi-family development in the College District and Subregional Center.
- Federal, state and City code requirements for landscaping and the creation of storm water detention/retention ponds and biofiltration and settling facilities on the new industrial sites will help mitigate the flooding potential and pollution of surface or ground waters that might result from the increased impervious surface.
- Federal, state and City regulations for the use, storage and monitoring of hazardous materials.
- State and regional requirements and standards for the control of air pollution.
- City noise standards.

Will the Intent be Met if the Impacts Occur? Yes. Redevelopment of the area for new businesses would be the primary intent.

Land Use Alternative #4:

This alternative contains the most significant proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to the new high-density residential designation (MF-3) and incorporation of the College District Plan land uses, this alternative proposes the conversion of some older residential areas to light industrial or business/technical uses, with related changes in zoning. The purpose is to respond to a commercial/industrial land use imbalance and to the related need for a higher proportion of stable family wage jobs that is more consistent with local housing costs.

New Development: This change would stimulate new business development in the southern part of Lynnwood – generally south of 200th Street and east of Highway 99.

Redevelopment: Most of the subject area is already developed. A key feature of this alternative is the redevelopment of older areas that are currently impacted by conflicting land uses. The proposed changes in Plan and Zoning, if approved, would expedite the redevelopment process.

Changes in Land Use: Approximately 260 single family homes and 170 multi family units between Highway 99 and 56th Avenue would be transformed into a larger industrial district. Scattered residential pocket neighborhoods would be phased out over time. As proposed in Alternatives 2 and 3, a new SF-2 area in northeast Lynnwood is also included in this alternative and would potentially add 24 new single family homes on smaller (7,200 sq. ft.) lots.

Changes in Density of Use: With the exception of an older mobile home park, single-family dwellings are the dominant residential use in this area. Alternative #4 would change the designations of more than 300 properties from residential to Light Industrial. This would increase the citywide residential density slightly and result in the loss of mostly single-family homes – the City's highest priority for preservation.

Housing Impacts: Alternative #4 would have the greatest impact on housing by removing about 430 units. In turn, the City's population would be reduced by about 1,000. Most of the impacted units would be single-family dwellings, many of them in older well-established small neighborhoods.

Economic Impacts: This alternative is based on the Economic Element's findings that Lynnwood's wages and housing costs are out of balance. The conversion of 87 acres to light industrial use would be a significant economic improvement for Lynnwood and would help balance local wages with the rising costs of local housing. The redevelopment of low-density single-family dwellings into higher-value business uses will also have a positive economic impact on property tax revenues to the City.

Recreation Impacts: This alternative would reduce the number of homes in the southern part of Lynnwood and also reduce the demand for parks and recreational facilities, since the needs for those facilities are based on population.

Environmental Impacts: This alternative involves a transition to a type of land use that has greater potential for significant environmental consequences. The higher proportion of impervious surfaces, larger buildings, noise and air pollution associated with industrial activities and truck traffic, greater storm water runoff and related surface and ground water impacts, etc., are all important considerations.

Changes in Management Practices: The Plan text, regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, will be revised to consolidate policies, eliminate redundancy and make objectives measurable. Those changes will make the Plan and its proposals more predictable, leading to better management and implementation.

Likely Impacts from the Changes:

- Approximately 260 single-family homes and 170 multi-family units that are currently impacted by the encroachment of industrial businesses and related traffic would be removed. Another 54 single-family dwellings could be replaced by higher-density development in the College District without any net loss of units in that area.
- The changes would result in an improved environment for the continued growth of industrial businesses and for the development of a new college-related neighborhood business district.
- Immediate changes in Plan and Zoning will create several hundred nonconforming uses and could contribute to an accelerated deterioration of the affected neighborhoods where a transition to industrial is the long-range plan.
- Industrial development is typically served by truck traffic, which may contribute to neighborhood noise and air pollution.
- A change in use from single-family residential to light industrial may result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface. Residential development restricts lot coverage to approximately 35% per lot. Greater coverage will not necessarily be the result of either of the industrial zones, particularly on small lots. Both zones require considerable setbacks as well as buffering and landscaping.
- College District impacts reflect the 1995 Plan, the intent of which was to replace all single-family dwellings with higher-intensity uses.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Possible phased approach to zoning to prevent nonconformities.
- Loss of residential units could be off-set by increased multi-family development in the College District, CBD and Subregional Center.
- Application of City development code requirements, including the creation of water detention/retention ponds on the new industrial sites would help mitigate any environmental problems that might result from the changed uses and increase in impervious surface.
- Federal, state and City regulations for the use, storage and monitoring of hazardous materials.
- State and regional requirements and standards for the control of air pollution.
- City noise standards applied to industrial operations and truck traffic.

Will the Intent be Met if the Impacts Occur?

- Yes – provided the impacts can be mitigated. Redevelopment of the subject areas for new family wage producing businesses is the primary intent of this land use alternative.

**The "Preferred Land Use Alternative" –
as recommended by the Lynnwood Planning Commission:**

Following the Planning Commission's public hearings and deliberation, a "preferred alternative" was developed and submitted to the City Council on August 24, 2000 for consideration.

The Preferred Alternative is essentially a combination of the residential preservation proposals presented in Alternative #1, the land use proposals of the College District Plan as recommended in May 2000, and the conservative increase in industrial land proposed in Alternative #3.

New Development: Limited opportunities for new development will be available on a few remaining vacant lots within the industrial district. In-fill residential and commercial development will continue to occur citywide on scattered vacant lots.

The most significant new development opportunity is the college-related mixed-use neighborhood district proposed in the College District Plan. Although it allows a new form of development, the overall intensity of development will not change significantly from the previous Plan.

Redevelopment: There will be limited industrial redevelopment of older residential or commercial areas that are poorly located or currently impacted by incompatible or conflicting land uses. Redevelopment opportunities will continue to be available for the development of a new Central Business District within the southern portion of the Subregional Center as well as a mixed-use College District. The proposed changes in the Plan and related zoning will help expedite the redevelopment process.

Changes in Land Use: Some areas between Highway 99 and 56th Avenue, including vacant, residential and commercial properties, will be transformed into a slightly expanded light industrial district. Adjustments will be made to correct existing Plan/Zone conflicts. Through that process, the total acreage in the "Business/Technical Park" designation will decrease by 17 acres while the "Light Industrial" area will increase by 28.9 acres for a net industrial increase of about 12 acres.

Since many properties were already developed under inconsistent zoning, the changes in the Comprehensive Plan and zoning will result in relatively minor land use and environmental impacts and, in many cases, help achieve Plan/Zone consistency.

Changes in Density & Intensity: Affected residential uses in the southern portion of Lynnwood are single-family homes and a nonconforming mobile home park. The proposed transition to industrial would change the designations of a number of properties from residential to industrial but would have only a very slight and insignificant effect on citywide residential density. More importantly, the intensity of land use will increase with the transition to industrial.

Environmental Impacts: Industrial development often brings more intense use of the land, truck traffic, higher levels of storm water runoff,

less vegetation and possible use of hazardous materials. Aesthetic impacts may also be a concern of nearby neighborhoods. This alternative results in very minor changes throughout the rest of Lynnwood. Related environmental impacts will be negligible beyond the areas directly affected by the proposed changes.

Economic Impacts: The Preferred Alternative helps meet the need for a better industrial employment base in Lynnwood and a better balance of family wage jobs and locally affordable housing, without radical changes to large areas of Lynnwood. The proposed changes are few and very selective to avoid encroachment into neighborhood units. The economic impacts will be positive in the long run.

Housing Impacts: A very small percentage of Lynnwood's housing stock would be expected to transition to industrial uses under the Preferred Alternative. The overall impact on housing will be considerably less than the positive economic impact of higher family wage jobs resulting from new industrial development opportunities. In fact, the transition will result in the removal of some homes that are deteriorated or in a poor residential environment, including an older mobile home park that has been designated "General Commercial" for several years.

Plan proposals will result in the loss of some existing single-family dwellings, but a very small percentage. These will be gradually replaced through infill development throughout the City, and also by limited new multi-family development in the College District and other areas of the City that are already planned and zoned for that type of use. Based on the current costs of new single-family housing, new higher density housing in appropriate locations will result in an increase in the City's affordable housing stock.

Changes in Management Practices: The Plan text, regardless of which land use alternative is adopted, will be revised to consolidate policies, eliminate redundancy and make objectives measurable. Those changes will make the Plan and its proposals more predictable, leading to better management and implementation.

Likely Impacts from the Changes:

- Some older homes that have been impacted by industrial encroachment and related traffic would be removed, resulting in an improved environment for the continued growth of businesses as well as an improved residential environment in protected neighborhoods.
- Industrial development is typically served by truck traffic, which may contribute to neighborhood noise and air pollution.
- A change in use from single-family residential to light industrial may result in an increase in the amount of impervious surface. Residential development restricts lot coverage to approximately 35%. Greater coverage will not necessarily result from either of the industrial zones,

particularly on small lots, since both zones require considerable setbacks as well as buffering and landscaping.

- Immediate changes in the City's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning will result in new nonconforming uses where existing uses conflict with the City's long-range Plan.
- The proposed changes may contribute to an accelerated deterioration of the affected properties and, in turn, sooner redevelopment.

Potential Mitigation Measures:

- Possible phased approach to zoning to prevent nonconformities.
- Federal, state and City code requirements for landscaping and the creation of storm water detention/retention ponds and biofiltration and settling facilities on the new industrial sites will help mitigate the flooding potential and pollution of surface or ground waters that might result from the increased impervious surface.
- Federal, state and City regulations for the use, storage and monitoring of hazardous materials.
- State and regional requirements and standards for the control of air pollution.
- City noise standards.

Will the Intent be Met if the Impacts Occur? Yes. Redevelopment of the area for new businesses would be the primary intent of the industrial proposals. The creation of a new college-related neighborhood mixed use center is probably the most significant feature of the College District Plan and, although it would phase of a number of older existing single-family dwellings, the long-range result will have a greater positive impact on the college, neighborhood and community.

Conclusions:

- After reviewing all of the citywide land use alternatives, the Planning Commission recommended the Preferred Alternative as the most reasonable and balanced response to the City's priority goals and objectives.
- A primary goal of the Plan update was to better ensure the preservation of established single-family home neighborhoods throughout the City and prevent future encroachment of conflicting uses. Neighborhoods were more clearly delineated on the Plan map, assigned residential designations (mostly low-density single-family), and proposed for zoning adjustments to ensure Plan/Zone consistency.
- Another primary concern of the Planning Commission was the need for a higher proportion of family wage jobs – not typically found in retail and service commercial jobs. To provide additional business

opportunities, some less stable residential and commercial properties in the southern portion of the City are proposed for light industrial development consistent with Economic Development objectives.

- The Plan proposes no new multi-family development opportunities that weren't already established in the 1995 Plan. It also recognizes that some multi-family designated parcels are currently vacant or underutilized but are appropriately located and should be allowed to develop as planned.
- If the Plan is implemented as proposed, about 63 percent of new dwellings built during the next twenty years would be single-family and about 37 percent multi-family. This will move the City in the direction intended by 1999 Land Use Policy 2.14 that called for a distribution of housing similar to that of our neighboring communities.
- The proposed Plan recognizes the uniqueness of the Subregional Center and the need to include higher-density residential uses within the center to achieve its intended purpose, as explained in Puget Sound Regional Council documents and guidelines for the development of centers. The Plan does not specify the type or density of future residential development within the center. Those details will be determined through separate planning programs and permitting activities.
- The Preferred Alternative did not find a need for any new streets or other public works projects beyond those already proposed in the Transportation and/or Capital Facilities & Utilities Elements. Some earlier transportation proposals that are still valid are shown on the updated maps, such as the Maple Street extension, the improvement of the 168th/Highway 99 intersection, and improvements to Alderwood Mall Parkway and the east end of 196th Street.
- The revised Capital Facilities & Utilities Element now includes an Essential Public Facilities Siting Process, as required by GMA and Countywide Planning Policies.

Preliminary decision, if any, regarding this key issue?

The Planning Commission reviewed four citywide Land Use Plan alternatives and, from the options presented therein, developed a Preferred Alternative which was recommended, on Aug. 24, 2000, for City Council consideration.

The Commission's recommendation included the text of all Plan elements and a citywide Comprehensive Plan Map.

Alternatives to be carried forward and summary of impacts:

All of the citywide land use alternatives that were considered by the Planning Commission were carried forward for the City Council's review. However, only the Preferred Alternative was included in the recommended Plan. Other alternatives were contained in the Background Report document.

(b) Key issue/question #2: A new Central Business District:

Lynnwood developed rapidly as a suburban community. Rather than building around a traditional downtown, the area attracted the Alderwood Mall and an abundance of strip commercial developments along highways and arterials. Recently, the local Chamber of Commercial, City of Lynnwood, local property owners and other stakeholders have been moving toward the preparation of a Central Business District development plan. In the summer of 2000, a visioning process was undertaken and it is expected that a subarea plan will follow within the next year or two.

The most likely and suitable location for a more traditional Lynnwood Central Business District (CBD), based on access, current land uses, etc., and the Chamber's visioning process, is felt to be within and surrounding the general vicinity of the "Lynnwood Triangle", which is generally located south of 196th Street, east of 44th Avenue and northwest of Interstate 5.

Alternatives, Potential Impacts and Possible Solutions:

1. Develop a master plan for a new CBD:
 - A process is already underway in that direction and most of the initial visioning process was completed in the summer of 2000. This process will take more time than is available for the five-year Plan Update. It's not necessary or advisable to do this within the context of a 5-year update. The resulting subarea plan can be adopted outside the Comprehensive Plan's annual amendment schedule.
2. Adjust Plan designations within the future CBD area to minimize or avoid conflicts with the subarea planning process:
 - The subject area is planned for a combination of "Regional Commercial" and "Office Commercial" development. Virtually all areas are currently developed. Removal of the "Office Commercial" designation (replacing it with RC) could provide a cleaner foundation for the future subarea plan.
 - This change in designations is very minimal and not expected to result in any new development.
 - Potential environmental impacts of development in the "Regional Commercial" and "Office Commercial" designations are very similar, e.g., traffic, storm water runoff, etc.

Preliminary Decisions:

The Preferred Alternative recommends removal of the "Office Commercial" Plan designation from within the Lynnwood Triangle area to include the entire area within the "Regional Commercial" designation – for purposes of expediting the CBD subarea planning process.

SEPA Review and Mitigation:

Future subarea plans for the Subregional Center, CBD and other areas will undergo SEPA environmental review, will include a traffic and other environmental impact analysis, and will be subject to the City's Citizen Involvement Program to ensure adequate opportunity for public review and input. Any necessary mitigation of adverse environmental impacts will be identified during the SEPA review of subarea plans.

Subarea plans are also subject to the requirements of GMA and must be consistent with City and state planning goals and other requirements, including public hearings and state agency review.

(c) Key issue/question #3: Incorporation the College District Plan.

During the past three years, the City of Lynnwood and Edmonds Community College worked collaboratively to develop a new master plan for the college campus and a subarea plan for the adjacent neighborhood. The integrated "College District Plan" was reviewed at public meetings and hearings and recommended for adoption by the Planning Commission in May 2000.

Alternatives, Potential Impacts and Possible Solutions:

1. Adopt the subarea plan first:
 - The subarea plan proposed a new college-related pedestrian-friendly mixed use neighborhood business district near the campus entrance.
 - The Plan was drafted prior to the City Council's adoption of Land Use Policy 2.14 (the 60/40 split) in 1999. Therefore, preservation of the older single-family housing stock, that had been planned for multi-family redevelopment since 1995, was not a high priority.
 - When the approval process was delayed, the Comprehensive Plan Update process caught up with and passed the College District Plan process – before it could be adopted.
2. Incorporate the College District Plan into the Comprehensive Plan:
 - The Planning Commission concluded its study and hearings on the subarea Plan in May 2000 and recommended it for Council adoption.
 - The Plan was subjected to environmental review, a special traffic analysis was completed, and a DNS was issued.
3. Prepare an alternative land use plan to preserve existing single-family homes within the College District – for consideration by the Council:
 - This option was presented to the Planning Commission, but was rejected. It would have required going back into the completed process for more study, public meetings and hearings. The Commission was comfortable with its earlier recommendations.

Preliminary Decisions:

Because the Planning Commission had completed its work on this Plan, and the Plan had undergone its own environmental review, the Commission incorporated the Land Use and zoning components of the College District Plan into its Comprehensive Plan recommendations. The potential impacts have been assessed and found to be favorable for the college, neighborhood, community and the environment.

SEPA Review and Mitigation:

The College District Plan has already been through Environmental Review. All anticipated impacts have been identified and the Plan includes a section on mitigation. A mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance with traffic mitigation measures was issued for the Plan and its related zoning in October 2000.

(d) Key issue/question #4: Single-family neighborhood preservation:

The City Council determined in 1999 that one of the City's strongest and most important assets is its single-family neighborhoods. Concern has been expressed in recent years that our high proportion of apartments is contrary to the best interests of the City. The City Council drafted and adopted a Comprehensive Plan policy in 1999 to pursue a distribution of housing types that is more consistent with our neighboring communities. That balance was dependent upon which communities were included in the survey. It was determined that the overall "balance" was approximately 58% single-family and 42% multiple-family. Since Lynnwood's single-family housing stock had fallen to about 54%, this policy was viewed as a directive to not only stop the further development of multi-family housing in Lynnwood, but actually reverse the trend.

Alternatives, Potential Impacts and Possible Solutions:

1. Review all Comp. Plan goals, objectives and policies equally:
 - This 5-year review was intended to include all goals, objectives and policies of the Plan and to ensure that they were all in balance.
 - No single objective or policy was considered untouchable.
 - Throughout the review and update process, staff and the Planning Commission addressed this particular policy very carefully in all land use plan alternatives and in all applicable Plan elements.
 - The environmental aspects appeared mostly favorable for this policy, particularly those involving ground, air, water, plants, aesthetics, etc. However, those positive aspects resulting from a probable "down-zoning" situation involving many properties, conflicted with other factors, particularly housing.

2. Develop a new citywide Land Use Plan to reverse the trend:
 - Land Use Plan Alternative #2 (addressed earlier) was prepared to go as far as reasonable in this direction, while avoiding wholesale changes in zoning and the creation of unnecessary nonconforming uses. This alternative did focus on vacant and underutilized properties and the Planning Commission reviewed many small "special study areas" in an attempt to find opportunities for justified change.
3. Develop a more balanced Preferred Alternative and reject the policy:
 - This option places less concern on the need to reverse the City and regional housing trends toward more multi-family dwellings. Instead, it continues the adopted objectives and policies of the 1995 Plan and builds on the City's existing assets.
 - This option recognizes established land use patterns, trends, and community needs, including housing and economic needs. It is more favorable to long-term property owners, investors and others who look for predictability, depend on political stability, and rely on the decisions made in previous planning processes. Environmental impacts will be negligible. [See: Preferred Alternative – P. 30]

Preliminary Decisions:

The Planning Commission conducted a thorough review of goals, objectives and policies and did not allow any one to dominate the process, although the housing balance policy was heavily considered throughout the process. Land Use Alternative #2, the "reverse the housing trend" alternative, was submitted for consideration, but rejected.

The Commission saw that neighboring communities were considerably different from Lynnwood. None had the same degree of commercial development, tax base or a regional center. Although they tended to be more "residential" in nature, most were moving in the direction of increased multi-family housing – the opposite direction of our own policy. Rather than attempting to be more like our neighboring communities, the Commission felt that Lynnwood should develop and follow its own vision and build on its own unique qualities.

Following considerable discussion and deliberation, the Planning Commission developed its Preferred Alternative Plan proposal to be the best scenario for the City's future, and recommended the removal the conflicting housing trend policy from the Plan. The recommendations were forwarded to the City Council for consideration.

SEPA Review and Mitigation:

The Plan recommended by the Planning Commission is very similar to the 1995 Plan in its percentage of single-family and multiple-family residential land. Nearly all residential lands are already development and future residential growth will be achieved primarily through in-fill on the remaining vacant lots or through the redevelopment of older areas. It should not result in any environmental impacts that require mitigation.

(e) Key issue/question #5: Municipal Urban Growth Area (MUGA)

The City of Lynnwood is located, along with several other cities, within the Southwest Snohomish County Urban Growth Area. This area has not been clearly delineated with portions assigned to each of the cities. Therefore, the City adopted a two-tiered Urban Growth Area that is fairly generalized. The issues are (1) what to do with the UGA and (2) how to plan within it?

To be better able to predict and plan for our future land uses, residential densities, infrastructure, service demands, traffic, population, etc., it would be valuable to review the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and develop and adopt a plan for our own UGA that is more sensitive to the long-term needs, visions and desires of Lynnwood.

Alternatives, Potential Impacts and Possible Solutions:

1. Develop a Land Use Plan for the 1995 adopted UGA:
 - Staff and Planning Commission reviewed the 1995 UGA and proposed a slight variation of the boundaries for the City Council's early approval – with the intention of developing a land use plan for inclusion in the City's Comprehensive Plan.
 - This task would require an extensive commitment of staff time to meet and work with County staff and the neighborhoods in the unincorporated areas. That amount of time was not available.
 - Land use plans and development activities in areas near Lynnwood have been fairly controversial in recent years, primarily because of the rapid growth and urban transition of formerly rural areas, and also related to concerns about the types and styles of development, particularly "planned residential developments" (PRD), as approved in the unincorporated areas of Snohomish County, including the periphery of Lynnwood.
 - Recent annexation attempts, specifically the 204th Street Annexation, have raised questions about how much land and what types of development the City Council anticipates bringing into the City. Areas in our UGA include wetlands and other sensitive areas as well as multi-family and perhaps other types of development that the present City Council may not consider to be in the City's best long-term interests. These issues need to be further investigated before the City can develop a meaningful UGA land use plan.
2. Delay development of a UGA Plan – Participate in MUGA Studies:
 - A new "Municipal Urban Growth Area" (MUGA) process was recently initiated to study our area's UGA and to assign portions to the various cities that share it. Work is progressing and it will be to the City's advantage to participate in this process. It's likely that the MUGA

process will not result in any additional environmental impacts since it will involve the distribution of urban growth responsibilities within our existing Southwest Snohomish County UGA and will not involve immediate changes to existing land use plans. Once established, each City will incorporate its adjusted UGA into its Comprehensive Plan.

Preliminary Decisions:

The Planning Commission, recognizing time, staff and budget limitations, decided to review only the existing Comprehensive Plan for areas within the City limits of Lynnwood and to not venture out into the unincorporated areas at this time. The County has an ongoing planning program in those areas and is currently developing a plan for the South Martha Lake neighborhood, which is in a UGA area of dispute between Lynnwood and Mill Creek. The Commission felt it would be prudent for the City to work out the more specific delineation of its UGA through the MUGA process before initiating a new land use plan in those areas.

(f) Key issue/question #6: Redevelopment of older, deteriorating and underutilized lands to increase light industrial opportunities:

Early in the Plan review process, it was decided to bring the few economic development policies out of the Land Use Element and to create a new (optional) Economic Development Element for the Comprehensive Plan.

The Land Use Inventory update (spring 2000) found 812 acres in commercial use – about 16.3% of the city. Only 143 acres (3%) were in industrial use. A more typical "balance" is about 10% for each category, as determined in a 1992 national survey by the American Planning Association (APA). Lynnwood's abundance of retail commercial provides jobs that pay, on average, about one-third the average of industrial sector jobs.

The issue was whether the City's gap between family wages and ability to afford local housing could be narrowed through the provision of new opportunities for industrial expansion, or if the City should continue on with retail as the primary economic sector.

Alternatives, Potential Impacts and Possible Solutions:

1. Do nothing and let local workers find affordable housing elsewhere:
 - This option would be consistent with the 1995 Comprehensive Plan but not with current trends in wages and housing costs and the related environmental factor of "impact on housing".
 - If the City intends to slow the development of multi-family housing and encourage single-family home development, it might also do

what it can to stimulate employment and encourage family wage jobs that will help local workers afford those new homes.

2. Take a pro-active step toward better-paying local jobs:

- Land Use Alternatives #3 and #4 involved the proposed transition of different amounts of lands to new light industrial type development – specifically in an area of south Lynnwood in the vicinity of similar development.
- Land Use Alternative #3 proposes less additional light industrial land than does Alternative #4 and focuses primarily on "marginal" properties that were poorly located, adversely impacted, deteriorated, and not part of an identifiable neighborhood unit.
- Both Land Use Alternatives #3 and #4 have the greatest potential to create environmental impacts because they both encourage a change in land use from large-lot single-family residential to industrial. Alternative #4 proposes significantly more additional future industrial land use than Alternative #3. It would result in about 152 acres of industrial use, compared to about 94 acres for Alternative #3. This difference could result in a proportional increase in truck traffic, higher lot coverage, greater potential for noise, greater amount of storm water runoff, etc.

Preliminary Decisions:

The Planning Commission's Preferred Alternative included a modest addition to the City's industrial land use supply, consistent with Alternative #3. This choice will provide additional industrial opportunities without encroachment into any neighborhoods and without significant re-designation of land that might lead to premature deterioration or speculation.

SEPA Review and Mitigation:

All future industrial development proposals will undergo a specific environmental review of their possible impacts and will be required to incorporate mitigation measures as determined by City code or through the SEPA review process.

| |
|--------------------------------------|
| 9. TOTAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION: |
|--------------------------------------|

Overview:

- Four citywide land use alternatives were considered. Each is described in detail in this document and in the Comprehensive Plan Background Reports.
- Separately identified "key issues" are also described. For the most part, these are related to but independent of the citywide alternatives. However,

their individual importance may influence the City Council's choice of which alternative, or combination of alternatives, becomes the final Plan.

- The City Council's 1999 housing distribution policy, often referred to as the "60/40 Split", was seriously considered in all alternatives, although it was not treated as the single dominant priority from a comprehensive planning point of view. It was clear that the City Council's housing type preference is the single-family dwelling on a large lot. However, those involved in the update process also understood that the Plan needed to comply with the state housing goal and with Countywide Planning Policies to ensure that the City is planning for a variety of housing choices for all economic segments and for our allocation of "affordable" housing.
- Lynnwood is nearing total development and has very little remaining undeveloped land. The Plan, therefore, relies heavily on in-fill and the eventual redevelopment of older areas. This type of growth and change will be good for the community with very little environmental impact.
- Most Plan proposals are not new. Many were analyzed for their environmental impacts in the EIS for the 1995 Comprehensive Plan and the situation has changed very little over the past five years. The main difference between this 5-year Update and the original 1995 Plan is that the City now has less "potential" development than it had five years ago because some of that 1995 potential has now been achieved.
- The College District Plan, a subarea plan that was prepared prior to the Plan update, was intended to be adopted and integrated into the Plan. However, delays in the final processing left uncertainties about whether or not the College District Plan would be adopted as proposed, modified, or rejected. As of this writing, the Plan is scheduled for a City Council public hearing one week prior to the final hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Update. If the Council rejects the mixed use concept of the Plan, which is the most controversial issue, it's likely that the College District portion of the Comprehensive Plan will revert to something resembling existing zoning to preserve the existing single-family dwellings in that area.

10. CONSISTENCY OF THE PROPOSAL WITH OTHER PLANS, POLICIES AND LAWS:

Regional Implications:

The City's Comprehensive Plan must comply with the Growth Management Act and state planning requirements. It must also be consistent with regional plans developed and adopted by Puget Sound Regional Council and the Countywide Planning Policies of Snohomish County.

Consistency concerns include the following:

1. **Subregional Center:** The City's Plan should reflect (or not conflict with) the development concepts and policies that have been adopted by PSRC for the development of regional centers. Lynnwood has not yet prepared a subarea plan for the full development of its center, although measurable objectives have been included in the Plan to establish design/development guidelines, densities and other parameters for future development.

Lynnwood is also beginning a subarea planning process for a new Central Business District, which would be located within the subregional center area. Initial visioning was completed in 2000.

2. **Affordable Housing:** The City acknowledges the existence of the "fair share" housing allocation system developed by Snohomish County Tomorrow for implementation through local Comprehensive Plans. It is anticipated that a new affordable housing allocation will be developed within the next year or two, based on 2000 Census data and projections of housing availability, household income, housing needs, buildable lands and other factors. Lynnwood will consider the new allocation and adjust its Plan accordingly at that time.

Environmental Requirements:

1. **ESA – 4(d) Rule:** On July 10, 2000, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a final rule under Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) which prohibits actions that take or harm certain Northwest salmonid species listed as threatened, including the chinook salmon. This rule is expected to have broad implications for such municipal services and stormwater programs, road construction and new development.

Lynnwood has not yet developed a strategy for dealing with the full impacts of this rule but will be doing so in the coming months. If changes are needed to the Comprehensive Plan's land use designations, intensities or densities, or to zoning or other development regulations, they will be made through the annual Plan Amendment process or, in the case of regulations, when most appropriate. In the meantime, the updated Comprehensive Plan does not contain land use proposals that might conflict with these important environmental efforts.

11. UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS AND IMPACTS TO BE ADDRESSED LATER:

1. ESA 4(d) Rule:

As stated in #10 above, the full range of implications of the 4(d) Rule is not yet available. They are currently being studied and strategies for compliance will be developed in 2001. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan may be proposed in 2001 to better accommodate the objectives of this Rule.

2. Essential Public Facilities:

A siting process for Essential Public Facilities has been developed by Snohomish County and its cities and was included in the draft of the updated Capital Facilities & Utilities Element. The City Council, at an October 30, 2000 work session, indicated that additional public hearings (separate from the Comprehensive Plan) should be held in 2001 so that the public has a better understanding of this process and has more time to comment. Based on that direction, it now appears that this section of the CF&U Element will be removed and considered at a later date.

3. Traffic:

This Comprehensive Plan Update will not result in major changes that might have significant adverse environmental impacts. However, Lynnwood is surrounded by other communities and urban areas that are continuing to grow and generate traffic. As a result, traffic volumes and congestion will continue to grow in Lynnwood, even if no further development occurs in the City. The Transportation Element proposes a conversion to a "delay" based method of measuring and monitoring level of service on City streets. When that new system is in place (in a year or two) the traffic model will be up and running and Lynnwood will be better able to deal with LOS and concurrency matters.

4. Growth and Annexation:

A Municipal Urban Growth Areas (MUGA) process is currently underway in southwest Snohomish County. Until that process is completed, the City will continue to review and consider each annexation on its own merits.

Some significant streams, wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas exist around Lynnwood's periphery. The ESA 4(d) Rule and other regulations applicable to such areas are evolving and the impacts of the evolution are not yet fully known. Therefore, the City Council has been hesitant to annex lands that may have future development or environmental "problems" or that may have serious liability issues attached. It's possible that these types of areas may become even greater obstacles to City growth and expansion in the future.

12. MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP:

1. Implementation Element:

The City of Lynnwood has developed a new Implementation Element for the Comprehensive Plan. Although not a mandatory element, it was felt that the Plan could benefit from some additional built-in guidance, particularly in the following areas:

- Goals, Objectives & Policies for the following:
 - Development Regulation
 - Development Assistance
 - Urban Redevelopment
 - Capital Investments
 - Service Programs
 - Coordination
 - Annexation and Growth Management
 - Plan Monitoring and Amendment
- Timing and scheduling of the annual Plan Amendment process.
- Criteria for Plan Amendment approval.
- A Plan/Zone Consistency Table.
- Policies for Urban Growth (to be expanded upon later).
- Annexation Policies (adopted in 1996 – will also be reviewed and adjusted later).

2. Measurable Objectives:

One of the key changes in this Plan Update is the inclusion of "measurable objectives" that better define when certain proposals will be done, who will do the work, etc. The measurable objectives from all Plan elements were then included in the Five-year Implementation Program, which is a table at the end of the Implementation Element. This table is similar to the project-oriented Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and can be updated annually as tasks are completed and objectives change.

The "Plan Monitoring and Amendment" sub-goal of the Implementation Element calls for the continuous monitoring of the City's progress and performance in achieving the measurable objectives of the Plan. Most of the five objectives of this program have already been contained in the Plan update or will take place during subsequent Plan Amendments.



Appendix A

ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

As addressed in the Comprehensive Plan Update Process

1. Earth

- Description of the site (flat, rolling, hilly, slopes, mountains, etc.)
- General types of soils. Any agri. soils or prime farmlands?
- Any indications or history of unstable soils that should be considered?
- Effects of Plan proposals on amount of impervious surface.
- Mitigation measures?

2. Air

- Will any Plan proposals contribute to long-term air emissions?
- Any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect the Plan?
- Mitigation measures?

3. Water

A. Surface:

- Significant impacts of Plan proposals on any surface water body?
- Will any Plan proposal result in fill or dredging? Explain.
- Will any surface water withdrawals or diversions result?
- Any discharges of waste materials to surface waters?

B. Ground:

- Will proposals result in withdrawal from or discharge to ground water?
- Will any waste material be discharged into the ground?

C. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- Describe significant changes in the type or amount of runoff resulting from the Plan proposals.

D. Mitigation measures: to reduce or control runoff water impacts?

4. Plants

- Will any significant amount of vegetation be removed or altered?
- Any threatened or endangered species on or near the site?
- Any Plan proposals to landscape, buffer, preserve open space or otherwise preserve or enhance vegetation?

5. Animals

- Any threatened or endangered species known to be in the area?
- Local significance as a migration route.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- Any significant or unusual impacts of Plan proposals on various kinds of energy, including solar?
- Do any of the Plan proposals include energy conservation features or other measures to reduce or control energy impacts?

7. Environmental Health

- Will any Plan proposals lead to potential environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste?
- Will any special measures be necessary to reduce or control environmental health hazards?
- Will any significant increases in the types and levels of noise result from any Plan proposals?

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- Any known or classified "environmentally sensitive" areas?
- Will any significant population displacement result from the Plan proposals? If so, describe the impact and measures to reduce it.
- What are the Plan's impacts on lake or marine shorelines?

9. Housing

- How will Plan proposals affect the provision of future housing units at the high, middle and low income levels?
- Approximately how many high, middle or low-income dwelling units, if any, would be eliminated
- What measures are proposed to reduce or control housing impacts?

10. Aesthetics

- What effects, if any, on building height and/or building materials?
- Will Plan proposals alter or obstruct views?
- Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts?

11. Light and Glare

- Will Plan proposals have any effect on light or glare? If so, explain any measures to reduce or control it.

12. Recreation

- How will Plan proposals affect designated and informal recreational opportunities in the community? Address any resulting displacements.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- How will the Plan affect any places of objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers?

- Does the City have an inventory of landmarks or places of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance?.

14. Transportation

- Describe any impacts of the Plan on the City's street system and public transit availability.
- Does the Plan address any proposed new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets that may be needed?
- Will Plan proposals result in any significant increases in demands on rail, bus, air or other transportation facilities?
- Are any measures necessary to reduce or control transportation impacts?

15. Public Services

- Address any increased needs for public services that might result from Plan proposals.

16. Utilities

- Identify and address any utility deficiencies that currently exist or that might result from Plan proposals.

