Comments and Responses
This section includes copies of comment letters on the Draft EIS and a copy of the transcripts from the public hearing held on July 10, 1995. The comments are organized as follows:

Public Agencies / Affected Tribes

- Metro
- Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Fisheries Department
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources
- Washington State Department of Transportation
- Shoreline Community College
- Cascadia Community College
- University of Washington
- Snohomish County Public Works
- City of Bothell

Individuals, Businesses, Other Organizations

- Ann-Charlotte Gavel Adams, Birney Adams, Kristina Adams
- Ann Aagaard
- James E. Hutter, Jr. - Enviro-Drain, Inc.
- Sue Kienast - Bothell Historic Museum Society
- Gordon J. and Jannelle W. Loewen
- Janis and Chris Newman
- Ted Pankowski
- Patricia M. Pierce
- Janine Sarti - St. Joseph Medical Center
- George F. Sherwin, Jr. - Quadrant
- Richard H. Truly
- Scott Wands
- James and Karen Wharton

Each substantive and procedural comment requiring a response is identified by a line and number on the right margin of the letter and transcript. Responses follow the comments and are keyed by the identifying number.
PUBLIC AGENCIES / AFFECTED TRIBES
July 20, 1995

James A. Reed, Associate Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lakridge Way
P. O. Box 43430
Olympia, WA. 98504-3430

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
File Name: Casedia Community College and The University of Washington - Bothell

Dear Mr. Reed:

Metro staff have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Casedia Community College and University of Washington - Bothell collocated campus. The transit and HOV mode split goals proposed in the Draft EIS are both aggressive and unprecedented for an institution located in a suburban setting. In order to meet the mode split goals, all of the suggested TMP actions (page 1-14) will need to be implemented. In addition, we recommend the following TMP actions be incorporated into the project:

1. Free shuttle service to nearby park-and-ride lots (in addition to or as an alternative to shuttle service to adjacent neighborhoods and businesses).

2. Transit-only bypass lanes at campus exit points.

3. A secure, central transit passenger facility located within convenient walking distance (1,500 feet or less) of any point on the campus; a second passenger facility may also be needed in future phases as the campus expands.

4. Substantial parking fees for all single-occupant vehicles, similar to those charged at institutions in more urbanized settings.

5. Vigorous enforcement of parking regulations.

On the City of Bothell's part, encouraging the development of affordable multi-family housing near the campus to increase the share of trips made by bicycles and walking.

Secure, weather-protected bicycle parking facilities.

On page I-14 of the EIS it is stated that the implementation of TMP elements would depend, in part, on the operating budget available for each institution. If an aggressive TMP can prevent the need to build additional parking, it is cost-effective to use this approach to campus development. Structured parking, the alternative, costs up to $20,000 per stall to construct.

On page IV-153, it is stated that if Phase I mode split goals are not attained, additional parking will be provided in future phases based on a higher level of SOV use. Yet, past experience has shown that high HOV use is particularly difficult to achieve with lower intensity development and that it is unrealistic to expect all TMP measures to be in place initially. More time will be needed to improve and refine the transit network, to aggressively market transit/HOV incentives, and to evaluate the results of each TDM action.

Some transit improvements will not be possible initially. For example, with the SR-522 south access roadway delayed until Phase II, revising I-405 transit service to serve the campus will be particularly difficult. Metro's draft Six-Year Plan proposes a full-time I-405 corridor route (Route 294) that would connect Bellevue with Canyon Park via Bothell; without the direct SR-522 access, this route will be required to operate through downtown Bothell in order to reach the campus, resulting in a costly time-consuming deviation for through transit riders. The ability to provide efficient campus access for this route will in turn affect the level of service Metro is able to provide.

Metro recognizes that the Draft EIS is addressing broad issues of environmental concern and that many elements of detailed site design have yet to be developed. However, to meet the mode split goals, we feel that it is critical to have transit/HOV priority in the roadway network that serves the campus, and that the network should be designed in such a way that permits flow through transit routing, rather than requiring buses to both enter and exit the campus through the same point. Therefore, further elaboration of the proposed NE 185th access from the west is suggested (page IV-153). This access would allow buses to enter via NE 185th and exit using Beardslee Boulevard and vice versa, reducing out-of-direction travel and improving transit efficiency. It is not made clear whether the 185th access is limited to transit and pedestrians (page IV-162).

The collocated UW Branch Campus and Casedia Community College has the potential to become a significant transit/HOV destination and a model for effective transportation management planning. Metro looks forward to working with the
Higher Education Coordinating Board and the City of Bothell as project moves into the design phase. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the EIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory M. Bush, Manager
Environmental Planning and Real Estate Division

GMB:kmg
July 20, 1995

Mr. James Reed
Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lake Ridge Way
P.O. Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

RE: Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington-Bothell Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Reed:

The Environmental Division of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Development of the Collocated Campus of Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington-Bothell. This project has the potential to adversely affect treaty-protected natural resources within the Usual and Accustomed Area of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe (Figure 1). Therefore, we have submitted specific comments for your review and consideration.

We have two general comments regarding this project. First, the analysis associated with the alternatives proposing to relocate North Creek should be modified by providing a quantification of existing stream habitat (in square feet by habitat type) compared to what would be created (in square feet by habitat type). An example of this type of assessment can be found in the Washington Forest Practices Board’s Standard Methodology for Conducting Watershed Analysis (November 1994). This type of analysis will enable reviewers to better understand what would be lost and what would be gained by the project as well as partially answer the cost-benefit question of the Creek relocation.

Our second comment involves notification of subsequent steps associated with the project. Since this project will have impacts to protected treaty resources (i.e., North Creek and downstream waterbodies), it is essential that the Tribe be given the opportunity to review and comment on draft relocation and drainage plans. The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe’s Fisheries Department staff is charged with assessing these impacts and would be willing to work with your consultants prior to Shoreline, 404. and other permit submittals. Our past experience indicates that early project involvement with our department is the key to a successful project.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions, please contact me at 931-0652 extension 116.

Sincerely,

Karen Walter, Watershed Coordinator
Response to comments from Metro
(Gregory M. Bush, Manager, Environmental Planning and Real Estate Division)

1. Your comments suggesting TMP actions are appreciated and are complementary to the mitigation measures included on pages IV-165 & IV-167 of the Draft EIS. The institutions will work with Metro to coordinate appropriate TMP actions when campus plans and designs are further detailed.

2. The cost of providing structured parking and the value of effective TMP measures are acknowledged. The aggressive TMP measures will be monitored to assess results. Off-campus spill-over parking impacts are particularly important so a balance of parking impact mitigation, including provision of additional on-site parking, will be carefully evaluated as the campus develops.

3. Comment noted. Additional transit service to the campus area is critical. The number, timing, and origin/destination of campus users (students, faculty, staff, visitors) is not precisely known but as more information becomes available, the HECB will cooperate with Metro to assist their planning of transit service.

4. The campus roadway network has been designed to permit “flow-through” transit routing. As described on page IV-152, local bus service would be routed through campus to/from Beardslee Boulevard via 185th Street and the main campus drive. (Automobile access to campus via 185th Street would be prohibited; 185th will provide pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access only.) Also, regional bus service in the I-405 corridor would be routed through campus -- between Beardslee Boulevard and SR-522 -- via the main campus drive. Through movement of automobile traffic on the main campus drive will be limited, providing priority for transit movement through campus. Appropriate transit priority treatment at the campus south access at SR-522 will be determined during the design phase and incorporated in the project.

5. Comment noted.
I. SUMMARY

A. Site Selection and Environmental Review Process

1. Lack of recognition of the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe as a co-manager of natural resources within the project area.

It appears that the proponent has initiated meetings with agency representatives and area citizens via the Site Development Advisory Group. Several of the following concerns may have been addressed if the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe had been invited to participate in this group. In addition, since the project is within the Muckleshoot Uxal and Accustomed Area, the Tribe should have been given the opportunity to be involved in site selection.

Although the Tribe does not have direct regulatory authority over the permits needed for this project, the Tribe does review Sec. 404 permits regularly and often makes recommendations to the Army Corps regarding mitigation, particularly if there is a potential for treaty fishing access to be obstructed. It does not appear that this project will impair treaty fishing access; however, since there is the potential for significant adverse impacts to occur to treaty resources, it is essential to coordinate this project with the Tribe through its Fisheries Department.

Therefore, the Final Environmental Impact Statement should recognize the Tribe as a co-manager of these resources and efforts should be made to include the Tribe in the development of stream relocation plans for North Creek.

2. The Historic and Cultural Resources section indicates that there is one historic site structure on the proposed site. As noted in the text section of the DEIS (pp. IV-124 through IV-127), there may be the possibility of archeological resources within the project area. It is not clear whether or not the proponent has requested information about archeological and cultural resources from the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. This type of information is not routinely given to the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation. The person to contact is Walt Pacheco at 939-3311 extension 153 for this information. Mr. Pacheco is also the contact person in the event that archeological resources are discovered on site. The FEIS should be updated accordingly.

3. What is the basis of the statement "by using similar riverine systems in the Puget Sound Basin as a reference, North Creek with its associated wetlands and floodplain, will be able to endure the impacts of increasing urbanization in the watershed" (pg. I-5)? What systems were used as a reference? These impacts should be defined such as stream channel changes, growth of fish, species composition, etc..

The North Creek Watershed Management Plan claims that urbanization has already taken its toll on the fish, wildlife, and water resources in the basin. In fact, the plan stated that "fish and wildlife resources in the watershed have drastically declined in abundance. Beneficial uses of North Creek, such as recreation, water supply, fisheries and wildlife are impaired because of water quality conditions." It is doubtful that the North Creek basin can endure increasing urbanization without continued decline in water quality and fish/wildlife abundance. The FEIS should provide the data to support this statement or eliminate it.

II. SITE SELECTION
Thus, compliance with the manual should not be construed to mitigate all probable and significant stormwater impacts upon instream biota. For example, site specific and cumulative stormwater discharge can increase stream velocities to the detriment of instream biota. Stream velocities at or above critical levels for salmonid spawning, summer rearing, and winter rearing can displace fish downstream or increase the energy expenditures of fish. An increase in the duration of flows above these critical velocities can increase the severity of the problem. The increased water volumes generated by development will cause an increase in some range of water velocity, no matter what detention standard is applied. Mitigating the impact of increased discharge duration at or above the critical velocities will require additional mitigation measures.

Project Specific Considerations-
The DEIS indicates that the average water velocity is estimated to be about 2 feet per second. Literature suggests that juvenile coho salmon (a species found within North Creek) can be expected to be swept downstream by water velocities in excess of 1 foot per second after 1 hour of swimming (Brett et al., 1958; Blaxter, 1969). During the winter, coho have also been observed to move into pools with velocities lower than 0.5 feet per second when temperatures drop below 45 degrees Fahrenheit (Narver, 1978). Salmonid fry demonstrate voluntary downstream displacement when water velocities reach 70% of critical velocities (Heggenes and Traen, 1988). Therefore, the existing stream velocities in North Creek, on average, exceed critical thresholds for overwintering juvenile coho salmon without the project being built.

According to the DEIS, this project does not propose to detain stormwater due to its proximity to the Sammamish River, a waterbody identified as capable of receiving direct stormwater discharge. (p. IV-49). The DEIS argues that “detention of on-site surface water runoff would delay site peak flows leaving the site, which then would decrease the separation between the basin and site peaks, an undesirable condition.” The proposal to discharge stormwater directly into North Creek without detention does not address the previously mentioned impacts to salmonids. Salmonids utilizing this section of stream will be subject to significant adverse impacts associated with new peak events and increases in a range of velocities, therefore, appropriate mitigation should be required.

Some examples of appropriate mitigation measures would include the creation of side channels and other types of overwintering habitat in channels that will be subject to stormwater discharge. Overwintering habitat will provide refuge areas that fish may use to avoid being flushed by stormwater. Another measure would be the addition of large woody debris to provide slack water areas and to retain fine sediments. These elements could be easily incorporated into the stream restoration mitigation proposal. The FEIS should complete a detailed analysis that demonstrates the amount and type of habitat that will be created considering the stormwater impacts to salmonids.

3. The DEIS does not consider the impacts to salmonids that may occur due to changes in water quality. On page IV-48, the DEIS indicates that the water quality control facility would be designed for the annual 24-hour rainfall stormwater event and would treat 95% of the rainfall that falls on the site. It does not appear that there has been consideration for back to back events which are common in the Puget Sound Region; therefore, it is likely that the water quality facility will treat something less than 95% and should be reevaluated in the FEIS. The FEIS should also consider the existing water quality and how changes in the water quality may adversely affect salmonids using the area. Salmon are very sensitive to heavy metals and hydrocarbons which are some of the types of pollutants found in urban stormwater.

4. The DEIS fails to consider the impacts of the loss of ground water recharge on baseflows in North Creek. A reduction of baseflows may adversely affect salmonids. The FEIS should quantify the potential loss of ground water recharge and the subsequent impacts to baseflows.

5. There may be some potential for fish standing within in wetlands to be created as part of the floodplain reconfiguration. The FEIS and stream restoration plans should analyze this potential impact.
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Response to Comments from Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Fisheries Department
(Karen Walter, Watershed Coordinator)

1 The existing reach of North Creek is approximately 3,200 lineal feet in length (~ 65,000 square feet & 1.5 acres) of riverine unconsolidated bottom habitat (Cowardin, 1979). The reach has been straightened, channelized, and contained within artificial levees throughout the site. Existing channel habitat consists primarily of glide (approximately 1,675 lineal feet), and run/riffle (approximately 1,325 lineal feet). The remaining channel habitat consists of pools and mixed habitat. Currently, there are 19 areas with residential pool depth; the median residual pool depth is 1.1 feet (range: less than 1 foot to 3.5 feet). Approximately 1,000 feet of the reach at the south end of the site is rip-rapped. The channel is hydrologically disconnected from the adjacent historical floodplain by the artificial levee system. There is no continuous floodplain surface internal to the levee system. The channel bedload is dominated by cobbles and gravels. The internal levee slopes are primarily non-wetland areas vegetated with Rubus discolor (Himalayan blackberry), Phalaris arundinacea (Reed-canarygrass), Prunus virginiana (Common chokecherry), and native and non-native Salix spp. (Willows).

The Alternative 1 restoration plan will create approximately 5,250 lineal feet of primary stream channel and 3,250 feet of secondary channel. The restored channel system will be comprised of approximately 215,00 square feet or 5 acres of naturally meandering channels and oxbows and structurally diverse habitat types. The levee system will be removed and the channel will be reconnected hydrologically to the restored floodplain surface. The restored channel and riparian corridor will consist of riverine unconsolidated bottom, aquatic bed/open water, palustrine persistent emergent marsh habitat, and palustrine forested broad-leaved deciduous habitat (Cowardin, 1979). The dominant species proposed for these restored habitat types include, but are not limited to, Alnus rubra (Red alder), Populus trichocarpa (Black cottonwood), Salix sitchensis (Sitka willow), Cornus stolonifera (Red-osier Dogwood), Rubus spectabilis (Salmonberry), Acer circinatum (Vine maple), Carex oshnuta (Slough sedge), Carex rostrata (Beaked sedge), Carex sitchensis (Sitka sedge), and Scirpus microcarpus (Small-fruited bulrush).

2 Comment noted. On August 21, 1995 a meeting was held at the offices of NBBJ with Karen Walter, Watershed Coordinator for the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. It was agreed that the Tribe will be given the opportunity to review and comment on North Creek drainage and relocation plans. Ms. Walter expressed support for the project.

3 Comment noted, see Comment #2 above.

4 Comment noted. A Historic Resources Assessment and Archaeological Assessment was performed at the Truly Farms-Stringtown site. These reports are summarized in Errata, Changes & New Information, Section III.B. Entire reports are located in the Appendix.
Response to Comments from Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Fisheries Department
(Karen Walter, Watershed Coordinator)

5 The mitigation/restoration design for North Creek was developed using the hydrogeomorphic approach to functional assessment of riverine wetlands (HGM) (Brinson et al. 1995). Using the HGM approach, 28 riverine sites and 30 depressional sites of similar hydrogeomorphic class in the Puget Sound lowlands were sampled in order to develop functional profiles and design templates. This data set was collected by sampling a) third and fourth order streams (Strahler, 1952) hydrogeomorphically similar to North Creek and b) depressions on valley alluvium hydrogeomorphically similar to the historical floodplain. The sites sampled exhibit the known range of waters/wetlands functional capacity for these hydrogeomorphic subclasses in the Puget Sound Lowlands (i.e. pristine to degraded). This data is used to set project targets and project standards (i.e. success criteria). The intended result of the North Creek restoration will be increases in hydrologic, water quality/biogeochemical, plant community maintenance, and habitat/faunal support functions at both site specific and landscape scales.

6 Table II-6 compares the three sites based on data from existing plans and policies. The “water-shed” sensitive designation on the Montevilla site comes from the Bothell Comprehensive Plan. However, only the portion of the Montevilla site north of 240th Street SE is designated watershed sensitive. The Truly Farms-Stringtown site is designated residential, office-professional, community business, and light industrial. From a practical standpoint, the condition of North Creek south of 240th Street SE could be best described as degraded. North of 240th Street SE, North Creek is much less degraded.

7 Impacts to salmonids due to sedimentation will be minimized through the placement of erosion control fence around wetland and riparian areas during all construction phases of the project (both floodplain restoration and campus construction phases). The new channel system will be protected by erosion control fence until the surrounding floodplain has been regraded and stabilized with vegetation. The new channel system is designed to include secondary channels, backwater/slackwater pools, and coarse woody debris that will create structurally complex habitat suitable to salmonid populations.

8 Comments noted.

9 Comments noted.
Response to Comments from Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Fisheries Department
(Karen Walter, Watershed Coordinator)

10 Comment acknowledged. Note that the average water velocity referred to is the average velocity during the 100-year base flood in the existing condition.

The proposed campus site is located at the bottom, or distill end, of the North Creek watershed (approximately river mile 0.2 - 0.8) which comprises approximately 17,800 acres (27.8 square miles) and 12.6 miles of main stream channel. Based upon HEC 2 hydrologic modeling of the watershed, it was determined that no significant increase in stream velocities, for the portion of the reach on the site, would result from the construction of the proposed campus facility. The site is located at the distill end of the watershed and surface and stormwater inputs from the campus facility will represent an insignificant input as compared to the total volume of inputs from up-gradient in the watershed.

11 Detaining of peak runoff flows on site will result in delaying the peak of site runoff to coincide with the peak of basin runoff. We believe this is undesirable. With the modification of the creek channel in Alternative 1, reconnecting the floodplain with the creek and wetlands will provide lower velocities, more suitable fish refuge areas, compliance with the intent of the King County Surface Water Design Manual.

In addition, the restored floodplain complex will function to slow the rate of flow of North Creek through the reach on the site. This is due to an increase in overall channel length and area (primary and secondary), a channel geometry that promotes periodic overbank flooding to the adjacent floodplain surface, increases in dynamic and long-term surface water storage capacity on the floodplain surface, and increases in roughness (Manning’s N coefficient) through the re-establishment of complex microtopography (chisel plowing to loft soils compacted through historical grazing) and structurally complex vegetation communities on the floodplain surface.

12 Development of the water quality control facility complies with the King County Surface Water Design Manual. Additionally, water quality of the North Creek will be enhanced by the realignment of the stream and the improvement of the surrounding wetlands.

Lastly, the stormwater inputs from the campus are not discharged directly to North Creek. Rather, the detention facilities are situated on the fringe of the restored floodplain at the toeslope of the hillside. The stormwater must flow through the floodplain complex before entering North Creek which will reduce the rate of input and increase the quality of the water through natural biofiltration processes. The restored floodplain complex will function to increase overall site water residence time and provide habitat with suitable slackwater and over-wintering areas for salmonid populations.
Quantification of the loss of ground water recharge on base flows to North Creek is difficult, if not impossible, to accurately calculate. Ground water recharge is not limited to wetland areas and occurs wherever precipitation falls (i.e. in upland areas as well). It is recognized that an increase of 15.6 acres of impervious surface on the hillside is significant, however, the hillside is composed of highly compacted glacial till. Groundwater recharge functions on the hillside are limited as a result of reduced infiltration capacities associated with the highly compacted substrate. Loss of groundwater recharge functions on the hillside is not expected to be significant given the limited capacity of this function on the hillside under current conditions.

Loss of groundwater recharge functions (and contributions to North Creek baseflows) on the hillside will be compensated for through the restoration of 58 acres on the floodplain surface. Restoration of the floodplain surface will increase dynamic and long-term surface and sub-surface water storage capacity. This will be accomplished by re-establishing characteristic complex microtopography, lofting the floodplain soils (i.e. chisel plowing to loft soils compacted through historical grazing) to increase infiltration, and establishing vegetation communities to increase surface roughness. The net effect will be to promote infiltration of water into the soil profile, and thereby contribute to the baseflow of North Creek.

Baseflows in North Creek should be expected to remain at the level existing today, or to increase with the proposal. Hillside wetlands primarily provide a discharge of groundwater, not recharge. Hardening up of the hillside areas will have little impact on hillside wetland recharge capability. Proposed wetlands in the lowland will enhance recharge of ground water. As a result, North Creek baseflows will not be reduced.

Comment noted. A specific design concept in the proposed channel was to substantially increase available in-channel refuge area over existing conditions. This would be accomplished by adding large amounts of woody debris and woody vegetation along the channel margins, creating more and deeper pools, and by constructing 3,250 lineal feet of side and overflow channel. While potential for stranding still remains, it should be no more than would exist in an unaltered channel of similar configuration.
DATE: August 11, 1995

TO: Attn: James A. Reed
Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lakeridge Way
P.O. Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

FROM: Roger Ramsdell
Resource Protection Specialist
South Puget Sound Region

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF Cascadia Community College University of Washington - Bothell

ACTION SPONSOR: Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board.

PROJECT: Development and operation of a new college campus at the North Creek site.

[ ] We do not have an interest in the above project and have no comments on the proposal.

[X] We do have an interest in the above project and wish to make the following comments:

A "forest practices permit will be required for the harvest of timber associated with this project.

09ffint.for
cc: Dave Dietzman - SEPA Center - Lands and Minerals DNR SEPA: 6935
Response to Comments from Washington State Department of Natural Resources

1 Comments noted.
Mr. James A. Reed, Associate Director  
Cascade Community College & the University of Washington - Bothell  
(UW-B/CCC) at Truly Farms - Draft IS Review Comments  
July 17, 1995

LAND USE  
The mixed use zoning designation surrounding the campus has the potential to create high density development, which is advocated through Growth Management regulations in urbanized areas. WSDOT is concerned that the internal road circulation of the campus project and the surrounding development within the City doesn’t conflict with or adversely impact SR 522. We also ask that the City work with local developers to promote a pedestrian friendly development in the vicinity surrounding the campus.

PARKING & TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (TDM)  
WSDOT, like the City Council, is concerned about campus parking. We support the proposed campus transportation demand management (TDM) goal of 60% transit/HOV for this project. Establishing this goal means that an estimated 60% of the people coming to the campus during peak period weekdays will arrive via transit or carpools. Achieving this goal is an ambitious task and will require an aggressive TDM Program. We are concerned about the potential for insufficient parking if the transportation demand management goals are not met. We ask the UW-B/CCC guarantee that if monitoring indicates the TDM goal of 60% transit/HOV is not being met, on-site parking will be expanded to accommodate the additional parking needs.

Improvements to existing transit service needs to occur. The DEIS lists all existing Metro service routes that provide service accessible to the campus and all routes that operate near the campus. We recommend that UW-B/CCC work with Metro in establishing an efficient regional transit program for the campus.

WSDOT supports the proposed connection to the North Creek Trail Via Freeway Overpass. TDM measures such as these will promote TDM conduct that will assist the UW-B/CCC in reaching it’s 60% projected TDM goal.

In conclusion we applaud the UW-B/CCC for setting such high TDM goals. We recommend, however, that the UW-B/CCC establish a full-time TDM Coordinator in Phase I to ensure the ultimate TDM goals will be achieved.

TRAFFIC  
The DEIS discusses the “Future Freeway/Arterial System” on page IV-142-143. These projects and studies include: the I-405 Multi-Modal Corridor, the I-405 HOV Lane Project, Bothell to Swamp Creek, the I-405 Corridor HOV Access Study, the I-405/NE 195th Street Interchange Improvements, the SR 527/SR 522/Main Street Intersection Improvements, and the SR 527 Route Development Plan(SR 522-I-405). The bulletted items on the above referenced pages contain some discrepancies. Please note the items listed below.

1. Additional study of SR 522 south access.
2. Additional study of SR 522 north access.
3. Additional study of SR 522 east access.
4. Additional study of SR 522 west access.
5. Additional study of SR 522 south exit.

University of Washington-Bothell & Cascadia Community College  
(UW-B/CCC) at Truly Farms - Draft EIS Review Comments  

Dear Mr. Reed:

This letter is in response to your request for comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the University of Washington-Bothell & Cascadia Community College (UW-B/CCC). The proposed project site is located southwest of I-405, southeast of Beardslie Blvd. and north of SR 522. WSDOT supports the choice of Alternative 1 as the "Preferred Alternative" with some reservation.

In addition, we endorse the ultimate buildout scenario that contains the SR 522 South Access. The South Access design avoids an "intersection" and will not cause any stop conditions for traffic westbound on SR 522 or from the off-ramps from I-405. We recognize, however, that a detailed design must be prepared to insure ramps that meet safety standards. If you have any questions regarding traffic design please feel free to contact our Traffic Design Engineer, David Berg at 206-440-4485.

Along with traffic design safety WSDOT is concerned with access management along SR 522 in Bothell. We are interested in working with the UW-B/CCC to ensure that the criteria upon which the access classification of SR 522 was based is maintained. These criteria include access density and land use. Direct access from SR 522 will result in a break in limited access. We request that development along SR 522 reflect the requirements of RCW 47.68 - Limited Access Facilities. Further, WSDOT’s most recent right-of-way plans for the project area of SR 522 will need to be revised indicating the break in access. This procedure should be handled during the Phase II design process.

July 17, 1995  
Mr. James A. Reed, Associate Director  
Cascade Community College & the University of Washington - Bothell  
(UW-B/CCC) at Truly Farms - Draft IS Review Comments  
July 17, 1995
TRAFFIC cont'd

- I-405/NE 195th Street Interchange: This is a City project w/ programmed state funding that is scheduled for construction not in 1995 as stated in the document, but for 1996.

- I-405 HOV Lane Project, Bothell-Swamp Creek: This project will built in two stages. The first is SR 522 to SR 527 and the second is SR 527 to I-5. WSDOT has no plans to widen I-405 beyond these planned HOV lanes, one in each direction.

- SR 527/SR 522/Main Street Intersection: This project is a proposed project for the State's 1997-1999 Biennium.

- SR 527 Route Development Plan(SR 522-I405): This bulleted item needs to be updated reflecting that the RDP recommends a four/five lane section. The document only indicates five lanes.

- Corridor HOV Access Study: This document is actually titled "Puget Sound HOV Pre-Design Study". This Study consists of two phases, of which the first phase is complete. Rob Fellows, 464-6234 of the Office Of Urban Mobility (OUM) can be contacted for further discussion or copies. The first phase of the HOV Pre-design Studies identified possible locations for direct access into median HOV lanes along the I-405 corridor. The Bothell Campus site was considered, but at the conclusion of the phase, options serving the Bothell Campus site were put on hold pending more detailed plans for the campus. Once a preferred alternative for the Bothell Campus has been selected, WSDOT is willing to discuss issues concerning access to the campus with the City of Bothell and the University. The Office of Urban Mobility is currently reviewing the second phase that will consist of forwarding all of the Alternatives into a model to see how they work as an overall system. Not each alternative in isolation, but all together. I believe that the authors of this document should update all related document information.

The DEIS analysis utilizes dated traffic information. It refers to final documents that will be completed in late 1994. We are in mid 1995 and suggest that the authors of the traffic segments in the DEIS update the WSDOT programmed projects information in the document prior to the final publication. Have them contact Val Rollins, 440-4716, for further information.

The DEIS proposes project stages to be in 10 year intervals. Traffic congestion is already a problem in UW-B/CCC vicinity. The existing LOS standards (see Figure IV-36) are already at minimal to below tolerance levels (D, E, &F). Updated traffic analyses will need to be submitted to WSDOT for review as phasing occurs. This will allow WSDOT to work with the proponent to establish adequate LOS mitigation measures.

The DEIS indicates several channelization projects upon state facilities or that will intersect with state facilities. Any channelization project must be submitted to WSDOT for review and approval. Funding for these projects and all intersection improvements necessary to support this project will need to be borne by the development. Additionally, WSDOT will request the UW-B/CCC pay a proportionate mitigation fee for all State HOV or capacity projects impacted by the campus project.

In closing, we look forward to working with you and your staff on the issues identified on our review of the UW-B/CCC DEIS. Please call me if you have any additional questions or if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

BILL DUES, P.E.
Assistant District Administrator for Programs and Traffic Operations

cc: Robert JOSEPHSON, WSDOT Planning
    Dave Berg, WSDOT Traffic
    Chris Picard, WSDOT Planning

vjr/k895
Response to Comments from WSDOT
(Bill Dues, PE, Assistant District Administrator for Programs and Traffic Operations)

1. Comments noted. No additional access to SR-522 — other than the identified campus south access — is anticipated. The existing connection to the small residential area south of SR-522 could be relocated and improved in conjunction with the campus south access project.

Access classification criteria of SR-522 will be maintained during the design and development of the main access, most likely in Phase 2, reflecting the requirements of RCW 47.52 - Limited Access Facilities.

2. Comment noted. No future access points to SR-522 are called for in Bothell’s Comprehensive Plan.

3. Comments noted. The DEIS states (page IV-153) that “if the 60% transit/carpool goal is not achieved, additional parking will need to be provided on-campus over time.”

4. Comments noted.

5. The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

Comment regarding need for updating traffic analyses as phasing occurs noted.

Comment regarding need for WSDOT approval of channelization projects on state facilities noted.

Comment regarding potential mitigation fees noted.
July 19, 1995

TO: JAMES E. REED, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
   HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

FROM: RONALD E. BELL, PRESIDENT EMERITUS
   SHORELINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RE: FURTHER COMMENTS—JULY 10, 1995 HEARING ON THE
   DRAFT EIS: CASCADIA C.C. AND UW-BOTHELL

Reflecting on my comments at the above cited hearing and after
having reread the draft EIS for Cascadia C. C. and UW-Bothell, I
would like to go on record supporting Alternative 1 first rather
than Alternative 1a as I stated on July 10, 1995. Thus,
Alternative 1a becomes my second priority.

Please place this memo in the record. Thank you.

:reb

c: David Habura, President
   Cascadia Community College
Response to comments from Shoreline Community College
(Ronald E. Bell, President Emeritus)

1 The correction in comments is noted. (Also see public hearing Response # 21)
July 20, 1995

James Reed
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lake Ridge Way
PO Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

Dear Mr. Reed,

I want to reinforce the positive comments made by Diane Campbell, the Chair of the Cascadia Community College Board of Trustees in her public testimony regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I believe the master plan for the site as expressed in the DEIS provides for the development of a campus that fully reflects the vision of the members of our citizens' advisory committees who have worked long and hard to create a community college to serve the burgeoning educational demand in the area. The DEIS also displays a high regard for the environmental and civic concerns associated with the development of the site and reflects the hopes of committee members for a campus development that would enhance the communities to be served.

I want to express my appreciation to the staff of the Higher Education Coordinating Board and to the consultants, citizens, institutional representatives, agency representatives, and others who came together to develop the plans reflected in the DEIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Habara
President
Response to Comments from Cascadia Community College
(David Habura, President)

1 Comments noted.
July 14, 1995

James A. Reed, Associate Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lake Ridge Way
P.O. Box 43430
Olympia, Washington 98504-3430

Dear Jim:

In my May 23, 1995 letter, the University of Washington provided comments on the preliminary DEIS for the relocated campus of Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington, Bothell. We have now received the DEIS. Our comments do not appear to have been addressed. Accordingly, I am resubmitting my earlier letter (copy attached) as the University’s comments on the DEIS.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tallman Trask III
Executive Vice President

May 23, 1995

James A. Reed, Associate Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lake Ridge Way
P.O. Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

Dear Jim:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preliminary DEIS for the University of Washington, Bothell and Cascadia Community College. Given the time constraints, we have limited our comments to a few major items.

I. LEGAL SUFFICIENCY—NEED FOR SITE SELECTION ANALYSIS

The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) is required by law to do a site selection EIS. This requirement is contained in the 1993 capital budget which provides that the HECB “shall acquire a site contingent upon a satisfactory site selection environmental impact statement…” (Emphasis added). Laws of 1993, 1st Sp. Sess., Ch. 22, § 110(1). The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) also requires an environmental analysis of the site selection decision. While the site selection analysis can be combined in the same document with the site specific analysis, a site selection analysis is still required. WAC 197-11-060(3)(c).

We are concerned that the pre-draft DEIS does not appear to contain anything resembling an environmental analysis of the decision to locate the campus at the Truly Farms site, including the required analysis of alternatives “at a roughly comparable level of detail, sufficient to evaluate their comparative merits.” WAC 197-11-442(2). Although the document contains some discussion of the process the University of Washington, Cascadia Community College, and the HECB went through to select their respective sites, the discussion of this process does not include any analysis of the environmental impacts of various alternatives. This significant omission appears to us to leave the EIS open to legal challenge.

1The Interlocal Agreement between the HECB and the City of Bothell (“Interlocal Agreement”) also requires a site selection analysis. Interlocal Agreement, § 5.
II. SITE-SPECIFIC COMMENTS

A. Transportation

1. Mode Split. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) mode split percentage of 60% HOV is unrealistic based on experience at our Seattle campus and other major institutions in the region. We note that this mode split percentage is even higher than the 43% mode split presented to the University of Washington Board of Regents in March which we had previously indicated seemed too high, given the conventional planning model of 10%.

2. Costs Implied by TMP. The TMP includes such elements as a downtown shuttle, "free-ride home", transit service improvements, van pool subsidies, residential parking zone programs, remote parking and shuttles, and street improvements. The capital and operating costs implied by this TMP are not indicated in the EIS. Are probably not even known, but in our judgment will be both significant and excessive because it is very unlikely a 60% split will ever be achieved. The likelihood of achieving a 60% mode split, or anywhere near it, also raises concerns about the adequacy of parking.

B. Mitigation Measures Generally

In addition to concerns over the cost and wisdom of the TMP, we note that the document identifies a number of other mitigation measures which may or may not be feasible or economically practical. Examples are concerned about include measures for erosion control, off-site parking and off-site wetlands, overpass and ramp improvements to mitigate air-quality, and full payment of site utilities. If those mitigation measures cannot be implemented, there will be substantial changes to the proposal or significant unmitigated impacts. SEPA requires an analysis of the technical feasibility and economic practicability of mitigation measures if there is a concern about whether they are capable of being accomplished. WAC 177-11-440(6)(c).

Additionally, the EIS indicates that all remediation will occur during phase I development. This will be extremely costly. It may be more appropriate to phase certain remediation to occur progressively with development.

C. Negotiations/Agreements

The document references a number of outside agreements, including a purchase and sale agreement with Mr. Truly ("Truly Agreement") and the Interlocal Agreement with the City of Bothell and implies that others exist. We are concerned these agreements may not adequately represent the interests of the institutions that will inherit this project.

First, although we have just obtained a copy of the Interlocal Agreement which the HECB and the City of Bothell entered into in January 1995 and are still reviewing it, we note that it commits the institutions to pay all utility upgrades, extensions, and connection charges while the commonly accepted statewide practice is to pay a “fair-share.” Second, we note what appears to be an overly broad commitment in the Truly Agreement to preserving non-historic buildings. Third, the EIS states that 20% of the site is developable, while the outside agreements already entered into commit the institutions to mitigation on 100% of the site. Fourth, the EIS and the Interlocal Agreement commit the institutions to obtain a series of individual land use/development permits. In other jurisdictions, the University has utilized an approach that obtains one single approval for the entire master plan. The fragmented approach described in the EIS is more cumbersome and more costly for both the institutions and the permitting jurisdiction.

D. Miscellaneous Comments

1. The official name of the University branch campus is University of Washington, Bothell. Alternatively, it should be referred to in text as the Bothell Campus or UWB.

2. Page IV-28 refers to the "Metro" U-Pass. It is the University of Washington U-Pass program.

3. At page II-32(3), the statement is made that the Wellington Hills site is outside the Urban Growth Boundary campus and development is, therefore, "impossible." Development at Wellington Hills is not impossible. Under current zoning for the site, development may be possible under a conditional use permit. Additionally, development would be possible if the site were annexed by the City of Woodinville.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the draft DEIS.

Sincerely,

Taiwan Trask III
Executive Vice President

cc: Dean Norm Rose
    Susan Harvey
    Joe Brealey
    Jan Arntz
    Mark Green
The comments by the University of Washington on the preliminary document (letter of May 23, 1995) were addressed by revisions included in the published Draft EIS. This input is appreciated.

Specifically, the Draft EIS includes additional information (that was added to the referenced pre-draft document) to respond to the concern expressed for a "site selection EIS." A new analysis, summarized in Table II-6, pages II-30 through II-34 of the DEIS, compares potential impacts for the three final sites by the Elements of the Environment. The analysis concludes that the Truly Farms-Stringtown site would likely result in the least probable, significant adverse impacts.

The cited SEPA Rules state that, "phased review is appropriate when the sequence is from a non project document to a document of narrower scope such as a site specific analysis or the sequence is from an environmental document on a specific proposal at an early stage (such as need and site selection) to a subsequent environmental document at a later stage (such as sensitive design impacts)."

Extensive site selection analyses were prepared for both Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington. The Draft EIS incorporates by reference these prior, relevant documents (see Draft EIS, page II-1). The Draft EIS follows the sequences cited by focusing upon sensitive design impacts (such as North Creek and wetlands) and avoids unnecessary duplication of environmental review (see WAC 197-11-600).

The SEPA rules do not reference or define the term "site selection EIS." SEPA encourages the use of existing environmental documents "that have previously been prepared in order to evaluate proposed actions, alternatives or environmental impacts." Consistent with SEPA, the DEIS incorporates in full all previous site selection studies performed over the last five years in anticipation of this project.

Further, the DEIS includes a detailed comparison on environmental criteria of the three top-ranked sites considered by the Board in November 1993, when it designated Truly Farms as the preferred location for this project and recommended its acquisition. That recommendation was in response to the 1993 legislative directive that the Board evaluate a minimum of four sites for the new campus.

This designation was the basis of the 1994 legislative action, appropriating funds and authorizing the Board to acquire a site for the campus. As part of its authorization, the legislature directed that the site be acquired upon completion of various environmental reviews and a satisfactory site selection environmental impact statement. Additionally, and importantly, the appropriation language also authorized the Board to "obtain an option on a second site if it becomes reasonably apparent that contingencies on the first site will not be met" (emphasis added).
Response to Comments from the University of Washington
(Tallman Trask III, Executive Vice President)

1, cont. The above legislative actions followed numerous public hearings, work sessions, and meetings held during the 1994 legislative session to review the site evaluations and recommendation of the HECB to acquire Truly Farms. The focus of these hearings was on the ability of the Truly Farms site, the “first site,” to accommodate the planned campus and to receive necessary regulatory approvals for development. Additionally, the need to fully study and evaluate the financial and environmental impacts of the recommendation to build the campus at Truly Farms was expressed.

The DEIS, with the studies incorporated therein by reference, provides comprehensive environmental evaluations of both off-site and on-site alternatives for this project.

2 Comment noted. The aggressive nature of the 60% HOV mode split is acknowledged. A second analysis used a more conservative mode split of 17%.

Information provided by the University of Washington (University of Washington Oil Smart Application, March, 1993) shows that 66% of the trips to the main campus are on motorized modes – i.e., in autos or buses – are in transit (49%) or carpools (17%). It is recognized that the 60% transit/carpool goal for a smaller suburban campus is quite ambitious. It is important to note, however, that the 60% transit/carpool “goal” was not a “forecast” or “prediction;” rather, it was the computed level of daytime transit and carpooling that would be necessary in order for daytime parking demand to be accommodated by the number of parking spaces needed to meet evening demand. Recognizing the ambitiousness of the 60% goal, the DEIS states (page IV-153) that “if the 60% transit/carpool goal is not achieved, additional parking will need to be provided on-campus over time.”

3 Costs for implementing all of the potential TMP measures have not been estimated. A range of parking supply is proposed to address the uncertainty in achieving the desired mode split. Cost of implementing a TMP has to be compared to cost of additional structured parking on-site.

4. The “Memorandum of Agreement Between the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Army Concerning the Determination of Mitigation Under the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines” guides national policy and states puts forth that on-site, in-kind mitigation should be undertaken whenever practicable. Off-site mitigation is optional only when on-site, in-kind mitigation is shown to be not practicable. Off-site mitigation, while not desirable, could be required under Alternative 1 or 1a.

Although specific cost estimates were not prepared, it was concluded that all of the transportation mitigation measures are feasible and economically practical:

- Off-site parking is not listed as a mitigation measure.

IV-25
Response to Comments from the University of Washington  
(Tallman Trask III, Executive Vice President)

4. cont.

- The I-405/NE 195th Street Interchange improvements comprise the widening of the overpass structure and the widening of the two off-ramps. This type of improvement is common, and at this location, introduces no extraordinary cost or engineering design requirements.

- The widening of the I-405 ramp to westbound SR-522 is an integral element of the plan for the campus' south access. It was included in the list of mitigation measures only because the need for the widening was first identified by the traffic analysis prepared for the original south access conceptual design.

All campus-related parking should be accommodated on-campus. The campus has the ability to accommodate from 4,200 to 6,600 parking spaces on-site, at build-out. If the transportation demand management goal of 60% transit/HOV is not being met, Alternatives 1 and 2 have the ability to expand on-site parking in future phases if needed.

Mitigation measures identified for erosion and sedimentation control on page IV-14 and page IV-49 are basic guidelines called out in the King County Surface Water Design Manual, 1990. These are standard measures used on all types of developments and are considered economically practical.

According to provisions of the Interlocal Agreement between the Higher Education Coordinating Board and the City of Bothell, the State would agree to pay the cost of all utility upgrades, extensions and connection charges related to campus operations as provided for in City ordinances. All required utilities are located at or near the site perimeter. Upgrades and extensions to campus facilities is not considered significant.

5

The restoration of North Creek and the adjacent floodplain system cannot be phased over time due to the interconnected nature of the riverine ecosystem. In order for the North Creek floodplain complex to function as a natural riverine ecosystem the entire restoration effort must be completed as a single project (i.e. Phase 1). Wetland functions such as hydrology, water quality/biogeochemistry, plant community maintenance, and habitat/faunal support are all intrinsically linked and dependent upon one another. Mitigation goals and targets are linked to the progression and development of the ecosystem as a unit through time. Phasing of the restoration effort will inhibit achievement of these goals and targets and compromise the effectiveness of mitigation for unavoidable impacts to waters and wetlands associated with the construction of the campus facility.
Response to Comments from the University of Washington
(Tallman Trask III, Executive Vice President)

6 As stated in Response #4 above, all required utilities are located at or near the site perimeter. Upgrades and extensions to campus facilities is not considered significant.

Comment noted regarding non-historic buildings. New information completed for the FEIS includes a Historical Resources Assessment. That assessment is summarized in Section III.B., Errata, Changes and New Information. That assessment identifies the Boone Farm Historic District. Project plans call for the preservation of its most important element, the main house and perhaps the Wash House and Garage. Preservation in place, adaptive reuse, and moving elements of the Historic District appear to be infeasible. Adverse effects to the Historic District may be mitigated by documenting it, curating this information, and using it in an interpretive center located on-site in one of the historic buildings. Project plans will not adversely affect the Dr. Reuben Chase House in Stringtown; it will be left in place.

Comment noted regarding mitigation. The DEIS states that at build-out, Alternative 1 would have approximately 102 acres of open space, or 80% of the total site area. Approximately 70 acres would be natural open space in the restored floodplain and approximately 32 acres would be campus open space such as the green, and evergreen forest areas. The total area of existing wetlands/waters for Alternative 1 is approximately 26.6 acres (1987 protocol). The total area of restored floodplain for Alternative 1 is approximately 58 acres (1987 protocol). This does not reflect a restoration of 100% of the site. It does reflect ratio of restoration area to impact area of 2.4:1 (1987 protocol).

Comment noted regarding obtaining a series of individual land use/development permits. The development of the UWB/CCC campus site does require obtaining multiple land use/development permits. However, due to the redundancy of the permit requirements, significant cost savings has been attained.

7 Comment noted. The Final EIS makes this correction.

8 Comment noted. The Final EIS makes this correction.

9 Comment noted. See page II-28 of the Draft EIS.
July 17, 1995

James A. Reed, Associate Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lakeridge Way (PO Box 43430)
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
RE: Collocated Campus
Cascade Community College/University of Washington

Dear Mr. Reed:

Snohomish County has reviewed the subject project. We would like to offer the following comments:

A. LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION

1. The proposed project is located within the Urban Growth Area which is an appropriate location given the type and scale of the development. The proposal would locate a new higher educational institution within the City of Bothell at a site located about 1 mile south of the county line. The project is planned to serve an ultimate student population of nearly 10,000 at build-out (year 2010 or later).

2. A project of this magnitude is likely to have some primary and many secondary impacts extending more than a mile from the site. The DEIS takes no notice of these potential impacts and, in fact, concentrates its analysis almost exclusively upon the area within 1/2 mile of the site. Examples of such far-ranging impacts for this project may include:
   a. Potential impacts on North Creek and adjoining properties;
   b. Impacts on the housing market within 2-3 miles of the site; and
   c. Traffic impacts on county road system, and SR 522/SR 9 and associated land use impacts at and around their nearby ramps.

We would suggest that the DEIS extend the scope of the impacted area beyond the current one-half mile radius.

3. The discussion of "secondary" housing impacts (page IV-108) suggests that this project will produce little or no housing impacts, based on the experience of the existing U/W-Bothell campus. However, that experience is probably not very instructive because of the much smaller scale, lower profile, and different character of the existing "campus" from the proposed project at build-out. A more relevant comparison would be with an existing 10,000 student institution with a commuter population as its service target. The approach used in Appendix E.6 for land use would also seem to apply to the housing market impacts.

4. Analysis of road impacts stops just east of the SR 522 and I-405 interchange which is inappropriate for a project of this scale. Much of the campus traffic from the north and northeast can be expected to utilize SR 522 and SR 9 which join at the county line about 2 miles from the site. Yet the traffic analysis does not include this critical interchange.

In addition, the subject development's traffic may impact county roads within Transportation Service Area F. As per Title 26B Snohomish County Code, mitigation would be based on the development's traffic that impacted such roads. The traffic study submitted does not carry out the peak hour trips far enough to determine if the development's traffic would impact county controlled arterial/arterial intersections with 3 or more peak hour trips. This information will be necessary before we can determine whether there will be a significant, adverse impacts to the county road system.

B. SOLID WASTE

1. The text should clarify that solid waste and recycling collection services are administered by the City.

2. We are not aware that garbage is sorted at the Houghton Transfer Station, as stated in the text. This implies that materials are pulled out for recycling at the transfer station, which to our knowledge, does not happen.

3. Other recycling collection services should be explained in more detail, listing all materials for which collection service is available from Waste Management-SnoKing or other vendors. Specifically, what can be collected by SnoKing? Is institutional food waste collection, yard debris and clean wood collection also available?

4. The 25%-30% estimate of recyclable materials is too low. It may represent what is currently recycled in other facilities, but these programs are still ramping up. The generation of recyclable materials should be much higher - perhaps 65% or greater. To ensure that the facility is able to fulfill its requirement to recycle as much as is reasonably
possible, enclosure areas should be provided and sized such that 50% or more of materials generated can be collected for recycling.

5. Construction related impacts: land clearing debris should not be delivered to landfill sites but should be processed on site or delivered to a wood waste processor for chipping for reuse. In addition, a great deal of construction waste will be generated and this material should be source separated as much as possible for recycling, with the residuals taken to a properly permitted facility for disposal.

C. SURFACE WATER AND WETLANDS

1. North Creek is a very important south Snohomish County stream, the County has a great interest in maintaining and enhancing the stream and its functions. We believe that the proposed mitigation under Alternative 1 would represent significant enhancement to North Creek, even at the expense of some wetland fill. Additionally, new, non-fragmented wetland areas would be created along the stream corridor. This makes ecological sense.

2. We are usually suspicious of wetland recreation efforts at the expense of existing wetlands. However, there would be a net gain under Alternative 1 of approximately 2 acres for every acre lost. Furthermore, these wetlands are nearly assured to be successfully recreated because of their location in historic wetland areas and hydrologic support from North Creek.

3. Therefore, we support Alternative 1 and the idea of relocating North Creek into a decidedly more natural channel configuration together with a 2 for 1 wetland creation ratio.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please feel free to contact Rubin Yu, Principal Environmental Coordinator at 206-388-3488, Ext. 4516.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

Sincerely,

Peter Hahn, Director
Public Works Department
Response to Comments from the Snohomish County Public Works Department
(Peter Hahn, Director)

1. The comment is accurate.

2. Comment noted regarding project magnitude and extended impacts. The proposed floodplain restoration proposed in Alternatives 1 and 1a had to take into consideration the entire North Creek watershed.

Potential housing market impacts are expected to be minimal, based on experience ASU West, since the proposal is a commuter campus.

See Comment #4 below regarding traffic impacts.

3. Comments noted. The physical scale, profile and character of the proposed campus does not change the target student population, which is commuter students.

A relevant model for secondary housing impacts for a 10,000 FTE commuter campus does not exist in Washington State.

4. The traffic forecasts for the various DEIS alternatives were prepared using the City of Bothell’s traffic forecasting model, which incorporates the land use, travel demand, and road networks included in the Snohomish County model and King County’s Northshore model. As a result, traffic forecasts were prepared for the entire freeway/arterial system in the City of Bothell, south Snohomish County, and north King County. The intersections and roadway segments for which capacity and level of service analyses were prepared were not selected based on geographical proximity to the campus; rather they were selected based on the extent to which they were used by campus traffic, as determined by a review of the areawide traffic forecasts. The forecasts indicated that the vast majority of campus traffic arrives and departs on regional highway facilities: I-405 and SR-522 in particular, and to a lesser extent, SR-527. Due to the dispersed origin-destination patterns of these trips and the intensive use of the freeway system, forecasted campus-related traffic volumes on arterials and interchanges beyond the immediate campus vicinity were found to be limited both proportionally and absolute terms. The forecasts also indicated that at several locations the introduction of campus traffic encouraged other traffic to shift to other more appropriate routes. As a result, the forecasted traffic volume increases on campus access routes are significantly less than the campus traffic volumes on those routes. (See DEIS Figures IV-41, IV-43, and IV-45)

Comments regarding inadequacy of the DEIS traffic analysis for use in determining Snohomish County Code Title 26B mitigation requirements are noted.
Response to Comments from the Snohomish County Public Works Department  
(Peter Hahn, Director)

5  Comment noted. General recycling services are not administered by the City of Bothell for non-residential sites. However, as stated in the DEIS (on page IV-186), the City provides collection of mixed-paper waste to commercial sites (including non-residential sites such as the campus) at no additional charge. As stated in the DEIS, other recycling services, such as glass and aluminum, are available to commercial customers directly from Waste Management Sno-King, Inc.

6  Comment noted. Use of the word “sorted” in the DEIS is not correct since solid wastes are not actually sorted at the Houghton Transfer Station. This correction has been included in Chapter III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.

7  Comment noted. Collection of mixed-paper waste would be provided to the campus by Waste Management Sno-King, Inc. through a program administered by the City at no additional charge. Other recyclable materials would be collected by Waste Management Sno-King, Inc. through a special program tailored specifically to fit the needs of the campus as it develops. At this time, Waste Management Sno-King, Inc. has stated that recycling services for aluminum, glass and plastics would be available to the campus. Waste Management Sno-King, Inc. also provides collection and disposal for commercial yard wastes and clean woods. Currently, collection and disposal of consumer food waste are not provided due to a lack of approved disposal sites in the King County region. However, according to Waste Management Sno-King, Inc., establishing pre- and post-consumer food waste collection and disposal programs is a goal of the King County Solid Waste Division, and such facilities may become available and could potentially serve future phases of the campus if feasible.

8  Comment noted. It is recognized that the quantity of recyclable materials generated by the campus may increase in the future. However, this potential increase cannot be accurately quantified or absolutely determined at this time. As such, the DEIS provides a conservative level of environmental analysis based on current information available on the amount of recyclables generated at other similar campuses in our region. Page IV-188 of the DEIS lists mitigating measures, which could ease the general demand for and operation of solid waste collection on campus, including provision of a designated recycling center or space on campus. Waste Management Sno-King, Inc. will be coordinating with campus development representatives on the design of enclosure areas for recycling. The suggestion to size these areas for potential increases in the amount of recyclables generated by the project in the future is noted.
Response to Comments from the Snohomish County Public Works Department
(Peter Hahn, Director)

Comment noted. The campus site is located in King County and as such, is subject to the requirements of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan produced by the King County Department of Public Works Solid Waste Division. Handling of construction, demolition and land-clearing (CDL) wastes would be subject to the requirements and provisions outlined in this plan. It is anticipated that the level of CDL wastes generated by the campus over its build-out period would not significantly impact the designated CDL disposal facilities owned and operated by private vendors. However, an alternative to disposal of CDL materials is reuse or recycling where feasible. CDL materials may be taken to any properly permitted recycling facility. Requirements for recycling vary greatly depending on material type. Examples of types of CDL materials which can typically be recycled include clean wood, metals, concrete, gypsum, asphalt and land-clearing debris.

Comment noted.

It is important to understand the allocation of fill into waters and wetlands associated with the preferred Alternative 1. According to Alternative 1, a total of 24.6 acres of waters and wetlands will be filled in order to construct the campus and restore North Creek and the historical floodplain. Of this 24.6 acres, 6.8 acres of waters and wetlands will be filled on the hillside to accommodate the construction of the campus facility. These waters and wetlands, and their associated functions, will be lost from the landscape.

A total of 17.8 acres of waters and wetlands on the floodplain will be “filled” in order to restore the floodplain. This is somewhat counter intuitive in that 17.8 acres of waters and wetlands will be “filled” in order to accomplish restoration. This “fill” is associated with grading of the entire historical floodplain surface in order to achieve the necessary final grades for site hydrology and planting zones. Despite the placement of 17.8 acres of “fill”, this area will become part of 58 acres of restored waters and wetlands. These waters and wetlands and their associated functions will not be lost from the landscape, but rather their level of functioning will be increased from pre-project conditions.

Comment noted.
July 20, 1995

James A. Reed  
Associate Director  
Higher Education Coordinating Board  
917 Lakeridge Way  
P.O. Box 43430  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3430  


Dear Mr. Reed:

The City of Bothell staff have completed the technical review of the UW-BCCC Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This letter contains our compiled general and specific comments.

Overall, staff find that Alternatives 1 and 1a more closely comply with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan - particularly with regard to the natural environment - than do Alternatives 2 or 2a, or the No Action Alternative. Comparing Alternative 1 and 1a, we applaud the commitment to transportation demand management embodied in Alternative 1, but we question its feasibility. Planning and engineering staff have other significant concerns regarding the transportation element, and we ask that you consider these carefully and respond in as much detail as is possible at this stage in the development process. Please note as well the extensive comments regarding historic preservation concerns on and adjacent to the proposed campus.

The interlocal agreement between the City and the Higher Education Coordinating Board prescribes certain roles and responsibilities with respect to the SEPA process. Specifically, Section 3.B and C state as follows:

B. Upon the City’s completion of its review, the City will consult with HECB regarding prospective impacts and mitigations.

C. The final EIS will include the identified impacts and suggested impact mitigation measures as determined by HECB in consultation with the City.

Please contact Bill Wiselogle, Long Range Planning Manager, or Gordon Burch, Associate Planner, at (206) 486-8152 once you have completed your review of our comments to discuss compliance with the above sections of the interlocal agreement.

Staff comments on the DEIS comprise the remainder of this letter. Comments 1-93 relate to specific words, sentences, paragraphs or sections of the DEIS, and follow the order of the DEIS: comments 94-97 are general comments.

1. Page 1-5, next to last line on page. Insert “of” between “amount” and “flood” at end of line.  
2. Page 1-12, summary paragraph on Shoreline Use. No language addresses shoreline concerns directly although reference to trail system and public access is a direct concern of the Shoreline Management Act and the City’s Shoreline Master Program.  
3. Page 1-13: Summary paragraph on historic/cultural resources. No language regarding buffering of cemetery (except see later on p. IV-95 where it says “...these properties would be effectively mitigated through provisions of buffers and enhanced landscaping at the property perimeter”). Do outbuildings associated with Truly house constitute a complex that should be preserved and what effect does removal of these outbuildings have on the historic integrity of the Truly house and property and its possible listing on the Local, State, or National Registers? See comments below under the Historic and Cultural Resources subsection in Section IV.  
4. Page III-9, Statement in paragraph 4, first paragraph under “Community Fit”. “Several significant existing structures are being retained” is stated but elsewhere in the EIS only the Chase House and the Truly House are mentioned for retention. Are there others?  
5. Page III-10, 2nd paragraph under “Pedestrian and Bicycle circulation”. Refers only to desire to protect the surrounding residential community, no reference to cemetery. Isn’t this part of the intent? Certainly should be and it is a result whether intended or not (see also p. III-16, 3rd paragraph).  
6. Page III-12, 2nd paragraph from top. Reference to 3.5 acres of landscape buffer to separate campus and adjacent residential areas: Does this mean adult growth left in place or augmented? The parking garage will be visible from cemetery and again no reference to cemetery needing screening is included. One diagram shows no trees along buffer between cemetery eastern boundary and proposed parking garage. Under “Light…”, “Impacts…”, 2nd dot point, reference to “shading” of cemetery during early morning hours: There is still no discussion of the impact of a modern building on ambience or
historic setting of cemetery. Reference should be made to National Register criteria regarding integrity of setting. Conclusion of no significant unavoidable impacts may need to be changed or another mitigation measure requiring planting of mature coniferous trees which would eventually grow to screen building from cemetery may be needed.

7. Page III-24, under "Water & Wetlands". 4th dot point. Shouldn't this begin "Alternatives 1a and 2a..."?

8. Page III-25, Mitigation Measures. 1st dot point. Revise this paragraph to read as follows:
The proposed stormwater system would be designed to comply with the 1990 King County Surface Water Design Manual, as adopted and administered by the City of Bothell Public Works Department.


10. Page III-25, under "Mitigation Measures". last dot point. 3rd line. Replace "discharges" with "discharged".

11. Page III-25, Mitigation Measures. after last dot point. Add the following paragraph after the last dot point at the bottom of the page:
- Storm detention facilities would be designed to contain runoff from the developed conditions 25 year recurrence storm event with an allowable 24 hour discharge rate equal to the 5 year 24 hour existing conditions event, unless hydraulic analysis indicates that the North Creek flood plain will not be impacted by undetained surface water runoff. Conditions of approval could be placed on the project as part of the PUD approval process.

12. Page III-26, 3rd dot point. last line. Replace beginning word "are" with "area".

13. Page III-26, 8th dot point. end of middle line. Replace "are to" with "area to".

14. Page III-27, under "Plants & Animals". 2nd dot point. last line and last word. Change from "plant" to "plants".

15. Page III-29, under "Noise". "Mitigation Measures". 2nd dot point. Does this address buffering surrounding land uses from noise caused by the campus, or buffering the campus from surrounding noise?

16. Page III-29, under "Noise". "Mitigation Measures". 6th dot point. Would "Limit" be a better word than "Schedule"?

17. Page III-30, under "Risk of Explosion". "Mitigation Measures". 2nd dot point. Insert "of" between "Elimination" and "methane" at beginning of sentence.

18. Page III-31, under "Land and..." "Impacts..." 2nd and 3rd dot point. Statement that Alternative 1 proposes 102 acres as open space and "Phase 1" proposes 110 acres as open space does not add up. Are figures reversed?

19. Page III-32, "Population..." "Impacts...". 1st dot point. Statement that Chase House and Truly residence are being preserved is misleading in this location since they are not intended to be reused as residences.

20. Page III-34, "Historic..." "Impacts..." 1st and 2nd dot points. and under "Mitigation..." 1st dot point. There is no discussion of preservation of complex of Truly Farm buildings and effect on potential for listing of Truly House on National, State, or Local registers. That discussion may change conclusion under "Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts...".

21. Comment intentionally deleted.

22. Page IV-9, 4th paragraph. The discussion of the amount of excavation and peat present should be revised to indicate the peat will not be over-excavated. Our experience indicates sanitary sewer lines constructed over peat may settle and require more frequent reconstruction; require cleaning and other maintenance at a significantly higher rate; and create public health hazards.

23. Page IV-13, last sentence. Refers to submittal of "Critical Areas Variance Request". There is no such application. "Critical Area Alteration Permit" or "Reasonable Use Determination" would make more sense in this context.

24. Page IV-14, 3rd paragraph. 2nd sentence. A reference to locating structures in seismic hazard areas is not entirely accurate since the City's ICAO prohibits construction of school facilities expected to house more than 500 users within the 100-yr floodplain which is a portion of the seismic hazard area in this location.

25. Page IV-15, Under "Significant Unavoidable..." "Build-Out". 2nd paragraph. 1st sentence. Needs language regarding minimizing as much as is physically feasible before identifying impact as unavoidable.

26. Page IV-16, 2nd line. Change to read "area can be characterized as having a marine..."

27. Page IV-28, 4th paragraph. towards end of 3rd line. Change to read "...just north of the
NE 185th Street..."

28. Page IV-28, 7th paragraph. Mention should be made that the site is wholly contained also within a sub-basin of the North Creek basin; for boundaries see "Plate 1 Drainage Basins and Sub-basins" of the City's Comprehensive Storm Water Master Plan", Nov 1993, Barrett Consulting Group. Sub-basin boundaries are important because of critical area ordinance requirements that wetland mitigation replacement occur within the same sub-basin as the alteration.

29. Page IV-28, last paragraph, 3rd line. Change to read: "...within the site; a the first 750 feet ...".

30. Page IV-30, last paragraph, 5th line. Change to read: "...into either North Creek or an off-site...".

31. Page IV-31, 5th paragraph, next to last line. Change to read: "...hydrologic environmental is discussed...".

32. Page IV-33, 1st paragraph. The City's ICAO regulations and Shoreline Master Program have been confused herein. To clarify, I suggest the language should read:

4th line. Change to read: "...Interim Critical Areas Ordinance (ICAO)..." and then, on the 6th line, change to read: "...floodplain encroachment. The ICAO classifies North Creek as a Category 1 stream since it has been identified as "shoreline of the State" according to the State Shoreline Management Act and the City's adopted Shoreline Master Program. North Creek is not, however, a "shoreline of state-wide significance". While the ICAO discusses buffers along all streams in Bothell, the Master Program also includes required setbacks from North Creek and the Sammamish River only. The City's Shorelines Hearing Board is presently in the process of revising the Master Program, and is expected to make their recommendation to the City Council by October of 1995 for Council action prior to the end of the year. Changes to the Master Program currently being considered would make the ICAO applicable to the Master Program area of jurisdiction where the ICAO presently does not apply. The City of Bothell has also adopted a Shorelines Master Plan that classifies North Creek as a Category 1 stream and is therefore inventoried as "shorelines of the State." The Shorelines Master Plan also discusses buffers along streams.

2nd paragraph. Change to read: "Additionally, this area falls under what was the City of Bothell's Plan for the North Creek Valley and Development Guidelines, which addresses development requirements for the site and which has been incorporated into the City's new GMA compliant Comprehensive Plan."  "

33. Figure IV-34. The existing figure is incomplete and should be replaced with the figure included as Attachment 1. This attachment shows the existing and planned arterial and street network which is included in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

34. Figure IV-39. The existing figure is incomplete and should be replaced with the figure included as Attachment 2. This attachment shows the existing and planned pedestrian and bicycle route network which is included in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

35. Page IV-45, 1st paragraph, 4th line. Change to read "...same for Alternative 1 with 4,200 parking spaces and Alternative 1a with ..."

36. Page IV-45, 4th paragraph, 4th line. Change to read "...vegetation. An increase of 15.6 ..."

37. Page IV-47, 1st paragraph, 1st line. Change to read "...2a does not relocate..."

38. Page IV-49, last paragraph. The following codes at least should be listed in lieu of the specific storm drainage facilities criteria: (1) the 1990 King County Surface Water Manual, (2) Department of Ecology requirements and (3) Department of Fisheries requirements.

39. Page IV-49, 1st paragraph. This paragraph indicates no detention will be provided. The discussion must confirm that North Creek is an approved receiving body. Additional hydraulic analysis will be required to demonstrate that detention is not necessary. This is subject to PUD review conditions.

40. Page IV-50, wetland restoration discussion. There is no clear comparison of the type(s) of wetlands (per Bothell's wetland classification system) destroyed and type(s) of wetlands created with the required (City code) separate replacement ratios. Also, the math doesn't quite work; using 1987 protocol, 24.6 acres impacted with 5.8 acres replacement does not equal 2.4:1 ratio - slight difference, 2.4:1 would require 59 acres replacement. Language also refers to replaced or "restored" wetlands. Bothell's code does not allow credit for restoration or enhancement of existing wetlands. The intent of the applicant needs to be clarified here.

41. Page IV-66, 2nd paragraph, Fish. On September 28, 1994, Daryn Brown of this office observed and documented a large salmon (12-15 pounds), identified as Chinook (blackmouth), resting in the calm current of North Creek where it passes under 214th Street SE. On October 17, 1994, Daryn observed and documented spawning Coho salmon in North Creek, above the project site (they would have had to pass through the project site to get to these locations): 3 were observed from the bridge over North Creek just north of NE 195th St and 7 were seen from the bridge over North Creek at 240th St SE.

p. IV-76: third paragraph beginning "Predictions...": Is the labeling reversed in the text where 1999 is labeled "(Build-Out)" and 2010 is labeled *(Phase 1)*? Tables IV-18 and IV-19 would make it appear so.
Page IV-66, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line. Change to read "...are also listed, and these are ...

Page IV-67, 2nd paragraph, next to last line. Change to read "...fish species populations; and an increase in fish ...

Page IV-81-84, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH: Risk of Explosion or Hazardous Emissions. Permits must be obtained from the Fire Department for the removal or safeguarding of UST's. Copies of all environmental reports shall be forwarded to the Fire Department to assure that the site has been restored to its normal state.

Pre-emergency planning is an integral part of Hazardous Materials Operations. Federal and State regulations require the City to have a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan in place to deal with any releases or emissions noted in the DEIS. It is imperative for the new Campus to provide any information to the Bothell Fire Department, when requested or required, to meet these planning requirements.

It is important to note that the Federal and State Departments identified in this section of the DEIS only perform compliance inspections for their regulations. It is up to the local Fire Department to perform compliance inspections for local codes and ordinances and to respond to any release or emission from these facilities.

In order for the Bothell Fire Department to effectively respond to this type of emergency it may be necessary to purchase additional equipment and obtain training to deal with Radiologic and Hazardous Materials releases. This may have a substantial financial impact.

Page IV-86, Table IV-21. change to read "Truly Farms/Stringtown Site (collection of 49–perecels) Homestead". I think this is what is intended since the collection of Stringtown properties is listed separately in the table. The change in labeling would also be consistent with the labeling on Figure IV-19 and would be less confusing to the reader.

Page IV-86, 1st paragraph, 1st line. Change to read "...referred to as the Truly Farms/Stringtown,..."

Page IV-86, under "Existing Site Land Use", 1st paragraph, next to last line. Change to read: "...of the site and the Truly Farms/Stringtown Homestead is operated..." (see reasoning in above comment

Page IV-89, 2nd paragraph, last line. Direct auto linkage to downtown from the campus site will be via Beardslee/Main Street, not NE 185th Street.

Page IV-91, 4th paragraph, 5th line midpoint. Change to read: "...located within its 100-year floodplain. Under...

Page IV-94, 2nd paragraph, 1st line. Change to read: "...institutional/educational, opens space, and...

Page IV-94, last paragraph, line 2. Change to read: "...Phase 1, two new buildings...

Page IV-96, 2nd paragraph, 1st line. Change to read: "Upon completion obtaining of all...

Page IV-96, 1st dot point, third line. Change to read: "30-minute travel time from the Bothell/ Woodinville area."

Page IV-96, 4th dot point. Conclusion assumes no outgrowth of competing businesses providing same services at lesser prices. No economic impact analysis is provided.

Page IV-97, 3rd paragraph, line 2. Change to read: "...have the same requirements relationship to comply...

Page IV-97, last paragraph, 3rd sentence. It is unclear what "location undeveloped" means.

Page IV-97, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence. Isn't the intended meaning that the amount of open space in alternative 2 is slightly greater than alternative 1, in which case, the sentence should read: "...greater than that from Alternative 1 [104..."

Page IV-98, under "Compatibility with Surrounding Area". Reference is made here and elsewhere that the Bothell Pioneer Cemetery is an especially sensitive property and that it will be protected through existing buffers of mature trees. In fact, the existing buffer between the Cemetery and an existing residential lot is sparse, meaning that there are significant gaps through which the proposed parking garage would be very visible and in fact tower over the cemetery, destroying the non-commercial, almost rural atmosphere of the cemetery site. The current buffer is adequate for the current residential use, but falls far short of adequate for separating the intense campus use and the historically significant cemetery. Unless mature trees can be planted which will continue to grow to completely screen the planned parking garage at build-out, planned vegetative buffering is insufficient to achieve the desired buffering effect. Also, in order to achieve that screen, greater width between the property line and the building edge will likely be required in order to have enough space to plant enough trees to provide the needed screening. If the site is not better buffered, a significant adverse impact will have occurred to the cemetery's historic setting integrity.
Page IV-99. 5th paragraph. Information contained in this paragraph should be expanded to explain that "...the Plan for the North Creek Valley and Developmental Guidelines document, adopted in 1979, with amendments in 1981, has now been incorporated into the new City of Bothell Comprehensive Plan. However, section 17.25 of the Bothell Municipal Code, remains in effect until the zoning code is rewritten to implement the new Comprehensive Plan and must also be considered. Certain differences may need to be resolved through a code interpretation process. Applicable provisions...".

60. Page IV-100. 2nd paragraph, next to last sentence. The statement "Open space corridors are delineated to the north and south of the site, but not across the site" is not accurate. Figure L16 depicts two kinds of open space corridors. The width of corridors established by streams such as North Creek are set primarily through the City's critical area and shoreline master program buffering requirements (although other aspects of the plan such as the Parks and Recreation element, "urban separator" requirements in the Land Use element, or the "feathered edge" concept in the Land Use element also establish these corridor-width requirements). These streamways are no less "open space corridors" than those depicted which join other significant critical areas such as steep slopes or wetlands. The above sentence seems to assume that only those areas with diagonal lines on figure L16 are "corridors", which is not the case. In fact, there is a corridor "across" the Truly Farm/ Stringtown Campus Site, along North Creek.

61. Page IV-102. 1st sentence. This sentence contradicts statements made earlier and should be rewritten to reflect the comments referred to on page IV-99, 5th paragraph, above, for consistency.

62. Page IV-102. 3rd dot point. Change to read: "Encouraging heavy landscaping along..."

63. Page IV-102. 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence. Change to read: "The campus design, particularly Alternative 1, incorporates..."

64. Page IV-103. 1st paragraph, 3rd line. Delete "historic places" from this description as they are not a part of the ICAO, but rather primary regulations concerning historic landmarks are contained in Title 14 of the Bothell Municipal Code. In fact, this section 3. of Chapter IV of the EIS should include a sub-section with reference to these applicable regulations, including Title 14 and the Historic Preservation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Even if the policies in the Historic Preservation Element are not yet included in Title 14 which will be revised at a later time, these policy requirements apply through the SEPA process.

65. Page IV-105, under Statement Growth Management Act. This section needs to be expanded to include discussion of the new law #1724 which blends procedural requirements for GMA, SEPA and SMA.

66. Page IV-119. "Environmental Impacts". The Truly Farm is the last remaining major agriculture site in Bothell. The "view" one gets looking south and west from I-405 illustrates the site's historic use as a farm and ranch which will be significantly affected from this proposal. See more under "historic and cultural resources" discussion below.

67. Page IV-124, last paragraph. A preliminary determination of eligibility on several houses in the Stringtown area will be completed by City of Bothell staff and consultant by September 30, 1995. Evaluation of the historic significance and integrity of the several buildings on the Truly Farm has been impossible since any access by city personnel has been denied by the present owner. Nothing in the DEIS allays this situation. Since no analysis has been done to identify whether or not the site is historically significant to the City of Bothell, the State of Washington, or the Nation, an adequate discussion of the possible impacts is impossible. Further analysis identified as a mitigation measures pages IV-126 and IV-127 would be more appropriately completed and included with this EIS so that a full understanding of the environmental impacts can be achieved. The Truly Farm is the last remaining farm complex in the City of Bothell. It is likely that the outlying farm buildings would contribute to the significance of the site and to the significance of the Truly house which is slated for preservation. However, no information on or analysis of these outlying buildings is included herein. In addition, recently completed field work on an update of the City's Historic Resources Inventory has identified another possible resource on the north side of NE 180th Street which must be further researched before a final determination can be made. In discussions with the applicant's consultant on this project, it was my understanding that an evaluation of the properties within the campus site would be thoroughly evaluated and the information made available to the City via the EIS. This has not occurred with this document. This section of the EIS needs to be expanded and the above information provided. If the applicant's timeline cannot accommodate the City process of identification and evaluation, the applicant should supply that information herein and document their conclusions and credentials.

No discussion is included in this section regarding the off-site impact to the Bothell Pioneer Cemetery - see previous comments elsewhere in this memorandum. These impacts include shadows and sight impacts upon the integrity of the setting of the cemetery.

In addition, site plans depict the continued use of NE 180th Street past the western boundary of the campus site even though textually, NE 180th is identified as a pedestrian and bicycle connect to downtown Bothell (p. IV-153). It is our understanding that no auto connection is intended and plans should show the blocking of NE 180th at the boundary of the campus with the Bothell Pioneer Cemetery (except for the allowance of emergency vehicles through breakaway bollards, etc., see page IV-172, 2nd paragraph). This intent (not just "likely" occurrence) should be better illustrated in the text and elsewhere other than just the public services section. In fact, the intersection analysis discussions in section 9. Transportation", pp. IV-130 through IV-168, regarding the
Intersection of Beardslee Blvd/Main Street/Kaysner Way/104th Avenue (Valley View/NE 180th) leads one to believe that NE 180th through the Cemetery will be used by cars. Please clarify.

57. cont.

58. Pages IV-149 and IV-153. Non-Motorized Transportation Sections. The existing plans for access by pedestrians and bicyclist may be inadequate. The DEIS implies elsewhere that the North Creek trail will be interconnected to main campus areas by the boardwalk paths. The boardwalk path is shown interconnected with the North Creek trail in the vicinity of NE 180th Street (extended) by means of a switch-back trail up the hillside. The other connection points shown between the boardwalks and North creek trail would be difficult to be made at the grade of the North Creek trail but alternate paths or connections are not shown. In any case, the North Creek Trail should be interconnected directly to popular campus areas at several points, in addition to the north and south edges of the campus as suggested by DEIS figures (Figure IV-42, etc.).

The DEIS should also describe the means by which only pedestrian and bicyclist access will be assured along NE 180th and 185th Streets. DEIS figures (Figure IV-42, etc.) suggest that automobile access may be permitted, by the absence of discontinuation of these routes except to pedestrians and bicyclists.

A vehicle turnaround space should be shown on NE 185th Street at the campus boundary for vehicles to drop-off and pick up people and turn around at the campus boundary. Only emergency vehicles, pedestrian and bicyclists will be allowed on NE 180th Street east of NE 108th Avenue (the west boundary of the Bothell cemetery). A vehicle turnaround and barriers should also be indicated on Valley View at 108th Avenue NE to allow people to be dropped-off and picked-up at this point. Definite turn-around areas should also be provided on the planned campus vehicle entrances on Beardslee Boulevard and SR-522.

65. The North Creek Trail will be the main interconnection between the Snohomish County and King County nonmotorized trail system. When completed, the North Creek Trail will interconnect with Paine Field and the Everett trail system in south Everett. The Connection with the Sammamish River Trail will provide through connections for pedestrians and bicyclists to the Seattle trail system and to Issaquah via the Lake Sammamish trail.

An alternate interconnection may be needed between the North Creek and Sammamish River Trails. The North Creek Trail link under SR-522 along North Creek may often flood since the trail would be only approximately 3 feet above the normal creek level at this point.

66. Page IV-149, last paragraph. The first sentence should be revised to read as follows: ...the general population residing in the...
Apparently the data provided in Table IV-28 were calculated assuming that all the people arrive during the a.m. peak period and no one departs. Should not those that are being dropped-off, buses entering and exiting, etc. be considered?

The assumption that 60% transit/carpool mode split is unrealistic. It would be helpful if one table were provided which showed the AWDT, AM in and out & PM in & out for 1999 and the build-out year.

78. Pages IV 169-173. PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES: Fire and Emergency services. In the first paragraph, under Affected Environment, it states that the Bothell Fire Department has three fire stations that are manned with cross-trained personnel capable of responding to either fire or emergency medical calls. It is important to note that the City of Bothell Fire Department's manning levels are such that currently it is not possible to respond to a fire call and an emergency medical call simultaneously. Manning would need to be increased in order to meet this demand. Therefore, it is imperative that the HECB negotiate with the City of Bothell, prior to Phase 3 (Design and Construction), for the payment of monies for the actual cost of provision of fire and emergency medical services provided by the City to and for the co-located campus. The interlocal agreement, identified in appendix E.7, shall become a part of the final EIS and not just a referenced document.

79. Pages IV 172. ACCESS POINTS. In order to keep Fire Department response times to a minimum, more than one access point to the campus must be maintained. In particular, the NE 185st access point shall be available, without gates or barricades at all times once the campus is opened. This will enable the Fire Department direct access from it's main station on Beardslee Blvd.

80. Page IV-192. Last paragraph. An analysis of the maximum required fire flow expected on campus should be completed to determine the adequacy of the size of the proposed distribution system. Information on the proposed building sizes, construction type, exposure, sprinkler system, etc. should be provided to the Bothell fire marshal in order to calculate estimated fire flow. Upgrading portions of the area distribution system may be necessary to satisfy the requirement and mitigate for project impacts.


82. Page IV-195. Environmental Impacts. Build-Out. Please provide support calculations for the estimated peak flow of 0.93 cfs for City review.

83. Figure 3 in Appendix E.1 (Earth). Test pit sites are not shown in the area where Phase I parking will be located and where the parking garages will be located when the campus is completed ("build-out"). Additional soils testing should be completed in these areas and this figure should be revised to indicate the locations of the needed test sites.

84. Appendix E.6, page 4, 4th dot point at top of page. 1st line. Change to read: "Five percent of all estimated weekly expenditures was applied..."

85. Appendix E.6, page 4, last dot point at bottom of page. Change to read: "Expenditures for food away from home..."

86. Appendix E.6, page 7, 1st dot point. Change to read: Reference is made to main access from campus to downtown via 185th. This is not true, but rather Beardslee/Main Street provide that access.

87. Appendix E.6, page 7, 1st dot point, 2nd line. Change to read: "...foot, containing a variety..."

88. Appendix E.6, page 7, 2nd dot point, 2nd line. Change to read: "...522, I-405 and..."

89. Appendix E.6, page 7, ditto, 2nd paragraph, 2nd line: "One-year's drive" does not make sense unless one is traveling in space or time. Please correct.

90. Appendix E.6, page 7, under "Experience in..." 1st paragraph, last line. Change to read: "...residential neighborhoods."

91. Appendix E.6, page 8, 2nd dot point. Change to read: "That campus development..."

92. Appendix E.6, page 8, 3rd dot point. What does this mean, it isn't clear?

93. Appendix E.9 (Transportation). Figure II-1. The trip distribution map is not clear. It is not possible for the reviewer to determine where the new trips generated by the proposed UW/Cascadia Campus are entering/exiting. The City of Bothell resolution No. 774 requires analysis of all intersections that are impacted by ten (10) or more peak hour trips. According to the DEIS, only 5 intersections were analyzed: 1) Beardslee Blvd./Campus North Access, 2) SR-522/SR-527/Main Street intersection, 3) Beardslee Blvd./Kaysne Way/104th, and 4) the I-405/NE 195th Street NB and SB ramps. This appendix should be revised to include a trip generation summary table of vehicle trips for 1999 and buildout year (2010). This table should show the AWDT, a.m. and p.m. peak, inbound and outbound trips.

The trip distribution map should be revised to show detail of where the new trips generated by the proposed UW/Cascadia Campus are coming from and going to. All intersections that are impacted by 10 or more peak hour trips need to be analyzed and mitigation measures need to be identified when the LOS drops below LOS "D".

94. GENERAL SECURITY COMMENTS. This project is going to be a very large impact on the Bothell Fire Departments operation. In particular, the Fire Prevention division.
For the short term it will require a tremendous amount of man hours for the numerous plans reviews, and inspections associated with just the construction of the campus. In addition, there will be a large increase of annual fire and life safety inspections and hazardous materials inspections. This impact needs to be mitigated. This would require the addition of at least one FTE in the Fire Prevention Bureau as well as monies to employ our hazardous materials consultant.

95. **GENERAL WATER AND WETLANDS COMMENTS.**

(1). There is no discussion of coordination between different agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands and streams (DOE, Corps, City), particularly with regard to ensuring that the timing of one agency does not negate the effective date of another agency’s decision.

(2). A discussion should occur showing the effects of floodwaters moving from a constricted system (the levied portion of North Creek in the Koll and Quadrant business parks) to an open area and into another constricted area as the Creek crosses under SR 522 to the Sammamish River. Specifically, what will be the effect of the expected flooding pattern on the North Creek Trail and/or the Sammamish River Trail system?

(3). I suggest deleting all references to the 1989 Manual. Recent decisions at the Federal and State levels have made the 1989 manual irrelevant at all levels of jurisdiction.

(4). All references to the King County Surface Water Manual must also indicated the 1990 edition of the applicable version as adopted and administered by the City of Bothell Public Works Department.

96. **GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COMMENTS.** In noise section in general, no discussion of timing of noise impacts and residential uses being more vulnerable to noise impacts at night from operation of classes, etc., versus day noise of construction phase. Should be acknowledged and discussed by report.

97. **GENERAL TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS.**

(1). What are the UW/Cascadia Campus impacts to the following CIP projects:

- 120th Avenue NE extension
- 39th Avenue SE extension
- 228th Street SE from I-405 to 39th Avenue SE
- 228th Street SE/SW from Locust Way to 9th Avenue SE

The transportation section of the DEIS will need to identify the number of trips that are generated and impacts to these capital improvements projects in order to calculate a fair share.

(2). All traffic control devices that may be installed or up-graded because of this project shall have 3M, series 500, Opticom Equipment installed. All equipment shall be compatible with what the Bothell Fire Department is currently using. All pre-emption designs shall be approved by the Bothell Fire Department.

(3). The DEIS indicated that at the I-405/NE 195th Street interchange, a second eastbound through lane on the bridge will be needed? How does this lane fit into the new bridge planned for construction in 1996?

(4). What are the impacts to Ross Road? The DEIS did not address the Beardslee Road/Ross road intersection. Currently, this intersection is operating at LOS "F" and projected to operate at LOS "F". Traffic turning left from Ross Road onto Beardslee would have a tough time making the left turn and may choose to travel through Ross Road to access from NE 185th Street? What are the impacts to Ross Road/108th Avenue NE intersection, Ross Road/NE 185th Street and NE 185th Street/Beardslee Blvd. intersections? The traffic distribution map as well as the traffic volume maps should show Ross Road and intersections along Ross Road.

Mitigation measures to address the impacts to Ross Road need to be identified. The following is a list of suggestions:

(a). Landscaped traffic circle at Ross Road/112th Ave. NE and at NE 187th/108th Ave. NE/Ross Road intersections. This is to create an atmosphere that Ross Road is a neighborhood Street and consideration be given to preserving the existing character.

(b). Paved pedestrian walkway on one side of Ross Road to provide a safe pedestrian facility,

(c). Additional signage such as local access, narrow road, etc.,

(d). Some street lighting at intersections.

(e). Intersection improvements to the Beardslee Blvd./Stub road and NE 185th/Ross Road.
Thank you for the opportunity to review this document. We look forward to working with the HECB and its consultants through the development approval process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gordon Ericksen
Community Development Director
Bothell SEPA Responsible Official

ATTACHMENTS (2)

cc: Long Range Correspondence
    Bill Winlogie
    Gordon Burh

https://example.com
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

1 Comments noted. Detailed responses to your specific comments follow.

2 Comments noted. Meeting with City of Bothell & HECB scheduled for August 30, 1995.

3 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

4 Comment noted. Land and Shoreline Use are addressed in the DEIS beginning on page IV-86.

5 Comment noted regarding buffering of cemetery. Existing vegetation on the campus site along the cemetery frontage will be preserved, where possible, and enhanced to effectively screen campus uses from the cemetery.

Comment noted regarding Truly outbuildings. See University of Washington comment Response #6. See Section III.B. of this document.

6 Comment noted. Other possible structures to be retained include the Wash House and Garage, both located next to the Truly residence.

7 Comment noted. The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

8 Comment noted regarding landscape buffers. A minimum of 30' has been allowed for screening and buffering adjacent uses. Any significant existing vegetation will be utilized for landscape buffering where possible. Supplemental understory plantings will help augment the screening.

Comment noted regarding cemetery screening. See Response #5 above.

Comment noted regarding "light impacts." Shading of the cemetery in early morning hours is mostly due to existing vegetation along the campus edge. This vegetation will be preserved as much as possible.

Comment noted regarding impact of a modern building on ambiance of historic cemetery. Campus buildings placed adjacent to cemetery are cut into the slope to reduce their impact from adjacent uses. In addition, the design of these buildings will take adjacent uses into consideration. A 30' vegetative buffer, utilizing existing vegetation where possible, will also help screen adjacent uses.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

9   The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

10  Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.

11  The City of Bothell requires compliance with the *1990 King County Surface Water Design Manual* for drainage collection, retention/detention, treatment and discharge. The *Manual* requires treatment for runoff from new impervious surfaces subject to vehicular use or storage of chemicals. Roofs and groundwater do not meet these characterizations; consequently treatment is not proposed.

12  Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.

13  Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.

14  The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

15  The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

16  The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

17  This buffering would be primarily around noise sources located on campus. Such buffering would minimize potential impacts to both on campus and off campus areas.

18  Thank you for the suggestion. Use of the word "limit" would be more appropriate. Correction is made to EIS. See Section III of this document.

19  Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS.

20  Comment noted. The DEIS is correct when it states that Alternative 1 proposes 102 acres as open space and Phase 1 proposed 110 acres as open space. Phase 1 has more open space since only two buildings are proposed.

21  The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

22 Comment noted. See University of Washington comment response #6. See Section III of this document.

23 Comment noted.

24 As discussed on page IV-9 of the DEIS, areas of underlying soft, compressible, low-strength deposits may require special construction techniques to reduce total differential settlement to acceptable levels. As stated on page IV-14 of the DEIS, site specific subsurface investigations, including soil and ground water explorations would be necessary for each campus building, road, trail, and utility corridor, and would be performed during the design phase. These special geotechnical studies and the related design applications developed during final site design and prior to construction would be available for City review as part of the building permit application process for each phase of campus development.

25 Comment noted. The terminology “Critical Areas Variance Request” should be replaced by “Critical Areas Alteration Permit”. Refer to Chapter III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.

26 No construction of campus buildings under either Alternative 1 or 2 would occur within the 100-year floodplain as remapped and approved through the FEMA Letter of Map Revision process. The proposed elevated boardwalk “structures” to be constructed in the floodplain would not meet the definition of “school facilities expected to house more than 500 users”, and as such, it is not anticipated that a Critical Areas Alteration Permit related to development in floodplain areas would be required.

27 Comment noted. It is the intent of the DEIS to identify potential environmental impacts that could result from development of the project. These impacts could be mitigated to the maximum extent possible through implementation of the mitigating measures listed on page IV-13 and IV-14 of the DEIS. However, even with these mitigating measures, some unavoidable impacts would occur as identified on page IV-15.

28 Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS.

29 Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS.

30 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell  
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

31 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

32 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

33 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

34 The portion of the site designated as floodplain is included in the City of Bothell’s 1993 Interim Critical Areas Ordinance (ICA0).

The ICAO classifies North Creek as a Category 1 stream since it has been identified as a “shoreline of the state” according to the State Shoreline Management Act and the City’s adopted Shoreline Master Program. North Creek is not, however, a “shoreline of state-wide significance.” While the ICAO discusses buffers along all streams in Bothell, the Shoreline Master Program also includes required setbacks from North Creek and the Sammamish River only. The City’s Shorelines Hearing Board is presently in the process of revising the Shoreline Master Program and is expected to make their recommendation to the City Council by October of 1995 for Council action prior to the end of the year. Changes to the Shoreline Master Program currently being considered would make the ICAO applicable to the Shoreline Master Program area of jurisdiction where the ICAO presently does not apply.

Additionally, this area falls under what was the City of Bothell’s Plan for the North Creek Valley and Development Guidelines, which addresses development requirements for the site and which has been incorporated into the City’s new GMA compliant Comprehensive Plan.

35 Comment noted. See Figure TR3 in the City of Bothell Comprehensive Plan for traffic signal locations.

36 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

37 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

38 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

39 Comment noted. The DEIS states “Alternative 2 and 2a do not relocate the creek channel and flooding characteristics would be essentially unchanged from current conditions.” No change necessary.

40 The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

41 Comment noted regarding additional hydraulic analysis. Detailed hydraulic calculations have not been prepared as a part of the current Master Planning effort. It is anticipated that hydraulic calculations will occur during Phase 1 site design.

42 The replacement ratio of 2.4:1 is, in fact, correct. Using 1987 protocol, 24.6 acres of impacts with 58 acres of restoration equals a ratio of 2.3577:1. This was rounded to 2.4:1. To report 2.3577:1 as the ratio would be to assume greater resolution, which does not exist.

It is important to understand the allocation of fill into waters and wetlands associated with the preferred Alternative 1. According to Alternative 1, a total of 24.6 acres of waters and wetlands will be filled in order to construct the campus and restore North Creek and the historical floodplain. Of this 24.6 acres, 6.8 acres of waters and wetlands will be filled on the hillside to accommodate the construction of the campus facility. These waters and wetlands, and their associated functions, will be lost from the landscape. The remaining 17.8 acres of waters and wetlands on the floodplain will be “filled” in order to restore the floodplain. This is somewhat misleading in that 17.8 acres of waters and wetlands will be “filled” in order to accomplish restoration, and will remain as wetlands even though they are “filled.” This “fill” is associated with grading of the historical floodplain surface in order to achieve the necessary final grades for site waters/wetlands hydrology and native plant community planting zones. Despite the placement of 17.8 acres of “fill”, this area will become part of 58 acres of restored waters and wetlands. These waters and wetlands and their associated functions will not be lost from the landscape, but, rather, their level of functioning will be increased from pre-project conditions. Currently, these 17.8 acres of wetlands are primarily composed of partially ditched and drained, non-native pasture grass dominated, grazed palustrine emergent persistent wetlands. This acreage includes ditches whose intent is to drain the historical floodplain and reduce the wetland area. The intent of the mitigation is to increase the functional status of these 17.8 acres in terms of their hydrology, biogeochemistry/water quality, plant community maintenance, and habitat/faunal support functions. Still, if the City of Bothell does not wish to consider these 17.8 acres of waters/wetlands in the mitigation ratio, then the mitigation ratio for the City of Bothell’s calculations would be 24.6 acres of impacts and 40.2 acres of mitigation for a ratio of 1.6:1.

It is important to recognize that the City of Bothell has been an important member involved in the planning process of the project to date. The mitigation planning team has welcomed their input and has worked to incorporate their suggestions into the current mitigation and monitoring plan. The mitigation planning team hopes that this cooperative planning process can continue as the final mitigation and monitoring plan proposal is drafted.

43 Comment noted regarding observation and documentation of salmon in North Creek.

Comment noted regarding noise. The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.

44 The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

45 The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.

46 Comments are noted. As stated on page IV-85 of the DEIS, numerous regulatory controls would dictate the use of hazardous materials on campus. The use of toxic and flammable materials would be controlled by Washington occupational safety and health standards and local fire codes. Thank you for the specific information pertaining to City of Bothell Fire Department requirements.

At the present time, it does not appear that Phase I of the campus would create hazardous emissions beyond what now normally occurs for construction and operation of other facilities within the City. At this time it is not known what, if any, types of hazardous materials may be used or generated as part of campus activities and operations in the future phases of development. As such, it is not known if the Bothell Fire Department would need to purchase additional equipment or obtain special training. In the future, with each phase of development, planning representatives for the college would coordinate with the City of Bothell to determine if there are any special needs for Bothell Fire Department services generated by the proposed campus activities.

47 The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.

48 The corrections are made in the EIS. See Section III of the document.

Comment noted regarding outgrowth of competing businesses. The DEIS assumed that the demand for retail space at build-out of the campus is likely to occur primarily on campus to best accommodate the needs of the placebound student. Should these services be provided off campus, potential impacts would include:

- **Land Use Impacts** - There appears to be adequate commercially zoned vacant land in downtown Bothell. According to the City of Bothell, there is between 9,000-10,000 square feet of built, unleased commercially zoned space in downtown Bothell. In addition, approximately .5 acres of undeveloped commercially zoned land currently exists in downtown Bothell. In the business parks across from I-405 from the campus (Koll North Creek, Quadrant Montevilla, Quadrant North Creek) there is approximately 30,000 square feet of built, unleased commercially zoned space. There is also approximately 130 acres of undeveloped commercially zoned land in the business parks.

- **Fiscal Impacts** - It is assumed that the retail/business tax would be the same whether on or off campus.

- **Employment Impacts** - It is assumed that jobs generated would be the same whether on or off campus.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

49 Comment noted regarding existing buffer of trees at cemetery. See Response #5 and #8 above.

50 The correction is made in the EIS. See Section III of this document.

51 Comment noted regarding existence of an open space corridor along North Creek at the campus site.

52 Comment noted. See Comment 50 above.

53 The two corrections are made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

54 Comment noted. See Historic Resources Assessment in Section III.B.

55 Corrections are made in the EIS. The section is expanded to address the new law ESHB 1724. See Section III of this document.

56 Comment noted.

57 Comment noted. New information (Section III.B.) in this FEIS includes a Historical Resources Assessment and an Archaeological Resources Assessment included in the Appendix.

The HECB will develop a Memorandum of Agreement between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. This agreement will identify specific measures that will be taken to mitigate adverse effects of the project on cultural resources that are listed in, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places.

58 Comment noted. Correction made.

59 Comment noted. Text added.

60 Comment noted.

61 Comment noted. Text added.

62 Comment noted. Text revised.

63 Comment noted. Text revised.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell  
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

64 Comment noted.

65 The primary purpose of the proposed regional trail connection on campus is to provide a linkage between the existing Sammamish River Greenway/Trail system and the North Creek Trail system. Students, faculty, staff and visitors will be able to access the regional trail connection at several points. The northerly and southerly boardwalks would provide access to the trail. The center boardwalk would not provide access to the trail with ramps from the trail to the boardwalk. Additionally, users could reach the trail from walking or bicycling on (or adjacent to) proposed roads at the north and south end of the main campus. Sidewalks or pathways could be developed in these areas to enable better pedestrian and bicycle access, even though such facilities are not specifically shown in Figure IV-142 in the DEIS. Refer to the Proposed Pedestrian & Bicycle Access graphic, following the response to the City of Bothell letter, which illustrates where additional sidewalks or pathways could be developed to provide access from the main campus area to the trail.

Auto access to campus will not be permitted on 185th Street or on 180th Street. Furthermore, in order to avoid attracting traffic to these and other neighborhood streets, turn-arounds and pick-up/drop-off areas will not be provided on any local street.

The comments regarding the important linkage the campus trail will provide to other regional trail systems are noted. The master plan design team understands the importance of this trail as a regional connector and has proposed substantial facilities including a pedestrian/bicycle overpass over I-405 and improvements under SR-522 to enable the connection to be developed as part of Phase I of campus development. The master plan design team chose the most direct route for the main trail connection, recognizing that non-motorized commuters may often use this linkage. The central third of the North Creek trail on campus could be inundated during a 100-year flood event. While the 100-year recurrence interval storm is the only storm that has been modeled to determine flood impacts, it is unlikely that any flood of less than a 25-year recurrence interval would cause flooding of the trail. It is also important to recognize the importance of the trail in providing public access to the North Creek shoreline jurisdiction which is a major objective of the Shoreline Management Act. In rare instances of flooding over sections of the trail, trail users could divert to utilization of pathways in the main campus area and could cross SR-522 at-grade, via the proposed interchange at the southerly campus entrance.

66 Comment noted. Refer to Section III of this FEIS, which includes an index of errata/changes to the DEIS.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

67 Trip generation and trip distribution estimates were prepared specifically for this campus. Trip generation estimates were derived directly from an assessment of campus activity (i.e., attendance and employment by time of day and day of week), and trip distribution estimates were derived from City of Bothell and regional trip distribution estimates for the UWB and CCC service areas. (ITE has not compiled trip generation rates for a suburban university/community college, so a comparison cannot be made. Furthermore, ITE does not publish trip distribution information, because such information is locally unique, and cannot be synthesized into "rates" or "averages.")

The trip generation estimates for the a.m. peak hour (compiled in Table IV-28) determined that the number of vehicles leaving campus during that period would be negligible. Furthermore, the assumption that none of the carpoolers will be dropped off leads to a "conservative" (i.e., maximum) estimate of parking requirements.

It is recognized that the 60% transit/carpool goal for a smaller suburban campus is quite ambitious. (See response to UW Comment #4.) Person-trip and traffic generation information is compiled in Tables II-1, II-2, II-3, and II-4 and Attachment B of Appendix E.9.

68 Comments noted. In previous meetings with the Bothell Fire Department for coordination of environmental analysis to be included in the DEIS, potential demands for Fire Department services were discussed but not specifically identified or quantified by Department representatives. As specified in the Interlocal Agreement between the State Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) and the City of Bothell, the HECB will coordinate with the City of Bothell to determine specific demands for fire and emergency services related to campus development. Prior to design and construction of campus facilities, the new institution(s) would negotiate in good faith with the City for the payment of monies to the City of the actual cost of provision of fire and emergency medical services provided by the City to and for the co-located campus. It is anticipated that this negotiation should take place as part of building permit process review and approval for each phase of campus development.

The Interlocal Agreement between the State Higher Education Coordinating Board and the City of Bothell is an official legal document recognized by both parties. Appendix E.7 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes the Interlocal Agreement in its entirety. It should be noted that the Draft EIS (Volume I) and Final EIS (Volume II) together represent the full Environmental Impact Statement documentation for this project. Both documents will be recorded and filed together by the State Department of Ecology.
Response to Comments from Sue Kienast, President, Bothell Historical Museum Society

1 Comment noted regarding historic criteria. An Historical Resources Assessment of the campus site is included in this FEIS. Further, this assessment is being reviewed by the appropriate local, state and federal agencies in order to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. See University of Washington comment Response #6 above.

2 Comment noted regarding historical consequences of campus plan. The additional information contained in this FEIS identifies all historic sites on or in the vicinity of the property. The condition or integrity of these structures and sites is also noted.

3 Comment noted regarding further research required. That information is contained in this FEIS.

4 Comment noted regarding parking structure adjacent to cemetery. See comment Response #8, City of Bothell. Comment noted regarding pedestrian/bicycle access to the campus via existing NE 180th Street.

5 Comment noted regarding supplemental Historical/Cultural section. An Historical Resources Assessment and Archaeological Resources Assessment of the campus site have been prepared; these reports are included as new information in this FEIS. These assessments have been reviewed by all the appropriate local, state and federal agencies, and their comments incorporated.
Gordon J. Loewen and Jannelle W. Loewen
10828 NE 183rd Court
Bothell, WA  98011

July 11, 1995

Dear James A. Reed, Associate Director,

After attending the meeting of July 10, at the Ricketts Building, Bothell, concerning the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of Cascadia College and the University of Washington, Bothell, we have a few comments that we would like to have on record.

We appreciate all the effort to mitigate any environmental damages to the property, surrounding residents and animal and bird residents of the Truly property. However we still have some vital concerns about a few things. We believe that noise pollution, air pollution, safety concerns - especially car damages, thefts, robberies, unwanted interruptions to privacy, property trespassing, and unlawful street parking on residential streets, namely 183rd Ct and 182nd Ct and Valley View Drive and Sunrise Drive could be largely minimized by not allowing any transportation through the college on 185th Street nor 180th Street. These two roads should remain totally for local, private use and emergency vehicles only! We are very concerned that, if the access road to the college be denied on 522, access to the college will overflow through 180th Street and 185th Street. These two roads are too close to historic places such as the Old Bothell Cemetery and the Franciscan Nursing Home. Both of these places, as well as the lovely, quiet neighborhoods of 183rd CT and 182nd CT would be overrun with illegal parking, undesirable pedestrians, litterers, oil dripping cars, noisy old car engines and trespassers. This cannot be allowed to happen. I cannot believe you are taking so much trouble to minimize environmental damages to the Truly property, maximize the environmental health of the old North Creek stream and keep the taller trees on the property and then would possibly put in access to the college site on 180th and 185th (especially if the 522 access is not funded). Pedestrian and bike access should not be allowed on either of these two streets either. The environmental damage to these back street neighborhoods is too much at risk if you open these two streets in any way to college access.

Another concern we have is about the tall trees. The plans have been very generous in saving the majority of tall trees, designing the buildings so that the surrounding residents still have a blocked view of the campus and retain a screen of trees and 'future planted landscaping.' However, in the Draft Statement, it mentions that if the projected 'limited car use' does not pan out as planned (a

[Signature]

Jannelle W. Loewen

[Signature]

Gordon J. Loewen
Response to Comments from James E. Hutter, Jr.

1 It is difficult to accurately determine the age and condition of students' cars. For example, students at the UW campus may be working professionals seeking career advancement by obtaining upper level degrees and may actually drive new cars.

2 On page IV-153 of the DEIS, quantities of earthwork and the number of truck trips are discussed. Policies in the King County Surface Water Design Manual require the maintenance of erosion control measures and haul routes, including street sweeping and installation of special construction entries/exits that are designed to clean mud off haul vehicle tires.

3 Design, permitting and construction of various phases of the project will comply with all codes in effect at the time of construction. The project specifications will require implementation and maintenance of erosion control facilities during the life of construction.

6 One of the primary goals of the mitigation/restoration plan of North Creek and the adjacent floodplain is to improve biogeochemical functioning, both at a site specific scale and at a watershed/landscape scale. Restoration of biogeochemical functions such as nutrient cycling, the removal of elements and compounds, and the retention of particulates will function to improve water quality as compared to the pre-project conditions. Furthermore, because the location of the site is at the bottom end, or the distill end, of the watershed, water passing through the restored floodplain complex from up-gradient is subject to improvements in water quality. This will improve the quality of water entering the Sammamish River and Lake Washington.

9 Comment noted. The HECB cannot endorse any particular product.
Washington Higher Education
Coordinating Board
917 Laketrade Way
PO Box 43430
Olympia, WA. 98504-3430

Dear Jim Reed,

As an occasional participant of the Citizens Advisory Committee, I have given input on the historical and cultural aspects of the new campus proposal at the Truly/Stringtown site. Unfortunately, no one seemed to be listening.

In addition, criteria established by the National and State Registers of Historic Places have not been met and Federal requirements as specified in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC470f) are not contained in the Draft EIS.

The DEIS is inadequate and does not inform the public or decision-makers about the historical consequences of the campus plan. Specifically it does not:
- Identify all historical sites, including locations, on or in the vicinity of the property.
- Indicate condition or integrity of these structures and sites.

On page IV-124 it states "The survey acknowledges that further research is required..." Further research and a completed study is required to be a part of the DEIS. The Final EIS is, well, final and no further input can be added.

On page IV-126 it states "no designated historic resources would be impacted". I beg to differ with you. The Bothell Pioneer Cemetery, a local and State designated resource, abuts the college property, and will be severely impacted. The DEIS showsAlter 1 with a 3-5 level (hard to tell) parking structure 10-20 feet (again hard to tell) away from the property line with no significant buffer. And all of the alternatives show a pedestrian/bike trail through the cemetery property, which will definitely impact the cemetery and its use as a city park.

These issues must be addressed NOW. I request that you prepare a supplemental Historical/Cultural section to the DEIS and circulate it for comment before the FEIS is written. I believe that answering adequacy and procedural questions at the back of the FEIS as I was told at the July 10th public meeting and making your own decisions concerning them is not within the letter of the law and does not meet State and Federal requirements.

Sincerely,

Sue Kie, President

P.O. Box 313 Bothell, Washington 98011

Jim,
As you know I am a supporter of the college campus, but I think some real errors have occurred in preparing the DEIS. I would not like to see the process come too near because of these mistakes.
I am sending this representing the citizens of Bothell as the President of the Bothell Historical Museum.

Sue
Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board  
Attention: James A. Reed, Associate Director  
917 Lakeridge Way
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

Re: Cascadia Community College, Bothell

July 10, 1995

Mr. Reed:

After reading through the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) from cover to cover, I found that the DEIS is incomplete and does not hold anyone accountable for the proposed development.

The reason this proposed development is so important to me is the impact on our economy and environment. If we are seriously looking at this college as an investment in our future generations, then we need to go one step further. The proposed development is stating that there will be anywhere from 3,000 to 6,000 cars entering the campus daily and parking on the campus. Because most of these cars will be driven by students means they are probably not driving new cars but older models that most likely leak and drip oil and gas.

Another problem with the DEIS is there is not a word about the amount of truck trips during construction or the truck route that will be used during construction hauling fill back and forth (i.e. supply trucks, cement trucks and the construction workers going in and out of the site.) All of this activity will have a huge impact on North Creek. Because we are so concerned about the site itself, what about the sediment loading of North Creek outside of the construction site? What about street sweeping?

Also, during construction there will be traffic jams up and down the roads leading to increased pollutant loading to North Creek and the Sammamish River. Cars dripping oil and grease and heavy metals from brake linings and clutches due to starting and stopping in traffic around this area will have a negative impact on the environment as well.

The type of soil is very fine silt. When exposed to pavement during any type of rain, it can lead to turbidity and increased TSS, or total suspended solids. Mix that with petroleum products and fertilizers, you have a pretty toxic combination for all fish in North Creek and the Sammamish River.

Because the college is an investment in our future, so should be the environment surrounding it. From the development stage up to full operation of the college, the impact to North Creek and the Sammamish River will be tremendous. The roads to and from the college which drain to North Creek and the Sammamish River will increase in traffic by 8,000 to 12,000 car trips daily.

Sincerely,

James E. Hutter, Jr.
President/CEO

JEH:vb
ENVIRO-DRAIN®, INC.

PATENT PENDING

Reduces Pollution Runoff At The Source

FOR USE IN...
- Parking Lots
- Gas Stations
- Golf Courses
- Streets
- Dairies
- Industrial Facilities
- Municipalities

- Affordable
- Effective
- Easy To Install
- Easy To Maintain
- Manufactured By
- Disabled Workshops

• Anti Clogging Design
• Recyclable Filters
• Environmentally Safe Filters
• Absorbs Oil and Gas in Water
• Neutralizes Fertilizers/Pesticides
• Eliminates Sediments
• Sampling Capabilities (NPDES)

ENVIRO-DRAIN™ Specifications

Flow Rate
0-60 gpm
Nominal Flow
3-8 gpm
Electrical
None
Dimensions
Standard/Custom Sizes
Dry Weight
50 lbs.

Filter Materials
Filter Fabric
Absorbent™ and Activated Carbon
Mechanism
Gravity Feed Capable
of All Types of Filter Medium
Construction
100% Stainless Steel

Three measurements are based on the standard catch basin design. Custom sizes also available.

When Enviro-Drain stormwater filter is installed in catch basins, contaminated water enters through the grate and the water is diverted to enter Enviro-Drain, filtering out sediments, cigarette butts, rocks, leaves, and grass clippings in the top tray. The second tray is filled with Absorbent™, a natural cellulose fiber that retains up to 7 times its weight in oil. The third filter is filled with activated carbon to neutralize fertilizers and pesticides. Each tray has its own characteristics and are properly spaced to eliminate clogging while providing aeration to the water which is needed to break down organic compounds and provide fish with adequate oxygen. By allowing you to use any variety or combination of filter medium Enviro-Drain stormwater filter is much more versatile and cost effective than other types of filters. Test results of Enviro-Drain stormwater filter proved to be very successful with up to 96% removal of efficiencies.*

*Test results can be provided upon request.

DESCRIPTION
Storm Water Pollution Filter
18" x 24" x 14" d. Insert
16" x 24" x 14" d. Rack
18" x 24" x 13" d. Rack
16" x 24" x 14" d. Rack Screen
18" x 24" x 3" d. Rack Screen
16" x 24" x 3" d. Divider Screen
18" x 24" x 2.5" d. Rack Screen
16" x 24" x 2.5" d. Rack Screen
18" x 24" x 2.5" d. Rack Screen
16" x 24" x 2.5" d. Rack Screen

DESCRIPTION
Storm Water Sediment Filter
Use same inserts, bar racks, rack screens and diveters as in 100 & 500 series filters
18" x 24" x 15" d. Insert

WARRANTY AND LIMITATION OF REMEDIES

1. Express Warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc., expressly warrants this product to be free from defects in material, workmanship and performance under normal use and service for a period of one year from the date of delivery to the original owner. Enviro-Drain, Inc. will bear the responsibility for repairing or replacing any part of this product at no cost to the original owner. This warranty does not apply to damage caused by misuse, neglect, or improper installation or repair. Enviro-Drain, Inc. is not responsible for any incidental or consequential damages. Enviro-Drain, Inc. is not liable for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all warranties, expressed or implied, including merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. Enviro-Drain, Inc. is not responsible for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all warranties, expressed or implied, including merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose.

2. Limitation of Liability. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty. Enviro-Drain, Inc. disclaims all liability for any damages, whether or not specifically described in this warranty.
Response to Comments from Ann Aagaard

1 Comments noted. A campus master plan document is being prepared that discusses the design, architecture and other elements of the campus. The PUD, Shoreline Conditional Use and Shoreline Substantial Development permit applications have been submitted to the City of Bothell.

The 404 permit application will be submitted to the Corps of Engineers in September, and it will contain details of the floodplain restoration.
Dear Mr. Reed:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this DEIS
for the Cascadia Community College and University of Washington.
I wholeheartedly support Alternative II, the preferred alternative,
including the relocation of North Court with 4,200 parking spaces.
While this alternative adopts a highly optimistic goal of 60% commute trip reduction, it is much preferred to be of 6,000 parking spaces.

I am suggesting that a narrowly focused Supplemental DEIS be written specifically to cover two areas. One, to discuss the stream/woodland restoration plan in more detail and provide in-depth DEIS it summarized in Table III-4. The second area which needs further analysis is the actual design and architecture of the campus buildings.

The stream/woodland restoration details are important for future permitting processes, as well as the ecological habitat
that could be integrated into the total design.

Sincerely,

Amy Aagard
(Holden Village)
1655 E 108th Ave.
Bellevue, WA 98004
Dear Jim Reed,

Sorry this is late. My response is being composed, rewritten, and sent from Nolde Village (via Chelan WA) a luxurious Resort Center in the mountains off Lake Chelan, some 30 miles uplake.

Here at the village there are no phones, no computers, no electric typewriters, no roads, and no cars. All mail and other provisions are by the daily barge of the lake. It is strange to consider life this primitive in these beautiful snow-capped mountains, completely isolated from cars, traffic, and urban noise. We were shocked one day when a plane roared overhead.

Hope these comments are helpful.

— Don Yeager
James A. Reed, Associate Director
Higher Education Coordinating Board
917 Lakeridge Way (PO Box 43430)
Olympia, WA 98504-3430

July 11, 1995

This letter is to express our concern with the DEIS planned location of the main parking structure of the CCC and UWB campus. It is hardly more than fifty feet from our residence on 110 30 Circle Drive. If it is constructed that close, we will be subjected to high automobile noise, polluting fumes, headlight glare and added risk from car prowlers who will surely be attracted first to the unattended garage and then the adjacent residences.

The DEIS states that the Campus Master Plan alternatives strive to be a good “community fit” and that “Building placement and landscaping seek to achieve compatibility with adjacent land uses” (III-9) and that “[B]uffers of mature trees would be preserved at the property boundaries adjacent to residences and other sensitive properties” (I-12).

As you know, there are two residential neighborhoods directly adjacent to the proposed campus: the NE 182nd/183rd Ct neighborhood and the Circle Drive neighborhood. The 182nd/183rd Ct residences will be shielded from the campus by a 100-200 ft buffer of evergreen forest (Figure III-1) which will be preserved and supplemented with understory plantings to help screen the campus from the residences (III-12). The buffering of the Circle Drive neighborhood is not discussed in detail in the plan. The majority of the existing vegetation south of NE 180th is to be cleared (I-11). Thus, the only buffer from the undesirable aspects of having an enormous parking garage move in will be the buffer that you provide.

What, specifically, will the buffering be? How will we be shielded from headlight glare and the additional automobile pollution?

Much of our concern would be alleviated by moving the parking structure another 100 feet from our house and by leaving the existing mature cedar and maple trees.

May we please hear from you on this matter?

Yours truly,

Ann Charlotte Gavel Adams  Birney Adams  Kristina Adams
Response to Comments from Ann-Charlotte Gavel Adams, Birney Adams, and Kristina Adams

1. It is not likely that cars using the parking garage will cause high levels of noise due to slow vehicle speeds. High levels of automobile noise are caused by vehicles moving at arterial-type speeds. The increase in noise at your address (11030 Circle Drive) should be virtually the same as the noise levels shown for Receiver Number 4 which is located at the end of Circle Drive. (Refer to page IV-74 through IV-78 of the DEIS.) The noise level at this location is calculated to increase only by two (2) dBA as a result of the project. An increase of less than three (3) dBA is usually not discernible to most people. The fact that three of the five parking levels will be below ground will also reduce potential noise impacts.

Air quality impacts of parking garages would be minimized in this project by avoiding “peak” concentrations through spreading out the traffic over much of the day; providing more than one entrance and exit point; and by the encouragement of multiple modes of transportation to and from the campus site.

2. Comment noted. See Response #8, City of Bothell.

3. Comment noted. Headlight glare and automobile pollution are not anticipated to be significant. The proposed parking structure is located downslope from the Circle Drive neighborhood, in addition, a large portion of the garage will be below grade at that point.

On August 30, 1995, HECB staff and the project consultant met at the Adams’ and Wharton residences to further review the likely impacts and proposed mitigations associated with the planned location of the parking structure and physical plant facility. Residents attending this review included: James and Karen Wharton, Birney and Ann-Charlotte Gavel Adams, and Betty and Dennis Behrens.

This meeting included a property line “walk” and interior/exterior observation of the physical/spatial orientation of the Wharton and Adams’ residences to the eventual planned location of the parking structure and physical plant. Based on these observations, it was determined that effective mitigation of visual, light, and emission impacts will require additional and complex analyses during the design phase of the project. It is acknowledged that in this particular instance, the level of specificity necessarily contained in the master plan is insufficient to describe a mitigation plan at the level of detail desired, appropriately, by these residents.

The design phase of the project will therefore examine these issues in detail and will include, but not be limited to, an analysis of the following alternatives:

- Adjust placement of the parking garage and/or physical plant to provide adequate buffer for adjacent residences.
- Adjust elevation of the parking structure and/or physical plant to reduce impact on adjacent residences.
- Alternative landscape treatments for proposed landscape buffer
INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESSES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS
Proposed Pedestrian & Bicycle Access

University of Washington-Bothell & Cascadia Community College EIS
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

78 The noise study looked at the time period when noise from the project would be greatest and calculated potential noise impacts from the project during that time, which in the case of the UWB/CCC Campus would be the evening commute period (PM peak period). In addition to substantial non-project traffic, this is the time when students and vehicles are leaving from daily campus classes while others are arriving for evening classes. Although this is the time when the highest project-generated noise levels would occur, the noise specifically emanating from the campus will be submerged to a great extent in the high levels of background noise from the adjacent freeways.

The residents of adjacent neighborhoods may be more aware of noises from the campus during the later evening hours (7:00 pm to 10:00 pm) as the significant background noise from I-405 and SR-522 subsides. In this sense, surrounding neighborhoods would likely be more susceptible to the project’s noise impacts, even though the level of campus activity and vehicle traffic is less than in the afternoon and campus generated noise levels will be relatively low. This time period is also one in which more residents are home and have the potential of hearing sounds from the project. By 10:00 pm, the campus would be essentially empty and producing very little noise.

79 Traffic forecasts were prepared for the entire Bothell/South Snohomish County/Northshore freeway/arterial system. The traffic analysis focused on the intersections and road segments experiencing traffic increases of 10% or greater with the campus alternatives.

Comments regarding inadequacy of the DEIS traffic analysis for use in determining fair share contribution to City of Bothell arterial system capital improvements are noted.

Comment noted.

The second eastbound through lane on the 195th Street bridge over I-405 – identified as a mitigation measure – would not fit onto the new bridge planned for construction in 1996. This additional lane would require additional widening or reconstruction of the bridge.

At the Ross Road /Beardslee Boulevard intersection, future level of service will be adequate (LOS D or better) for turns off of Beardslee onto Ross and for right turns from Ross onto westbound Beardslee. Peak period left turns from Ross onto eastbound 195th Street, however, will be greatly constrained not only by traffic volumes on Beardslee, but also by queues on eastbound 195th Street at the nearby intersection of 195th Street with the southbound I-405 ramps. Campus traffic will exacerbate this problem. The difficulty of making the left turn onto 195th may induce some Ross Road residents to travel west to 185th Street instead, but it will also discourage through traffic (from the adjacent neighborhood north and west of Ross Road) from using Ross as a shortcut to 195th Street and I-405. This may reduce volumes at the Ross Road /108th Avenue intersection somewhat. However, because the actual use of Ross Road will determined by the personal preferences, perceptions, and decisions of individual motorists in the immediate vicinity, it is impossible to predict Ross Road or 108th Avenue volumes with any precision. The identified Ross Road improvements appear to be adequate and appropriate.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

69 Comment noted. Emergency access to the campus from 185th Street would be available and open at all times. Emergency vehicle access would also be available via the north campus entrance point from Beardslee Boulevard and the south campus entrance point from SR-522 when developed in the future. A secondary access point would also be available via 180th Street, which would be closed to private vehicles but open to emergency vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. Private vehicle access to the campus from 185th would be prohibited through the use of signage and law enforcement. Private vehicle access to the campus from 180th would be physically prohibited with special design treatments to allow for emergency vehicle access when necessary, as coordinated with and approved by the Bothell Fire Department.

70 It is anticipated that this level of information would be provided to the Bothell Fire Department as part of the Building Permit Application process for each phase of campus development. The information provided in the DEIS represents a preliminary design level of information suitable for the master plan phase of the project.

71 The plan notation is correct. Ten inch lines are proposed to loop through the interior of the site. The outer loop is an eight-inch diameter line.

72 Support calculations for the estimated peak sanitary sewer flow of 0.93 cfs (based on a peaking factor of 3.0) will be provided to the City for review as part of the Preliminary PUD Application submittal. The City will have an opportunity to review these calculations and coordinate with the master plan design team during the PUD process.

73 As stated on page IV-14 of the DEIS, site specific subsurface investigations, including soil and ground water explorations would be necessary for each campus building, road, trail, and utility corridor, and would be performed during the design phase. Although not specifically stated in the DEIS, further soil and ground water exploration would be required for all parking areas as well. These special geotechnical studies and the related design applications developed during final site design and prior to construction would be available for City review as part of the building permit application process for each phase of campus development. At this time, it would be premature to denote specific locations for future testing sites on the DEIS figure referenced since there may be minor adjustments to buildings, roads, parking areas, etc. as part of the final design process. If the City is concerned about potential follow-through of more detailed geotechnical analysis, PUD approval for the project could include a condition requiring this more detailed analysis prior to each future phase of campus development.

74 Comment noted. See Section III of this FEIS.
Response to Comments from City of Bothell
(Gordon Erickson, Community Development Director)

75  Figure II-1 of Appendix E.9 illustrates the general geographical distribution of campus traffic; it does not show the specific streets used by campus traffic. Specific campus-related traffic volumes for the various alternatives are compiled in DEIS Figures IV-41, IV-43, and IV-45 (and Figures III-2, III-4, and III-5 of Appendix E.9). Person-trip and traffic generation information is compiled in Tables II-1, II-2, II-3, and II-4 and Attachment B of Appendix E.9.

Comments regarding inadequacy of the DEIS traffic analysis for use in determining City of Bothell Resolution No. 774 mitigation requirements are noted. See additional traffic analysis in Section III.B. New Information. Further traffic analysis deemed necessary will be accomplished during the PUD permit negotiations with the City of Bothell.

76  Comment noted. In previous discussions with the Bothell Fire Department during preparation of the DEIS, potential impacts to Fire Department services were discussed at a general level but were not specifically identified or quantified by Department representatives. It is anticipated that campus development would occur incrementally, in phases, over a period of ten to fifteen years. With each phase of development, college planning representatives would coordinate with the Bothell Fire Department to identify specific needs and determine required improvements. Prior to final design and construction of campus facilities, the new institution(s) would negotiate in good faith with the City for the payment of monies to the City of the actual cost of provision of fire and emergency medical services provided by the City and for the co-located campus. It is anticipated that this negotiation should take place as part of the building permit review and approval for each phase of campus development.

77  Coordination of the agencies with jurisdiction over waters of the U.S., including wetlands has been orchestrated by L.C. Lee & Associates Inc. (LCLA). As the primary subcontractor to NBBJ for issues relating to waters and wetlands on the site, LCLA acts as the liaison between the various agencies with jurisdiction. An interagency pre-application meeting was held on April 19, 1995 to seek and incorporate guidance from the respective agencies and to coordinate efforts in order to facilitate the permit application processes. LCLA is in continual contact with the respective agencies to coordinate efforts during the application process.

The 1989 delineation data appears in the DEIS because the delineation of the proposed campus site was performed prior to Washington State's decision to utilize the 1987 delineation protocol. Since Washington state taxpayer money was used for the delineation of the site, the data is technically public information and the Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE) expressed a wish to have the data made available to the public through the DEIS.

Comments noted regarding flooding pattern on North Creek Trail and Sammamish River Trail system. As shown in Figure IV-15 of the DEIS, off-site portions of both trails will be impacted by 100-year floods. On the campus site, approximately 1,500 feet of the proposed regional trail will be impacted by 100-year floods. Portions of the regional trail on site not impacted include fire lane access and turn-around areas for the lower campus buildings.
Response to Comments from Janis and Chris Newman

1  Comment noted. See Response #1 to Loewen comment above.

2  Comment noted. Full campus development is not possible without SR-522 access.

3  Comment noted. See Response #8, City of Bothell letter.

4  Mechanical systems noise can be reduced by buffering compressors and fans within concrete structures, as is contemplated for the project. Equipment selection can also play a part in ensuring quieter operations.
Testimony by Ted Pankowski before the Higher Education Coordinating Board on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Development of the Collocated Campus of Cascadia Community College and the University of Washington at the Truly Site in Bothell, July 10, 1995

Members of the Higher Education Coordinating Board:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. My name is Ted Pankowski. I live at 7728 238th Street SE, Woodinville and have had the pleasure of serving on the Site Development Advisory Group for campus collocation at the Truly site in Bothell.

I would like to offer my wholehearted support for Alternative 1, the preferred alternative, for the reasons stated in the DEIS.

In summary and among other considerations, the preferred alternative provides for extensive restoration and functional enhancement of wetlands and would return the degraded North Creek floodplain to its original condition; it limits parking to 4200 spaces initially and establishes a commute trip reduction goal of 60%; and it provides for a phased, economically practicable yet far-sighted approach toward meeting the region’s higher education needs by the year 2010.

Taken together, all of the alternatives, except “no action”, represent a breakthrough in the siting of such a major regional facility.

When we first met at the HEC Board hearing in Kirkland in October, 1993 a large gathering of interested and involved members of the public supported a new look at collocation and at alternative sites for the regional campus. In terms of its operational success, the factors that seemed to emerge most prominently were cost effectiveness, institutional and inter-governmental cooperation, and access to adequate transportation. As one witness summarized, it was a question of “location, location, location.”

In selecting Bothell, however, the HEC Board also established a co-equal goal of community acceptance and environmental enhancement. And it has been the Board’s continuing commitment to these goals, in particular, that have made it possible to consider the Truly-Stringtown site as a means for squaring the public’s educational, community and environmental needs at a single, well-situated, and cost effective site.

Until recently, the Truly Farm site had been the subject of intense litigation between the City of Bothell, Department of Ecology, Washington Environmental Council, and the owner over shoreline management issues, specifically possible encroachments on North Creek, a salmon-bearing stream, and its associated floodplain and wetlands system. The trigger was a Shoreline Master Plan provision that would have allowed conversion of the site for a regional shopping center. Because of the nature of the proposed development, the repercussions on traffic, adjacent land uses, and on shorelines and wetlands would have been enormous.

As the DEIS has demonstrated, however, campus collocation do not engender these effects to the same degree. In fact, protection of the floodplain under all of the alternatives demonstrates how, “with innovative siting, mitigation, and appropriate restraint, a major public facility can co-exist and enhance a challenging urban environment.” The difference between the past and present, of course, is that a shopping center needs to maximize the number of people visiting the site irrespective of external restraints. Campus collocation needs only to ensure capacity for its 10,000 student enrollment at full build-out by the year 2010 so that decision makers can site, design, and plan the entire facility accordingly. I believe the DEIS provides an adequate basis for doing that.

In addition, I would like to commend the HEC Board and members of the legislature who insisted that collocation should occur within an established urban growth boundary consistent with local comprehensive planning under the Growth Management Act. This action alone sets an exemplary standard for all major state sponsored facilities, especially in the light of this project’s pre-HEC Board history. Your courage and commitment to the public interest has not gone unnoticed.

This brings me to the two remaining environmental issues that are the subject of your questions: (1) the relocation of North Creek and (2) transportation demand management.

The Relocation of North Creek

In my opinion, the marginal monetary costs of relocating North Creek and re-establishing its meander to an original condition are more than justified by three measurable benefits.

First, there is an abatement of future costs for maintenance. Over the decades, North Creek has been a highly manipulated environment where each dike, levee, and pump has created a need for maintenance or for additional dikes, levees and pumps. Without a cash crop to support such continuing management into the indefinite future, it seems that the prudent and conservative course would be to restore the stream's meander so that nature can once again do the work for us. To the extent possible, these economic tradeoffs might be documented in the final EIS.
Secondly, stream restoration more than doubles the existing fish and wildlife habitat and actually increases that environment's species diversity, biological productivity, resiliency to change, and uniqueness in an urban setting. While these latter values may not be easily measured, certainly the monetary value of additional fish and wildlife habitat can be quantified by the Department of Wildlife if necessary. I believe their initial cost would prove to be a sound public investment over the long term.

In terms of non-monetary costs, I believe the loss of six to seven acres of degraded wetlands is more than justified by the gain of 88-61 acres of restored waters and wetlands. In fact, the DEIS is difficult to read in this respect because of its mandated format. It is not clear where the 8-7 of filled wetlands would be physically located, whether the "loss" is a "net loss" because it occurs within the floodplain and would be used as buildable land, or whether the fill is part and parcel of the restoration itself.

The suggestion has been made that a brief, supplementary planning document be prepared for public scrutiny on stream restoration. I heartily endorse this idea since it appears that some of the more interesting and easily understandable material on this point is found in the Draft's Appendices. This would give the public and the casual observer more insight into some of the exciting restoration possibilities that had been orally presented to the Site Development Advisory Committee by NBBJ's subconsultants.

And finally, there is the value of additional educational and recreational value that a restored North Creek would create. The proposed trail linkage to the Sammamish Slough, in particular, would place this community in a unique and indispensable position for the thousands of people who use the Burke-Gilman trail on an annual basis. Again, the state Outdoor Recreation Coordinating Committee may be able to quantify these values if necessary.

Transportation

I wholeheartedly support the DEIS' stated goal of a 60% commute trip reduction and the initial 4,200 parking spaces in the preferred alternative. The DEIS lists those specific measures that may be taken in order to achieve this goal and I read this as a commitment by Cascadia/UN management, by METRO and by Community Transit to do all that they can to reduce reliance on the single occupancy vehicle.

We need to recognize, however, that transit planning in the region is now in a state of flux. As an original contributor to the Regional Transit Authority's initial, ill-fated transit plan...
The design of Cascadia/UW, especially, ought to be a celebration of who we are and a symbol of our educational and environmental aspirations. Those of us who were able to work a little more closely on this project are not the only members of the public. I would like to see all of our friends and neighbors and generations yet to come able to say with us “one heck of a good project.”

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this exciting venture.

TED PANKOWSKI
7728 23RD SE
WOODINVILLE WA 98072
(206) 489-4272
FAX (206) 437-3593
I, Assistant Regional Administrator for the
Avonite Area, recently switched
Site Director's Department. Thank you, Jim.
Mr. Reed: Bill Reed.

Thank you very much.

The board community to serve as their chair.

I am very humbled and very proud to be a member
of the Woodville community. I am honored to be a member
of the Board of Education.

The Board of Education, the Board of Education,
which is where I do that, and I have been
active in the community, and now I am the
person responsible for the

I'd like to introduce Roger Tocci from the
Woodville community, a board member of the Board of
Education.

and for the benefit of the members of the
board with excellent accessibility.

area and all of the district that it encompasses at a
For a campus to serve the educational needs of this
district, they represent the vision that we all had
plans and they have been pressed in the EIS. I
see the campus and the environmental impact
but it's been a long time, and I am so delighted

Yesterday.

Beginning in 1965, but it doesn't seem like that
and we began in 1990, some years after Dr. Bell's
member of the architect's committee and the architect's committee --
people of this area well, and I have to say... as a

The people and the master plan will become the

overseas and our children.

access to community college education in the area for

this area. Without this campus there will not be
access to post-secondary education for the

We have all been so excited about the

specialty commission on all phases of this project.

processes through the availability of criteria

publicly to constructive lenses about having the

committee and very good suggestions about having the

of trustees in this commission in seeking for the

and I can only speak on behalf of all the board

"
This process to date.

members of the community who have been interested in
you, thank you, and most importantly thank the
one or the other things we want to do in thank the
community college, we would like to make a few
on behalf of the Board of Trustees of College.
K.C. Campbell: Thank you, Jim.

Dianne Campbell:
Mr. Need: Okay. Thank you.

Chair.
Mr. Campbell: Yeah, I'm still kind of
which I would assume you want you were interjecting
Alex Campbell, you interjected a question mark.
Mr. Need: Okay.

Mr. Lorenz: Not at this time.

James -- oh, excuse me. Gordon and Jan
Mr. Need: Thank you, John.

Mr. Campbell: Thank you. Well, I support in as well.
So I would recommend we support in as well.
make sure that you'll get there by 10:00 to start.

a lot of work cooperatively across the system to
I'm not sure to go for it because it's something to take
being expressway down parking. I think it we can get
and I think that the best gentlemen who -- was

Community.

give use the campus as a park and a recreation area
protection by program is involved in restoration
such that the campus looks like a park and the

4.5
Diane: My name is Diane Bell, B-6-T-1.
Mr. Need: Ron Bell.

parking.
In order, I support Alternative 1 with more enforcement and parking.

Parking, and don't want local tax dollars spent
directly to meet the university with the demand
don't really want to become like the Monteagle
parking in my neighborhood to become unmanageable. I
and I don't want to be a caution play waiting for the

Regarding Alternative 2, I think the goal of 60
1980 Honolulu 183rd Court.

MARK: I'm Scott Wunder. W-u-d-e.
MR. WUNDER: Thank you.
regarding the

environmentality? I think in the community organizations
and the leadership of the state, the city or county, and the
the education of the next generation. I think this

Regarding Alternative 2, I think the goal of 60
1980 Honolulu 183rd Court.

MARK: I'm Scott Wunder. W-u-d-e.
MR. WUNDER: Thank you.
the development stage up to full operation of the
treatment system and its impact on the
ecology. This is the next stage of development, and the project is already well underway.

-- The main point is that when the water is released into the river, it will hit the river, which
will cause a severe drop in the flow of water, and the river will dry up. This will have a negative impact on
the surrounding area, as well as the wildlife, and will affect the environment. It is important to address
this issue now to prevent further negative impacts.

In conclusion, the proposed development is moving forward, and the negative impacts are
already evident. It is imperative that we take action to mitigate these impacts and protect
the environment. Further discussion and detailed planning are needed to ensure that the
development proceeds in a sustainable manner.
MR. HUTTNER: My name is Jim Hutter.

Jim Hutter: Thank you very much.

Thank you.

These can forget and what will you do to protect wet areas -- what will the parking structure look beyond where -- what will the property line. Will it go to the rear from the property line.

And I don't know you. I've seen such different and which will destroy our trees.

Exposure to noise, pollution, climate, can promote, can promote, obstruct from this parking structure which will obstruct from the rear, whereas it does rezone to the right. I have one question. Will you rescind rezone?

Coast.

The proposed parking structure on the southwest -- proposed by the developer, advantageable by the park, one of the homeowners that will be more negatively I live on 1100 Avenue in the 9-1-1, I have.

Gavel-admonish: I have no objection.

Mr. Reed: No objection.

Ms. Lancaster: Revocant Lancaster.

Ms. Lancaster: Thank you.

Be following up with a letter. May think you've done a wonderful job, and I will.

I'm not going to say very much. I just want to.

Revocant Lancaster.

Mr. Reed: Thank you very much.

And it's very much in favor of this project.

North Creek, receding it to the tidepool.

It to the road to the road, whatever it to the land in front of the beach, whereas it does rezone to the right. I'm very excited to see what you're doing.

Also, I am just here as a neighbor who has been

North Creek, receding it to the tidepool.

Barrett: G-A-V-E-0.6-E.-T.-E.-E.-T.

Ms. Lancaster: So I need to say pretty

Mr. Reed: Okay.

Ms. Lancaster: How about Barrett?

Barrett: Barrett.

Nearly -- excuse my pronunciation. It is.

This very exciting venture.

Mr. Reed: Thank you.
I want to thank you for letting me participate in all of us in the outreach campaign. I'm very pleased that the tenants, the local community, the恐怕 and the state department of transportation in this respect. I'm very pleased at the tenants
and around the proposed south entrance to the new area, the proposed south entrance to the new
of the I-495 interchange and the need to improve on the I-495 intersection and the I-270 interchange as well as to improve on the I-495 interchange and the I-270 interchange need to be made next to the hotel
planning, careful design and the electricity should be in a placement, consistent with regional transportation needs and quality of life.
advantages and the state department of transportation

agreement, however, that the tenants

and quality of life.

education in particular the region's economic growth

proposed consideration of the importance of higher

of the system. This system, I believe, can add

the interaction of higher education and the economy

thing with the new transit plan, he would think all of

departure who once made it to could only do one

of the works of the member of our congressional

then sent down on the button last year, I am reminded

an accident is not a fatal event. The fatal event would be the

enough the right to continue to the regional transit

we need to recognize, however, that transit

enforcement on the flag-occupy vehicle.

Community and development.

involvement with positive results for both the local
group. I think this should ensure greater continuing
were represented on the state development advisory

while keeping a good neighbor but a source of pride for
requirements and that the camp will try to keep
in the direct impact statement will essentially be
that -- the local community that the commitment made
more direct relief here in soccer and the

witness process and a mechanism be established at a

well done, the suggestion has been made that a

on the advisory board. The idea of the

Board, NRB and the subcommittees, and my colleagues
in conclusion, I would like to commend the

for each year.

warrant that in the stroll plan that be an early
departmental cooperation has been that we called
in the part of the major interest of the
betray these interests could be strengthened since
I should think that would be a mistake in this instance. I
the stroll plan will be to influence for this parking
know there are sectors of interests to that fact that I
and with respect to the direct impact statement, I

Community and development.
supplementary planning document may be prepared for

the suggestion that has been made that a bridge

perched on the escarpment ledge.

buildings lands on whether the field to part and

it occurs within the landscape and would be seen as

located, whether the loss is a known net loss because

several acres of staffed wetlands would be physically

reduced, if not more than the gain of 60 acres to 72

eastward of the staffed wetlands. In fact, the DNR is

involved in the non-conformance case. I believe the

investment over the long term.

interest costs would drop to be a non-public

Department of Wildlife has been necessary. I believe their

measured, certainly the monetary value of additional

while these projects result may not easily be

uninformed in an urban setting.

photometric production measure to change, and

increase that environmental aspect directly.

the existing list will likely multiply and accentually

Secondary, stream restoration more than double.

suggest that those could be quantified.
I would like to commend the NC Board for the excellent work on the Strategic Plan and the Board's commitment to the goal of improving the Board's effectiveness in the areas of:

1. Education community and environmental education
2. Strategy document as a means of guiding the particular areas that have made it possible to consider the

In the interest of time, I'd like to focus on:

- Board's continuing commitment to these goals.
- Board's commitment to the Strategic Plan and the Board's effectiveness in the areas of:
  1. Education community and environmental education
  2. Strategy document as a means of guiding the particular areas that have made it possible to consider the.
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I would like to commend the Board for their commitment and their effectiveness in the areas of:

1. Education community and environmental education
2. Strategy document as a means of guiding the particular areas that have made it possible to consider the.

In the interest of time, I'd like to focus on:

- Board's commitment to understanding and communicating the Board's effectiveness in the areas of:
  1. Education community and environmental education
  2. Strategy document as a means of guiding the particular areas that have made it possible to consider the.
which is wellington hutches, and they sounded like
had a 10.4 house, and acre 96 and 7.
and also, we're reading in your book here -- you
have some kind of high fightning for 4 x 3.
the neighbors, but wherever there's coedence, to
around the borders, not just where our home is and
the way to keep the people out of the
corner, to keep the people out of the a.
It's going to be some 4 x 3. The
that would stay year-round in heavy clothes and also
the same brand of clothing for some time.
go in, there would be a greater concern that some
something
that was mentioned in the, and so any further that do
be seen like that because more of the
in the wilderness. And, you know, you would see that
that was mentioned to us, and we went over these
and also, we did go over to children's hospital.
butter do you plan on planting
parking garage and that whole perimeter, what kind of
from that, preferably plant, and also, going around the
butter in there to kind of amid that in a little bit
what kind of -- would you be planning on planting a
anything because it is an octagon. So I don't know
being there, and there's no tall, cooks of
old oceans and a garden, made from our own health,
and in that part of our property we have a very
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of the room. If you need them.

of the EIS on the rear table, the table on that side.

MR. SANDRO: We have additional copies
would be very helpful.

name -- write your name on the outside of it. It

your written testimony in an envelope and put your
meeting will provide those to you. If you could put
there, some envelopes over there, and other than on
if you have written testimony, we'd ask you to --

they can continue to speak.

after everyone else has had an opportunity to speak,

does not reword comments to the very end, and

people who want to take much longer than that to
give people who do not testify? We might need to ask
than that, time, depending on the total number of

comments to about five minutes, if you need more

In case of those who have testified, they'd like

ground rules we need to go over.

interested in coming on the evening. There are some

comments are coming on the evening. We want to thank you for your

Mr. Reader: Thank you very much.

and for this project.

Mr. Reader: Thank you very much.

have the overall responsibility for the SEPA process.

of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and he

with me is Jim Reed, he's an Associate Director

conference. We were here to talk to you about

the team that has completed the master plan and the EIS

consultant team, and I am personally the leader of

I'm Bill Sandro, I'm with USD and we're the

State.

conducted pursuant to the SEPA Laws of Washington

meeting that's being

Community Colleges and Internality of Washington in

development of the coordinated campus of the Cascadia

to the public meeting on the draft EIS for the

MR. SANDRO: Good evening and welcome

...
Dear Mr. Read,

9/17/74

2386 NE 183RD CT. BENDLE. Wash.
Jane and Chris Newman

environment.

Dear Mr. Read:

Thank you for your efforts. Most people seem to like the

There is a large concern over the mechanical noise pollution.

of the property be

possible. It is, and if not, can such a huge development be

proposed. If so, we feel the proposed access procedures would be

other access points. Because rezoning could just as easily enter from

those sides. Because rezoning could just as easily enter from

I. No access (at any kind) to the campus should be allowed during

areas we probably feel most strongly about.

since you said everything had to be addressed. The following are

however, where our concerns on a few things. Some issues

have talked to some of our neighbors and am sorry to say they

sincerely,
Parking expansion areas are located as to minimize impact existing tree canopy on the campus. 

Parking expansion is shown in Figures III-2 (Alternative 1a) and Figure III-5 (Alternative 2a). 

Alternatively, I and Z have the ability to expand on-street parking in future phases if needed. 

The transportation demand management goal of 60% transit/HOV is not being met; both alternatives show the need for additional transit facilities. 

Common needs regarding tree retention. The DES states on p. 1-13 II monitoring shows that 16% will be removed. 

Response to Comments from Gordon J. Towe and Janelle W. Towe
 Allegiance landscapes’ recommendations for proposed landscapes buffer
  •
Adjust Elevation of the parking structure and/or physical plant to reduce impact on
  •
for adjacent residences.
  •
Adjust placement of the parking garage and/or physical plant to provide adequate buffer
  •

but not be limited to, an analysis of the following alternatives:

The design phase of the project will therefore examine these issues in detail and will include:

These residents

is insufficient to describe a mitigation plan at the level of detail desired. Appropriately, by
that in this particular instance, the level of specificity necessary contained in the master plan
additional and complex analyses during the design phase of the project. It is acknowledged

Determining the effective mitigation of visual light and emission impacts will require
location of the parking structure and physical plant. Based on these observations, it was
physical/spatial orientation of the Wharton and Adams residences to the proposed planned

This issue included a property line “walk” and interview/observation of the

Beatty and Dennis Delahaye

review included: James and Karen Wharton, Beatty and Ann-Catherine Cavell Adams, and
planned location of the parking structure and physical plant facilities. Residents attending this
required to further review the likely impacts and proposed mitigation measures with the
residences to the others review the likely impacts and proposed mitigation measures with the

On August 30, 1995, HECB staff and the project consultant met at the Adams and Wharton

Comments noted.

Comments noted regarding property values;

ways as discussed in detail in the DEIS (Page 1A-27).

Potential air quality impacts resulting from construction can be minimized in a number of

noise issues and can respond to complaints.

occur on the weekends. The King County Department of Health is the agency responsible for
1:00 pm as per King County Regulations. At this time, it is unknown if construction would

At the DEIS stages (Page 1A-80), construction work will be limited to the hours of 7:00 am to

Response to Comments from James and Karen Wharton
street because your location is significantly elevated above those nearby.

The noise levels at Recorder Number 4 are lower than Knight Company’s maximum permissible levels (50 DBA). The predominant source of noise from this project will be the parking lot. Noise levels at Recorder Number 4 are lower than Knight Company’s maximum permissible levels (50 DBA).

Exhibit B, which is calculated to increase 15 DBA (over the proposed background levels) at the site at any time, and some of these will arrive and depart by public transit, resulting in little effect.

The noise levels caused by motor vehicles at your address are best indicated by the parking garage.

Vibration is expected to be minimal outside such a plant.

The noise from the controlled-cooling plant would be created by fans, compressors, and auxiliary equipment. Based on experience, fans and compressors of this type would be expected to be quiet. Very little noise is expected to be generated by the buildings.

The noise from the controlled-cooling plant would be created by fans, compressors, and auxiliary equipment. Based on experience, fans and compressors of this type would be expected to be quiet. Very little noise is expected to be generated by the buildings.

No other equipment or activities are expected to be affected.

The parking garage.

Vehicle noise.

Exhibit B, which is calculated to increase 15 DBA (over the proposed background levels) at the site at any time, and some of these will arrive and depart by public transit, resulting in little effect.

Transportation to and from the campus site.

Parking garage.

Representatives of the Contractor, Knight Company's, and the City of Los Angeles will be available during peak travel periods. These are also the times when the Contractor's noise is expected to be at its highest levels.

The parking lot. Noise levels at Recorder Number 4 are lower than Knight Company’s maximum permissible levels (50 DBA). The predominant source of noise from this project will be the parking lot. Noise levels at Recorder Number 4 are lower than Knight Company’s maximum permissible levels (50 DBA).
Il is desirable to preserve the ability to route transit through the site by using access along the boulevard bus service to be routed through the campus via 18th St. and the main campus.
Dear Mr. Reed:

Olympia WA 98504

Po Box 4430

Higher Education Coordinating Board

July 17, 1995

Booth WA 98011

10806 NE 183rd Cir.

Attached #1:

Agnes Whyte is very much in favor of this campus. I must encourage you to use

the Travis Ringberg, as he is involved in the construction of the new library on NE 183rd

and has been a strong advocate for the campus. Mr. Ringberg is a member of the board - a man

who understands the importance of the campus and its potential.

Also, there is a need to continue to fund the campus. What will happen if there

is no more funding? The college needs to be recognized for its dedication and success.

Providing students with a campus environment is crucial. The purpose of higher

education is to provide students with opportunities to develop their skills.

Communities benefit greatly from the presence of a college. It enhances the local economy

and provides a source of pride for the residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns about the proposed University of

Scan Wands

Sherry

Response to Comments from Richard H. Truly

1. Comments noted.
2. Comments noted. Acquisition of the Truly Farms Stringtown property will occur upon completion of regulatory reviews and receipt of necessary approvals.
Dear Dr. Fink:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DES.

The DES is a critical component of the WSUDD's mission. As you may know, the current design is above the floodplain and is not adequately protected against floodwaters. The current design does not meet current seismic standards and is vulnerable to catastrophic failure. The DES is a key part of the University's emergency management strategy and is critical for the safety and security of the community.

Sincerely,

James A. Reed
Associate Dean, Career and Technical Education
HCC

July 20, 1996

Richard H. Tracy
Prepared for the DES

The University of Washington-Boothill
Boothill, WA 98801

Richard H. Tracy

July 20, 1996
Commends noted. The expressed cooperation and support by Quadrant is appreciated.

Response to Comments from George F. Shevlin, Jr. (Quadrant)
Proposed
Commercial Development

Vice President
George E. Sowers

THE QUADRANT CORPORATION

Campus and Community colleges at this site are

share in this proposed project and remain supportive of the establishment of a combined branch

school: the campus will be located in the existing business park setting. We will continue to work with the
department of the proposed campus use of our property, so long as our property is required by the
design and construction of the project. We have no objection to any of the development

The proposed project is consistent with the development alternatives approved to be developed in

Dear Board Members,

The Board of Washington Island Community College and

RE: Plan Environmental Impact Statement for Campus Community College and

Olympus WA 98542-8430

P.O. Box 4134

97th Street West

City of Tacoma

Washington Higher Education

July 13, 1995

Category: (C)
Response to Comments from Jahnke, S. J., Joseph Medical Center.
Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mr. James Reed

July 17, 1995

St. Joseph Medical Center
Everett, Washington 98204-3430

Olympia, WA 98504-3430

P.O. Box 47340

917 Exchange Way

Health Education Coordinating Review Board

cc: Ken Thompson

Associate Director, Risk Management

Assistant Counsel, Counsel

[Signature]
Forecasts indicate that about 100 vehicles will be traveling between the campuses and SR 527.

For discussion of Ross Road issues, see response to City of Poulsbo Comment #79, Part 4.

While a minimal increase in the delay time for left turns from 185th onto Southbound SR 527 will
all of this traffic will pass through the 185th Street/SR 527 intersection, but the only impact
vehicles will be traveling between the campuses and SR 527 during the p.m. peak hour. Some of
for the most part, impacts will not be noticeable. In addition, forecasts indicate that about 100
street by 15%. This will make left turns from 185th onto Beach Drive a little more difficult, but
At build-out in 2010, campus traffic will increase peak-hour volumes on Beach Drive at 185th
Valley View more difficult during peak periods.

Due to the close proximity of the Valley View/Fernwood and 180th contact to be exclusively local
the campuses will be permitted. As a result, the campuses will have no impact on 180th Street
Campus access via 180th Street will be for pedesitrians and bicycles only; no auto access to
1. Response to Comment from Partner A, Pierre
Sincerely,

[Signature]

1. The expressed concern for not improving the existing neighbor-
   10th NE and NE 18th (on Bexartrim (Maywood) Hill) will
   concerning the through traffic on the collector arterials (10th and
   concerning the through traffic. Nor is there much infor-
   can only find any discussion of how to buffer the neighborhood
   the concern of the residents on Ross Road are noted, but I
   been considered.

2. What will be the impact be on NE 18th at the intersection with 52
   and also at the Bexartrim intersection, the future home
   not continuing NE 10th to the campus rendezvous?

3. Could the campus rendezvous be the intersection where<br>
   the campus rendezvous at the corner of NE 10th and NE 18th
   the campus's rendezvous at the corner of NE 10th and NE 18th?
   This is to look the document over.

Dear Board Members,

Olympia, Washington 98504
Po Box 43490
917 Larkspur Way

Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board

July 20, 1999
(206) 438-6586
B701 NE 10th
1001 NE 10th
Puyallup, WA

[Signature]
Comment noted. Development. Funding of future phases is dependent upon the legislation.

Comment noted. The south access is scheduled for installation in Phase 2 of campus.

DEIS

Comment noted. Conceptual plans for a campus south access on SR-222 are defined in the DEIS.

Comment noted. Construction changes are defined in the DEIS.

5

Comment noted. Planned improvements and necessary mitigation measures at the 195th Street/I-45 intersection are described in the DEIS.

Comment noted. Plans for the proposed hoodiehmem complex from the campus facility falls into the proposed hoodiehmem complex from the hoodiehmem facility.

Comment noted. The campus design incorporates boardwalks and interpretive/educational.

Comment noted.

4

See Snohomish County Public Works comments, Paragraphs 10 & 11 above.

Comment noted. Monetary damages, they are separate and distinct, ecosystem as a whole. Values are what society perceives these functions to be worth in monetary terms. They are separate and distinct functions. Functions are self-sustaining processes. Processes are necessary to the maintenance of the ecosystem. Functions are functions that support the ecosystem. If not capable of sustaining economic value to these functions, the National Estuarine Resources. The NEM approach can only assess the functions. This approach can only assess the self-sustaining functions. The self-sustaining functions within the reach of national resources, economic and beyond the scope of the hydrogeomorphic. Calculation of economic costs and benefits associated with the North Creek Restoration is.

Comment noted. On-going economic costs for levee maintenance have not been quantified.

Comment noted. The watershed condition is presently degraded conditions and that is sustainable under present day conditions within the watershed. Degraded conditions are present within the Puget Sound Lowlands. This data is used as a design level of levee and hoodiehmemcoastal ecosystems functioning given the current status. The mitigation/restoration plan seeks to achieve the conditions that can sustain the highest.

1

Response to Comments from Ted Fakhoury
I think the goal of having 60 percent of the
people come to campus in something other than a
single-occupant vehicle is certainly going to be
challenging. It is certainly a very worthy goal and
very ambitious, but I think we all can easily
recognize in our region that the days of building new
freeways are gone. And as transportation demand
continues to grow, we've got to do a better job of
getting people where they want to go in carpooling or
transit or maybe someday a train, if that ever -- if
that ever passes.

So it's -- as I say, it's an ambitious goal, but
we need to set some challenges like this, and not
only at the college but maybe some other future
projects in the region to try to start working toward
this.

But recognizing that it is a very ambitious goal,
I can easily understand concerns of neighbors about,
"Gee, what if it's not enough parking space and then
there's going to be spillover?"

So I do think that there has to be right up front
a very strong backup plan that if we're not achieving
this kind of goal, having so many people ride the bus
or being in a carpool, that there is a plan where
additional parking will be built on campus and not in
the floodplain.

Page 4-142 in the draft EIS lists a number of future freeway or arterial projects. And before the final comes out, we need to update that. There's a number of just outdated information and a number of just small errors in that.

For one, the construction work at 195th Street, it shows in there that it's going to be done in 1995. That's now scheduled for 1996.

There's information about the future HOV lane project on 405, but it also indicates that beyond that there's a Stage 2 that would widen 405 and add general-purpose lanes. And there is no plan to add general-purpose lanes there.

But anyway, a number of things in there that I think we need to just update and correct before the final.

And third, I want to compliment the designers and the committee on the way they developed the future access off of 522. You know, in the beginning we had some real concerns about if we have an access point there and a traffic signal, it's going to make a stop-and-go condition right as people maybe come off of a high-speed freeway, that we would be creating an accident potential. But the final design, this eliminates that stop condition for the high-speed traffic coming off of 405 and, I think, looks, you know, a very good compromise and easily achievable.

So we'll be following up with more comments in writing. Thank you.

MR. REED: Thank you, Bill.

Any individual who has come in after we began who hasn't signed up but would like to testify, would you please do so? Or if you'd just like to approach the podium if you care to testify and state your name and spell your last name.

MS. KIENAST: Okay. My name is Sue Kienast. It's spelled K-i-e-n-a-s-t.

And I live in Bothell and am also president of the Historical Society and the Bothell Landmarks Board. I've been a supporter of the campus on the Truly site, and I've been following it closely and meeting -- coming to some of your meetings just to observe.

I have asked the question from day one about the historic sites that are not only on the site but adjacent to or nearby that may be impacted by this project.

I was slightly disappointed with the draft EIS.

There is one page, Chapter 4, 124, that's titled...
"Historic and Cultural Resources," and it states some things that aren't there. And the last line says, "The condition integrity of these structures," which they vaguely mentioned, "for register eligibility has not been determined."

I've been involved in other EIS's, and the draft EIS should certainly have addressed every site on the property. You can't wait for the final EIS. You need to do it before the final EIS, because you not only need to identify what the historic buildings and sites are; you need to address the mitigating measures that will be taken if they have to be torn down or moved or -- and so I was very disappointed in that.

And I -- the question I'm asking is: When is that study going to be done? And if it is when the final EIS comes out, what sort of recourse or what sort of comments can the public, and especially the historic community, make on it?

It addresses one site in Stringtown and a couple of homes on the Truly property and adjacent to it, but I understand there are quite a few other buildings that should at least be identified and talked about as the mitigating measures.

The cemetery, the Bothell Pioneer Cemetery, is of great concern to me. It's adjacent to the piece of property due west.

It shows an access through the cemetery, strictly a pedestrian and I guess bicycle access, not a roadway, or cars. I'm concerned about that because I think if there's a road there, there will be cars there and they will park there. And you can go up and give them tickets till the day is long, but they'll still try to park there because it's a very convenient place to park to get to the campus and sort of the back -- the back way.

So I thought maybe that that would be addressed in the draft EIS, but it wasn't. So I have several recommendations: That if there is a foot and bicycle access to the campus through the cemetery that a gate be erected at the entrance to the cemetery so that cars can't go there. It doesn't have to be a large gate, just something so a car can't get through there.

It would be convenient for the citizens of Bothell to get there through there, and that's no objection on my part. But I just see if there is a road there and vehicles do go in there.

And I'm also concerned about a buffer zone. I haven't reviewed all of the maps, but almost all the
to Beardslee Boulevard. And if we're talking about
22,000 cars a day or whatever on Beardslee Boulevard,
that's a big concern.

There's also an access right in front of or I
guess through the Franciscan Home. And that's of
concern to residents. What does that involve? Is
that a road that will be used during construction?
And if the main entrance doesn't come to reality,
then are you going to start looking at those roads as
access to the campus?

Thanks.

MR. REED: Thank you.

Alex Campbell, have you reached closure?

MR. CAMPBELL: Pretty much. I was just
wondering: Is 180th going to be opened up --
MR. REED: For the record, could you
please --

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh. Alex Campbell,
C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l.

I just wondered if 180th or Valley View, is that
going to be opened up to the campus?

MS. KIENAST: The cemetery road.

MR. CAMPBELL: The cemetery road.

MR. REED: Go ahead.

MR. SANFORD: Not as a roadway, but a
pedestrian access and bicycle access. It will not be a through street.

MR. CAMPBELL: It will not be a through street? That was my main concern.

Thanks.

MR. REED: Did Gordon and/or Jan Loewen, did you --

MR. LOEWEN: No.

MR. REED: -- want to testify? Okay.

Thank you.

MR. COWLES: Ladies first.

MS. NEWMAN: Go ahead.

MR. REED: No. Go ahead.

I'm sorry. I do not see your name here.

MS. NEWMAN: Janis Newman. We live at 10826 Northeast 183rd Court.

We do have a large concern over the proposed access for pedestrians and bicycles at 180th through the cemetery. I don't -- I don't even think a gate -- or I just think the whole idea of bringing anything through there is a mistake.

I don't see it's necessary. If it's to get the Bothell people through, I mean, it's no big deal to go around.

People I've talked to have supported the campus site but were kind of shocked when they realized that that could be opened up for the parking and just increase foot traffic or bicycle. I just -- I have real concerns over that.

And also, it says in here that 185th would be used for transit and emergency vehicles. And that -- the woman previously mentioned that, too. But I have a concern over that because we're directly affected and -- because we're right above that.

But one of my concerns is why, because originally when I had checked with some of the things down, you know, last summer, that wasn't in the proposal until the last meeting we went to. It was going to be off of Beardslee, which the transit goes through anyway. So I really haven't got an answer yet why that is the proposal now.

As far as noise, in reading some of the things -- because we're right above the nursing home, and being above -- somebody else mentioned a concern of being above that level even with barriers, what that really does. And I'm reading this (unintelligible) -- and, I mean, I don't know what those things are -- and acoustic barriers on the buildings.

But the things like, you know, the central air-conditioning, I have a real concern over the
noise. And, you know, a lot of these things say
there's no real negative impact, but I just wonder
who is accountable.

I did read in the part of it about the
street-sweeping during construction, but again I
wonder if -- you know, does that just say that? And
then is it really done?

The only other thing is something that bothered
me on the -- it was in 464 when it was talking about
the birds and it said that during the site visits,
which were summer 1994 through winter 1995, which we
haven't even got to -- and there are more than are
listed there. And I know that's not going to change
anything as far as what happens. But things like the
heron nests in the woods that are on the hillside.

And we have told people about that.

And then the owls living in the cemetery, that
was one of our concerns also. If it's a pedestrian
path, are they going to add lights? And I don't see
that as an advantage.

And then the last thing. I think the least we
could do if they consider -- in a huge thing like
this, do they ever consider when they start a
construction? I don't care if it's coyotes or birds
or whatever, but if they took into consideration the
time of year, in other words, avoid the breeding and
mating season or the nesting season -- because we see
a lot of that -- at least it wouldn't be disrupting
them during that.

Thanks.

MR. REED: Thank you very much.

Paul Cowles.

MR. COWLES: Paul Cowles. I live at
18536 94th Avenue in Bothell. The last name is
spelled C-o-w-l-e-s.

I'm here in a number of capacities. I am a
member of the site development advisory group. I
have been working this project for the last about 18
months.

Prior to that, I was -- there was an issue of --
the collocated campus has been an issue of mine when
I was active on the city counsel. I'm also here as a
board member of the Northshore Chamber of Commerce.

The shielding of the parking, I think that,
first, we've got to recognize we're -- that this
level, we're calling out that issue, the need for
parking, when you get to the point of actual
development conditions, which we're -- was going to
be the next step, I think you're going to have ample
opportunity to talk about how that's going to be
shielded, and the community will be involved in that input.
I will say, however, having worked with this site as an elected official, I was beginning to wonder if there was ever going to be a development on this that would actually fit the contour and the ecological challenges that are on the site. And at this point in time, I think this is a pretty good match.

Have we mitigated all the impacts? Certainly not. But we’ve come about as close as we’re ever going to come.

The greatest environmental benefit that you folks have been able to render to folks is basically the reestablishment of the floodplain, which was a scenario that I -- I was not in favor of originally.

The site could, in my opinion, carry a lot -- a lot heavier development, but I think you’ve done an excellent job of matching where the parking structure’s going to be, where the campus buildings are going to be in comparison with the site and making it fit well within the community and well within the environment which it now is involved in, and that’s the watershed for the North Creek.

Regarding the potential development conditions of process regarding the stream infiltration, that’s, again, something that will be brought forward as the permit process progresses. Those conditions will, in fact, be addressed and will be delineated for who the developer is, which at this point in time is not going to be the HEC Board, is my understanding.

So I think it quite likely may end up with the University of Washington as the potential developer. That seems prudent since they do have the experience in that regard.

An updated schedule on particular road networks, that would be great. I think probably the DOT could give you that, as well as the City of Bothell under a six TIP (phonetic) as far as what traffic improvements are going to occur and when.

The historical advisory issue, I think, can be more specifically addressed, that concern. There was a study done, which Ms. Kienast was involved with, that identified 580 historical sites or potential sites in the city. I think the City could provide you a copy of those that actually are on the site.

In our historical preservation statutes, there are certain requirements, or shall I say opportunities, for the actual owner of those historical sites to participate or not. Whoever ends up in ownership of the property would have, then, to
work out a solution how they would be handled.
And regarding the cemetery, I think that probably
the downgrading 185th through there as a pedestrian
bicycle/path is actually a blessing. Yeah, there's
going to probably be some people that try to park
there, but if you've ever tried to pull off the side
and -- when I have as work parties for the cemetery,
it's pretty goddamned tough to make sure that that
final set of tires is off the (unintelligible).
I think it's something that you could address and
concern yourself with, but as far as mitigation, I
believe that really if you talk about some fencing,
that would cure that problem.

By and large, I want to congratulate the HEC
Board and NBBJ for long, deliberate studies on this
site in coming to the conclusion that I always knew
eight years ago, that the site actually can carry
some development, good quality development. And I
even believe it still can carry far more intense, but
you've done a good job of matching what the needs are
as far as a public institution with what the
environmental requirements are. You're to be
applauded on that, and I think that is absolutely
extraordinary in today's times.

One last issue. The 60 percent is aggressive.
final EIS will include our response to those
comments.

We anticipate that the HEC Board will take final
action on the EIS in late September. Anyone who has
signed this sheet and provided your address will be
sent a notification of the date and time and location
of the HEC Board hearing on the final EIS.

With that, I'd like to conclude.

Oh, excuse me. Also, if you do want to provide
and would please provide written comments, they are
due by the close of business July 20.

With that, I am going to conclude the hearing.

Thank you all very much.

(Proceedings concluded.)
Response to Comments from Public Hearing Transcript

1  Comment noted regarding physical plant. See comment Response #2 from Wharton letter above.

2  Comment noted regarding buffer. See comment Response #8 from City of Bothell.

3  Comment noted regarding site selection. See pages II-28 through II-30 for detailed explanation of HECB site selection process for a collocated campus.

4  Comment noted regarding noise. See comment Response #3 from Wharton letter above.

5  Comment noted.

6  Comment noted.

7  Comment noted. Ongoing economic costs for levee maintenance have not been quantified.

8  Comment noted. The economic value of restored fish and wildlife habitat has not been quantified. See comment Response #1, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe for areas of existing and proposed habitat.

9  Comment noted regarding location of impacted wetlands. See page III-29 for summary of wetland fill per each alternative. Alternative 1 proposes filling approximately 6.8 acres of wetlands for campus development. These are primarily upland wetlands impacted by campus buildings, roads, parking structures, etc. Alternative 1 proposes filling approximately 17.8 acres of wetlands for historic floodplain restoration/enhancement. These are primarily floodplain wetlands impacted during the restoration process.

10 Comment noted. A series of documents are being prepared to that end. A 404 permit application describing in detail the wetland restoration process will be submitted to the Corps of Engineers in September. A PUD, Shoreline Conditional Use, and Shoreline Substantial Development permit applications have been submitted to the City of Bothell; the City will incorporate public input and review. Finally, a Master Plan report is being completed in September which summarizes the physical campus master planning efforts to date.

11 Comment noted regarding educational and recreational values of a restored North Creek. Educational and recreational monetary values have not been quantified. However, the significant increase in educational and recreational values have been noted.

12 Comment noted.
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13 Comments noted regarding transit planning. The project team has been careful not to preclude any future transit options.

14 Comment noted.

15 Comment noted.

16 Comment noted.

17 Comment noted.

18 Comment noted regarding parking structure. A total of approximately 3.5 acres is specifically designated as buffers for the adjacent residential area and cemetery. The buffer will be a minimum of 30' and will retain existing vegetation where possible. Existing vegetation will be enhanced with new evergreen plantings to fill out the buffer. The parking structure is primarily below grade near the west campus property line, and is located downslope from the residential areas, helping to preserve existing views.

19 Comment noted regarding aggressive mode split. See comment Response #2, University of Washington letter.

20 Comment noted.

21 Comment noted. See comment Response #1, Shoreline Community College letter.

22 Comment noted.

23 Comment noted.

24 Comment noted regarding aggressive mode split. See comment Response #1, Wands letter.

25 Comment noted.

26 The corrections are made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

27 Comment noted.
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28 Comment noted regarding historic criteria. An Historical Resources Assessment of the campus site is included in this FEIS. Further, this assessment is being reviewed by the appropriate local, state and federal agencies in order to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. See University of Washington comment Response #6 above.

29 Comments noted. An Historical Resources Assessment and Archaeological Resources Assessment of the campus site have been prepared; these reports are included as new information in this FEIS. These assessments have been reviewed by all the appropriate local, state and federal agencies, and their comments incorporated.

31 Comment noted. See comment Response #5, City of Bothell.

32 Comment noted. At buildout, about 80% of traffic entering and exiting the campus will use the south access.

33 Comment noted. The campus access at NE 185th Street is pedestrian/bicycle/transit only.

34 Comment noted. NE 180th Street will be pedestrian/bicycle access only.

35 Comment noted. See comment Response #1, Loewen letter above.

36 Comment noted. See comment Response #2, Wands letter above.

37 Comment noted. See comment Response #3, Wharton letter above.

38 Comment noted.

39 Comments noted.

40 Comments noted.

41 Comments noted.

42 Comment noted.

43 Comment noted.
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44 Comments noted.

45 Comments noted.

46 The correction is made to the EIS. See Section III of this document.

47 Comments noted. See Section III B of this document. See Response #5, City of Bothell letter.

48 Comment noted regarding aggressive mode split. See comment Response #1, Wands letter.

49 Comment noted.