Appendix F

Comments and Responses
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Sultan UGA request was considered as part of Alternative 3 in the Draft EIS. The County requested planning level utility information from the City and it was reviewed and included in the Draft EIS.
Thank you for your comment on support for recognized mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures in the form of incorporated features (GPP goals) and regulations and commitments (Section 3.1.1.3) would apply. As noted in the applicable regulations and commitments, development activities or clearing of ground in hazard areas are required to minimize the risk of hazards by minimizing impervious areas and retaining vegetation (SCC 30.62B.320).

Regarding inclusion of infrastructure at the planning/permitting stage, it should be noted that the Alternatives are programmatic in nature. Snohomish County’s Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) generally examines county and non-county capital facilities over a 20 year timeframe per GMA requirements. Details about utility infrastructure at the project planning and permitting phases are not included in this document for either type of capital facility. Project level details about County capital facilities with funding sources are included in Snohomish County’s annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and statement of assessment. We do not provide infrastructure details at the project planning and permitting phases for non-county facilities in either the CFP or CIP. We would typically provide summary information about their utility infrastructure and refer readers to the comprehensive planning documents of those agencies.

However, all applicable procedures would apply to project level applications; for example, for projects subject to SEPA review, the SEPA checklist form questions regarding energy and utilities would be considered.

---

**Earth, Topography, Soils, and Erosion:**

City of Stanwood (page 1-7): We support the recognized mitigation measures and would stress that careful planning and siting should be implemented in areas of landslide hazard to avoid conflicts that worsen conditions, e.g., vegetation removal over landslide-prone slope to accommodate distribution service lines and clearance requirements.

City of Stanwood (page 1-7): We request the inclusion of electric and water infrastructure at the planning and permitting stage as part of the larger project, a step critical to avoiding impacts, increased costs, and delays.
A-002-002
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The Draft EIS evaluated the potential impacts on water resources of revisions, including the docket requests under Alternative 3, to the comprehensive plan at a broad, programmatic level. All three alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS would continue to provide policy direction for the environmental protection of water resources, both surface water and ground water. The Draft EIS identified county, state and federal regulations and statutes that designate and protect water resources. The Draft EIS noted that regulatory authority for the protection, remediation and management of groundwater resources lies primarily with the State of Washington.

A-002-003
The EIS is a programmatic document addressing planning level proposals.

Snohomish County’s Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) generally examines county and non-county capital facilities over a 20 year timeframe per GMA requirement. Details about utility infrastructure at the project planning and permitting phases are not included in this document for either type of capital facility. Project level details about county capital facilities with funding sources are included in Snohomish County’s annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and statement of assessment. We do not provide infrastructure details at the project planning and permitting phases for non-county facilities in either the CFP or CIP. We would typically provide summary information about their utility infrastructure and refer readers to the comprehensive planning documents of those agencies.

However, see Section 3.1.4.3 where a full list of mitigation measures is included including applicable regulations and commitments. Procedures are in place to address project level proposals at the permit stage such
As part of its commitment the PUD offers a wide range of energy efficiency solutions for its commercial, industrial and residential customers. Many of these solutions include technical assistance, financial incentives or rebates for existing building retrofits, HVAC system optimization, solar panels, efficient lighting upgrades, commercial kitchen appliances, new construction and residential weatherization and heating.

For Snohomish County, as the regional growth strategy is implemented, multi-use and higher density housing will take a prominent role in implementing that vision in the urban areas of the County. However, multi-family housing often presents unique challenges in efforts to improve energy efficiency performance of these housing units.

We encourage Snohomish County to explore potential incentives, processes and other opportunities to support investment by developers in pursuing energy efficient designs and technologies as they design, construct and maintain these types of developments. Snohomish County PUD looks forward to the opportunity to continue to work with Snohomish County in this regard in support of its Comprehensive Plan and implementation of Vision 2040.

Investing now in sustainable building practices, energy efficiency measures and conservation programs is a practical way to reduce operating expenses, add money directly to our customer’s bottom line, support our communities’ economic vitality and reduce environmental impact.

Section 3.2.6.1

The PUD requests replacing the first three paragraphs of Section 3.2.6.1, page 3-123, Electricity, Snohomish PUD #1, with the below wording, which includes a more up to date overview of the PUD:

The PUD relies on a diversified power portfolio consisting of a long-term power supply contract with the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), a broad range of conservation and energy efficiency programs, three PUD-owned hydroelectric projects, some customer-owned generation and several long-term power supply contracts. In 2013, the PUD received 84% of its power supply from BPA, 6% from its long-term wind and other renewable resources contracts, 6% from its own hydroelectric projects, and 4% from wholesale market purchases. The PUD’s owned and operated hydroelectric resources include the Jackson Hydroelectric Project and two small, run-of-the-river hydroelectric projects – the Woods Creek Hydro Project and Youngs Creek Hydroelectric Project. All three of these generating resources are located within Snohomish County. The PUD makes short-term purchases and sales in the wholesale power market to balance daily and seasonal fluctuations in its load and resources.

The PUD’s Strategic Plan and Integrated Resource Plan encourage the development of small, distributed renewable generating resources such as the Woods Creek Hydroelectric Project and Youngs Creek Hydroelectric Projects. Local development of these resources diversifies the PUD’s power supply portfolio and provides a variety of measurable benefits to the PUD’s ratepayers. From a planning perspective, capacity assessments for the PUD focus on analysis of “System Peak Demand” – the largest amount of power the utility is called upon to deliver at any one time. The Normal Winter System Peak Demand is expected to rise from the 2014 level of 1,383 megawatts to 1,604 megawatts in 2032, an increase of 16%. To meet this growing peak, the PUD has identified a
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First bullet: Snohomish County’s Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) generally examines county and non-county capital facilities over a 20-year timeframe per GMA requirements. Details about utility infrastructure at the project planning and permitting phases are not included in this document for either type of capital facility. Additional information on county capital facilities with funding sources is included in Snohomish County’s annual Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and statement of assessment. We do not provide infrastructure details at the project planning and permitting phases for non-county facilities in either the CFP or CIP. These plans typically provide summary information about their utility infrastructure and refer readers to the comprehensive planning documents of those agencies.

Second bullet: The alternatives under review in this EIS concern the allocation of population and employment growth in UGAs in Snohomish County. Under any of the alternatives, the effects of individual development proposals would be addressed through project-specific reviews. Site-specific consideration of potential conflicts between tree retention requirements and power line siting needs would occur during those reviews; therefore, that topic is not addressed in this EIS. Please note that the proposed mitigation measure does not constitute an absolute prohibition on the removal of hazard trees in power line corridors.

A-002-005

Alternative 1: The word "efficient" is changed to "readily available." The sentence will now read:
Alternative 1 would direct a large share of growth into cities, where provision of electrical distribution infrastructure is more readily available, resulting in a reduced need for new distribution infrastructure relative to the other alternatives.

Alternative 2: The word "efficient" is changed to "readily available." The sentence will now read:

Alternative 2 would direct a larger share of growth into rural areas and unincorporated UGAs, where provision of electrical distribution infrastructure is less readily available, resulting in an increase need for new distribution infrastructure, relative to other alternatives.

Alternative 2: Add the following text.

Inclusion of electrical facilities design and siting into early permitting stages would help in delivery of these services in more rural areas where impacts are more likely, and where permitting costs can be higher. Public costs, delays, and impacts would be reduced through consideration of utilities within each proposed project.

Alternative 3: The word "efficient" is changed to "readily available." The sentence will now read:

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would direct a greater share of growth to rural areas and unincorporated UGAs, where residential densities are generally lower than within cities, making provision of electrical services less readily available.

Alternative 3: The word "efficient" is changed to "readily available." The sentence will now read:

Alternative 3, however, includes policies to promote infill development,
which would create areas of more compact development where provision of electrical services would be more capable, relative to Alternative 2.

A-002-006

The Draft EIS identifies the need for early consultation in the plan update process to coordinate land use with future water supply needs, particularly in the urban infill areas designated for higher densities. As described in Land and Shoreline Use Section 3.2.1, with all alternatives, a greater concentration of population and employment growth would continue within cities and unincorporated UGAs. Proposed map changes (changes to FLUM and zoning) generally seek to shift higher density development to areas with compatible adjacent land use and a greater ability to provide utilities and public services.

A-002-007

The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. As described in Section 3.2.6.3, the County could consider adding GPP policies to promote energy efficiency in new construction, transit-oriented development, retention of mature vegetation to moderate temperatures, and promotion of regional trails to increase non-motorized transportation options.

A-002-008

Thank you for your comment Snohomish County PUD. The old text will be deleted, and the new text added.

A-002-009

Thank you for your comments. The Final EIS will be revised to include suggested changes.
rule went into effect on September 26, 2005 through the end of 2012. The Department of Ecology is in process of preparing the 2013 accounting.

- We note that the list of water service purveyors in the Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA) is missing several that can be seen inside the Southwest UGA in Figure 3.2-15.
- Page 3-172, City of Stanwood: Please note that this is one of the systems where the boundary shown on Figure 3.2-15 is incorrect. The water service area is larger than shown.

* Sections 3.2.10.2, Impacts Common to All Alternatives and 3.2.10.4, Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts: This should be updated with information from the City of Everett’s draft 2014 CWP.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS. The PUD looks forward to participating with Snohomish County in the Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update process and working together towards mutual objectives into the future.

Sincerely,

Steven J. Klein
CEO/General Manager

cc: Brenda White, Legislative Liaison
    Chuck Peterson, Executive Account Manager
The comment is noted and has been provided to County decision makers who will consider the range of Alternatives, EIS analysis, and public and agency comments.

It should be noted that all alternatives minimize growth allocations to rural areas. All alternatives would achieve no net change in UGA boundaries. Section 3.2.2 describes the compatibility of alternatives with regional and local plans, and Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIS describes the implications on population and housing. Alternative 1 addresses growth allocations that align with VISION 2040 whereas Alternatives 2 and 3 were formulated with the understanding of buildable land capacity as of 2012 (prior to local plan updates).

Alternative 1 would assume more compact growth in cities (particularly Everett) where there is infrastructure and transit. Alternative 2 assumes no change in current plans for unincorporated areas and growth where current plans allow for buildable capacity.

Alternative 3 would upzone some areas in the UGA to add capacity in mixed use and multifamily categories, or would create more compatible land use patterns (e.g. recognizing public facilities). The growth trends show that the pending permits have already fulfilled about 50% of the 20-year growth allocation only a few years into the planning period. The Alternative 3 upzones would help add capacity to avoid future UGA expansions.
and (c) undermine efforts of cities to redevelop and densify existing and sometimes deteriorating neighborhoods.

The City of Mountlake Terrace encourages you to recommend to the County Council Alternative 1 since it is consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy set forward in Vision 2040 and consistent with the previous action taken by the County Council on June 12, 2012.

Thank you for considering our input. We appreciate the cooperative relations we have had with Snohomish County and look forward to continued collaboration on our collective planning efforts.

Sincerely,

Steve Osuethorpe, AICP  
Community & Economic Development Director  
City of Mountlake Terrace  

Cc: Arlene Fisher, City Manager, City of Mountlake Terrace
While the Planning Commission is directly involved in the comprehensive planning process, the decision on updating the Comprehensive Plan rests with the Snohomish County Council. The Council will have the benefit of both the recommendations from the Planning Commission and input from all jurisdictions, agencies, organizations, and people who commented on the Draft EIS.
All three of the alternatives are consistent with the RGS (Draft EIS, page 3-95). The population growth allocation for Alternative 1 provides the closest match to the RGS numbers. Alternative 2 and 3 are the same as Alternative 1 across all jurisdictions except for the population growth allocations for Everett, Lynnwood and the unincorporated UGA and non-UGA. Even so, the Alternative 2 and 3 allocations for these exceptions represent a significant shift away from current growth trends towards the RGS.

Population capacity relative to the growth allocations is discussed in Section 3.2.3 of the Draft EIS. Excess capacity in the unincorporated urban areas beyond what is needed to accommodate the county’s share of the urban growth allocations is greatest under Alternative 1, less under Alternative 3, and excess capacity is the lowest under Alternative 2.

Some degree of excess capacity allows for a market safety factor to protect from price inflation due to land supply shortage. This is consistent with market principles and with Countywide Planning Policy DP-1. Alternative 1 has the greatest excess capacity but this is not a result of county actions proposed under Alternative 1 to increase the capacity. Instead, this excess is the result of the existing capacity based on the current land use designations and zoning compared to a low 2035 population target for the unincorporated county. The only alternative that actually adds capacity in the unincorporated UGA is Alternative 3. Under Alternative 3, there is additional capacity for approximately 8,786 more people than Alternatives 1 or 2 (see Draft EIS, Table 3.2-17, page 3-110). The added capacity accounts for only 3.7% of the countywide growth out to 2035 and slightly increases the market safety factor for Alternative 3 relative to Alternative 2. This additional capacity under Alternative 3 does not constitute substantially more growth, nor does it...
further decrease the feasibility of Everett reaching the initial growth targets because Everett's growth target under Alternative 3 is the SCT target of 143,000; much lower than the initial growth target of 164,812 (Alternative 1). If however, the infill capacity under Alternative 3 were to be paired with the initial growth targets from Alternative 1, the excess capacity in the unincorporated UGA would increase to over 52,000. This excess county capacity could become a problem for Everett meeting its Alternative 1 growth targets if Everett's capacity is too tight (i.e. limited land supply or density opportunity), land values are inflated due to supply issues, or the growth is otherwise attracted to the unincorporated areas instead of to the city.

Excess capacity in the unincorporated UGA is not inconsistent with the RGS and does not automatically mean that growth will locate there instead of in the cities, particularly if the cities can offer amenities to draw growth into their jurisdictions consistent with the intent of Vision 2040. Current demographic trends and preferences for millennials and retired populations indicate a shift towards cities in coming years, which may facilitate alignment with the RGS growth targets for cities.

Alternatives 2 and 3 are designed to better match municipal capacity as currently understood reflecting SCT recommendations for growth allocations while bending the trend towards the VISION 2040 Regional Growth Strategy.

Transportation effects of redistributing growth in Alternatives 2 and 3 compared to Alternative 1 are addressed in Volume II of the Draft EIS.

Please also see Response to Comment A-003-001.
Planned Improvements section on Page 3-64 of Volume II and in the Model Technical Memo (Volume II, Appendix B-4). A draft Transportation Element map that shows the general locations of planned major transit facilities was submitted to the Snohomish County Planning Commission as a revision to “Attachment 1 – 2015 Update: Proposed Amendments to the Transportation Element” and titled “Figure 8 – High Capacity Transit” on page 139.
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The Draft EIS addresses impacts to local transportation facilities through its analysis of city and County arterial units. That analysis includes 185 city transportation facilities throughout the County, including 39 segments in Everett, and 267 County arterial units. Since the County’s travel demand model includes a full representation of the state highway system, and County and city arterial roadway networks, the effects of limited capacity on the state highway system are reflected by increased volumes on local facilities. Summary results for the city arterial analysis may be found on Pages 3-75 (Alternative 1), 3-78 to 3-79 (Alternative 2), and 3-81 to 3-82 (Alternative 3). Complete results for the city arterial analysis are shown in Appendix A-3, City Arterial Unit LOS Tables. Summary results for the county arterial analysis are presented on Pages 3-72 to 3-74 (Alternative 1), 3-76 to 3-77 (Alternative 2), and 3-79 to 3-80 (Alternative 3). Complete results for the county arterial units are shown in Appendix A-1, County Arterial Unit LOS Tables.
The Snohomish County Park and Recreation Element (PRE) is a planning document and is intended to identify large scale needs for park facilities to serve the population for at least a ten year period. In order to achieve that, the PRE considers demand for recreation facilities based upon population trends, level-of-service standards, recreation interests expressed by stakeholders/public, policy identified priorities and other priorities identified by staff. An analysis is then completed to determine if the expressed demands are being met and, if not, what types of projects and/or facilities are needed to address the demand. The resulting Recommended Park Improvements list does not constitute full planning for the projects identified, and a separate project-specific planning process is applied as part of individual capital projects in order to include stakeholders in planning for those projects, as appropriate. The Wellington Hills project is currently in the project-specific planning process and those comments related to this project, which were submitted through the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update process, will be forwarded to the Wellington Hills Project Manager for review.

Specific comments related to environmental impacts (including those outside the Snohomish County boundaries) and adoption by the Snohomish County Council of the Wellington Hills Master Plan are outside the scope of the PRE (see above).

Proposed GPP language additions – Thank you for the suggested General Policy Plan (GPP) language changes/additions. The Planning Commission recommended version of the GPP has been transmitted to Snohomish County Council and they may consider language changes as a part of their review.

See also response to C-002-001 regarding programmatic SEPA review.
grade artificial turf as well as 100,000 square feet of building space and significant commercial and economic development components (what are sometimes called "public/private partnerships)

The County is not proceeding on a clean slate with regard to policies, objectives, and GMA/SEPA analysis concerning Wellington Park. The Parks Department investment in planning for Wellington Hills Park has now reached the one million dollar plus level including a substantial contract with an outside consultant, Bruce Dees and Associates. As long ago as 2012, Mr. Dees acknowledged that his contract was to plan for what he forthrightly called out as the "Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex". See "Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes" dated May 4, 2012 (copy attached).

The County Parks Department has now relabeled Wellington Park as a "Community Park," publicly downplaying the intended use, while continuing to invest large sums in implementation of that ambitious intention. It has done so even after being dealt a setback by the County Hearing Examiner in a June 18, 2013 decision. In upholding Woodinville's appeal of a SEPA DNS issued by the Parks Department for Wellington development, the Hearing Examiner stated that

It appears that before any development permits or approval are sought approval of the Master Plan for the park must be obtained from the Snohomish County Council.

Yet, despite repeated promises by the Parks Department, no Wellington Master Plan has ever been submitted let alone approved. Why should the Planning Commission be concerned with this? Because the Parks Element and Planning documents that have been presented to you neither recognize what is occurring nor provide a GMA policy and objectives framework for addressing these concerns. In effect, through obliquely worded language and strategic silence, the planning documents presented to you for approval could be misconstrued to allow the Parks Department to continue violating the Growth Management Act and SEPA. In other words, the wording before you could encourage the Parks Department to continue pursuing a major investment in implementing a Wellington Plan that has never been critically vetted for compliance with the GMA and the County's capital budget by the responsible County authorities, including the Commission and the County Council.

This kind of approach is barred by the GMA. For example, the Parks Department's spiraling investment violates RCW 36.70A.120 which mandates that:

Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its comprehensive plan.
Equally important, the adoption of the oblique approach taken with regard to the Wellington site and a Regional Park facility in the planning documents now pending violates the GMA requirement in RCW 36.70A.100 that:

The comprehensive plan of each county or city that is adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 shall be coordinated with, and consistent with, the comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to RCW 36.70A.040 of other counties or cities with which the county or city has, in part, common borders or related regional issues.

For example, the plan proposals currently before you speak to coordination among jurisdictions of recreational activities. But they do not acknowledge that establishment of significantly intense uses outside the UGA but right by a City requires coordination with regard to obvious impacts such as those cataloged in Woodinville’s February, 2014 comment letters to PDS.

The City does not believe that the Planning Commission would knowingly adopt provisions facilitating placement of urban intensity development outside of a UGA. Nor would the Planning Commission want to, through GMA plan provisions, facilitate Departmental actions inconsistent with County-wide planning policies and GMA principles with regard to transportation, public services, as well as joint planning, development patterns, and the natural environment.

However, without some amendments, that may well be the “takeaway” conclusion. To address this, the City proposes the following additions to the “New Proposed Parks GPP Goals/Objectives/ Policies” now before you:

Add to PR Policy 1A2: In the absence of an interlocal agreement for mitigation, avoid locating regional park-type uses, significant park development, or tournament or commercial use facilities that would best be served by urban services (for example sewer) outside of a UGA. Avoid location of such park uses where unmitigated impacts on adjacent jurisdictions may occur.

Add to Objective PR 2A: Development of new park facilities shall be based on a master plan for that park approved by the County Council.

Add to Policy PR2A2 at start: In compliance with a park master plan approved by the County Council.

Add to Policy PR 4.A.6 at start: If consistent with other park policies.

Add to Objective PR 8A: Such methodologies should not be a factor in deciding where to locate a park use or facility.
Add to Policy PR 8.A.1: *but do not allow such methodologies to influence siting or use decisions.*

Add to Goal PR 1 at start: *If consistent with other park policies and approved master plans*

These additions to some extent mitigate the impacts otherwise inherent in the proposal now before you, which are neither recognized nor analyzed in the DEIS. None of the proposed additions should be controversial or objectionable to the Parks Department which, for example, has advised the City and the public repeatedly over the last year that a Wellington Park Master Plan is a prerequisite to implementation of Wellington park development. If that is the case (and under the GMA and otherwise it must be) then why not include this key precept in the proposals before you?

Respectfully,

EGLICK KIKER WHITED PLLC

[Signature]

Peter J. Eglick  
Special Land Use Counsel for the  
City of Woodinville

cc: Client

Enclosures:  
Letter from EKW to PDS (Tom Barnett) 02/05/14  
Letter from the City of Woodinville to PDS (Tom Barnett) 02/05/14  
County Parks Department SEPA Notice of Action 03/20/2013 and related appeal materials  
Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex Meeting Minutes 05/04/2012
Peter J. Eglick
eglick@ekwlaw.com

February 5, 2014

Via E-mail, Facsimile and Hand-Delivery

Tom.barnett@co.snohomish.wa.us
Fax: (425) 388-3872

Tom Barnett
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Robert J. Drewel Building, 2nd Floor M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

RE: File Number 13-115371-LDA (Wellington Hills Park; 6818 240th St. SE, Woodinville, WA 98072)
Legal Comments on behalf of the City of Woodinville in Response to January 15, 2014 Reissuued Notice of Application.

Dear Mr. Barnett:

This office acts as special land use counsel for the City of Woodinville with regard to the Wellington Hills Park ("Wellington") proposal. These comments are submitted in response to the County’s January 15, 2014 Reissued Notice of Application. They are in addition to and incorporate by reference comments dated February 5, 2014 submitted on behalf of the City of Woodinville over the signature of its Public Works Director, Thomas Hansen P.E.

1. **Defective Notice and SEPA Checklist**

   The Notice and SEPA Checklist refer to an LDA application. It turns out, however, that the Parks Department is proceeding with separate applications for the project, including

---

1 This date was omitted from the original version of this letter, and has been added to this copy for the sake of completeness.
2 The City also refers to and incorporates, to the extent they are not inconsistent with the City's comments, submissions by other entities and citizens concerning impacts on traffic and on the City of Woodinville as well as compliance with the Growth Management Act. See Back v. City of Shoreline, 167 Wn.App 1027 (April 2, 2012) (unpublished).
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pedestrian bridge and drainage modification applications. These are not disclosed, as they should have been, in response to SEPA Checklist Question A.9 which asks “Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal?” This continues a pattern in which the Parks Department has implemented piecemeal its Wellington sports complex plan, while actual SEPA review has yet to commence. The SEPA Checklist must therefore be corrected and the Notice withdrawn, corrected, and, when appropriate, re-issued to allow an opportunity for informed public comment.

2. Lack of Authority to Submit Application and Incorrect Route to SEPA Review

The SEPA Checklist identifies the Parks Department as the “applicant”. However, as the Parks Department and its counsel have acknowledged, there is currently no authority for the Parks Department to pursue its Wellington Plan, which has not been approved by the County Council. The Parks Department and its counsel have adopted the pretense that, to trigger SEPA, they must submit an application to PDS for implementation of an unapproved plan. However, that is not correct. Submission of the proposed Wellington Plan to the County Council for review and approval would by itself trigger SEPA review. There is no need under SEPA to apply to PDS for approval of massive grading and development permits for an unapproved Plan. Doing so violates the County Code, SEPA, and the Growth Management Act. The Snohomish County Hearing Examiner’s June 18, 2013 decision makes clear that Parks cannot lawfully seek development permits until it has obtained approval of the Wellington Plan from the County Council.

3. Incorrect Use Type

Per the SEPA Checklist “The current zoning classification of the site” is R-5. The Checklist discloses a proposal for the R-5 site which is no simple park. It includes “a community activity center and an indoor mountain bike facility”. Background information in the County files discloses plans for commercial-type uses and arrangements as part of a goal to establish a destination regional tournament level sports complex. While recent Parks Department public relations efforts have downplayed this, the actual proposal has not changed. The “Rural and Resource Use Matrix” in SCC 30.22.110 lists use categories and the permits required to establish them. Despite the nature of the uses proposed, the SEPA checklist assumes that the Wellington Sports Complex Project falls only into the “Park, Public” matrix use category which is listed as “P”, meaning permitted without special use approval.

However, the Parks Department proposal for Wellington is not simply for a public park. The Wellington complex is more accurately categorized as a “Recreational Facility Not Otherwise Listed” which requires Conditional Use approval. In the alternative, the proposed use

1030 Second Avenue, Suite 3130 North, Washington 98104
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reflects characteristics in common with a Motocross Racetrack, which also requires Conditional Use approval.³

The SEPA Checklist failure to disclose and address the proper characterization of the proposed use is a fundamental flaw. If this is not corrected now, it will only result in greater controversy later.

4. Failure to Address Unmitigated Impacts

Woodinville’s Public Works Director has submitted under separate cover comments addressing the significant shortcomings in the Wellington Plan and consequent undisclosed adverse impacts including for “Phase 1.” As noted in that letter with regard to traffic,⁴ the Plan as proposed would severely impact traffic and in some cases literally threaten public safety (e.g. the Parks Department proposal for a shared bi-directional turn lane raising the prospect of head-on collisions). Further, in some cases the mitigation proposed has been diminished in comparison to what the Parks Department alluded to in earlier project materials. The City has raised these issues in consultation with the County, but, despite Parks Department public relations claims, the City’s earlier expressed and current concerns have not been addressed through binding mitigation plans -- as distinguished from general assurances that somehow or another all will be well.

Sooner or later, the piper must be paid when major projects are implemented without adequate mitigation. The City has repeatedly expressed its concern that Wellington Plan implementation would result in major impacts and require significant mitigation expense. As a local government itself, the City sympathizes. However, it is not appropriate for the County to run up an impact tab and then leave it for the City to pay.

5. Failure to Address GMA Issues Related to the NonProject Proposal

Wellington Plan adoption, a nonproject action, is a prerequisite to project permits and implementation. Yet, the SEPA Checklist does not include a nonproject SEPA Checklist and no separate SEPA notice and nonproject checklist for plan adoption has been noted. The Parks Department’s proposed Wellington Plan proposes an intensive use with commercial and economic development elements in a rural zone outside of any UGA. There is a serious question whether development of this type of recreational facility outside of the UGA is consistent with the Growth Management Act. Particularly where the proposed development would serve as an inducement for violation of GMA-based requirements or distortion of the UGA, this issue must

³ The Department’s plans also reflect aspects of a “Community Club” use, which, again, requires Conditional Use approval in the R-5 zone.
⁴ The Director’s questions with regard to the proposed plan for waste disposal also raise significant issues as do the Parks Department’s plans for alteration of drainage and groundwater.

1000 Second Avenue, Suite 2330 Seattle, Washington 98104

telephone 206.448.1069 • www.ecklaw.com • facsimile 206.448.1089
be addressed first and foremost rather than treated, at best, as an afterthought to an application to PDS for proceeding with the development.

6. **Conclusion**

   This is the second time that zeal for implementation of its preferred Wellington Plan has resulted in fundamental missteps by the Parks Department. No applicant, even a County Department, is entitled to operate on a less rigorous basis than is required by the law as applied to individual citizens. PDS should respond to the City’s comments by withdrawing its Notice and declining to process the application until the fundamental flaws identified here and by other commentators have been corrected. When/if an application is finally accepted for processing, preparation of an environmental impact statement must be the first order of business.

Sincerely,

EGLICK KIKER WHITED PLLC

Peter J. Eglick
Special Land Use Counsel for the City of Woodinville

cc: Client
February 5, 2014

By: e-mail to Tom.Barnett@co.snohomish.wa.us
Hand Delivered
US Mail

Snohomish County
Dept. of Planning & Development Services
Attr: Mr. Tom Barnett, Project Manager
Robert J. Drewel Building / 2nd Floor, MS 604
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201

Re: File Number 13-115371-LDA
(Woodville South Park; 6818 240th Street SE, Woodinville, WA 98072)
Initial Comments by the City of Woodinville Public Works Director in
response to January 15, 2014 Reissued Notice of Application

Dear Mr. Barnett:

The following comments are being submitted on behalf of the City of Woodinville in response to
the City’s issuance of a SEPA Checklist, project report, design documentation, and
preliminary plans for the proposed Wellington Hills County Park. The comments are necessarily
preliminary because the underlying documentation and proposed mitigation are deficient in
significant respects, particularly in traffic and transportation. Nonetheless, on the basis of what
is known now, and as explained below, it is apparent that the project will result in significant
unmitigated adverse impacts to the City of Woodinville and its citizens. In the absence of
assured and effective mitigation, these require the preparation of an Environmental Impact
Statement (EIS) before the proposal proceeds.

Particular impacts related to traffic, geotechnical, sewage, and drainage/stormwater aspects of
the proposal are noted below. Additional impacts and issues will be addressed in separate
comments submitted on behalf of the City by Eglick Kiker Whited PLLC, Woodinville’s special
counsel for this matter. However, any one of the following impacts and issues is sufficient to
warrant issuance of a SEPA Determination of Significance and preparation of an EIS.

TRAFFIC/TRANSPORTATION
a. A critical significant adverse impact identified by the City is the increased volume of the
southbound to eastbound left turn at the 240th Street SE/Woodinville-Snohomish Road
intersection (from 109 vehicles per hour today to 224 vehicles per hour with the project).
The Final Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for this project by Gibson Traffic Consultants,
dated December 2013 (herein after referred to as the “Report”, TIA), states that this
intersection will operate at LOS D when the project is constructed and improvements are
made to the westbound approach only (separate right turn lane). However, the data
included in the TIA attachments suggest that this does not accurately represent what will be
happening at this intersection if the park is built and the intersection is not improved beyond
the westbound approach.

17301 133rd Avenue NE • Woodinville, WA 98072-8534
425-489-2701 • Fax: 425-489-2705
The southbound to eastbound left turn movement only has storage for 4 cars (100 feet) in the left turn pocket. Assuming a 120 second traffic signal cycle, an average of 9 cars will show up each cycle trying to make this left turn. There is insufficient storage to accommodate this volume without impacting the southbound through lanes. This will cause vehicles trying to get to the park to divert and use a different route without going through this congested intersection. Many will divert through the SR 522/195th Interchange and the NE 195th Street Woodinville-Snohomish Road intersection, which now only operates at LOS D, causing it to fail (LOS F). A second, southbound left turn lane is critical for efficiency of the overall signal operation at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road/240th Street SE intersection.

There is no ability to increase the left turn pocket storage length given its proximity to the SR 522 EB Ramp signal immediately to the north. This southbound to eastbound left turning traffic at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road intersection volume would be nearly equivalent to the northbound to eastbound on-ramp left turn forecast in the study at the SR 522/EB ramps intersection. At this location, the left turn lane has approximately 250 feet of storage available, a more typical minimum length to accommodate turning movement demand at a signal without creating vehicle back-up into the adjacent through lane of traffic causing an unsafe condition.

b. The Report shows two levels of trip generation, one level is based on generation rates from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, and is less predictive of actual Wellington Hills Park impacts than the second level of trip generation rates, which is based on actual counts from local facilities and similar sports complexes, as well as other literature sources, the current TIA labels the second level as “Event” trip generation rates. In an earlier TIA for the park project, they were labeled “SEPA analysis” rates. The “Event” trip generation rates, in the current TIA, are significantly higher than the ITE trip generation rates, 370 vehicles per hour in the PM peak hour versus 249 vehicles per hour for the park. The increase of the southbound to eastbound left turn volume to 351 vehicles per hour will cause significant impacts to the operation of the intersection of Woodinville-Snohomish Road/240th Street SE.

The report and all of the other application documents describing this project do not provide a reliable basis for an assumption that an “Event” trip generation situation will not be the typical condition for the park, which will be a venue for various sports competitions. Rather, in light of the County’s stated ultimate purposes and utilization plans for the park, the “Event” trip generation rates based on the underlying local trip generation studies, must be accepted for project review purposes representing typical peak utilization characteristics and should be used for all traffic impact analysis. Again, applying these rates demonstrates significant unmitigated adverse impacts created by the project as proposed.

c. The traffic report identifies as a mitigation measure changing the existing dedicated left turn pockets -- northbound to eastbound left turn at the SR 522/SR 9 eastbound ramps intersection, and the southbound to eastbound left turn at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road/240th Street SE intersection -- into a two way left turn lane between these two intersections. The report indicated that the queues for these two left turns could then share the two way left turn lane for storage, the maximum queues would occur at different times, and there would be sufficient storage length. We have determined upon review that, for the following reasons, this is a dangerous non-solution to a significant problem:

1. The available storage length between the two intersections, of roughly 455 feet, is insufficient and does not allow for distances for entry of the vehicles from opposing directions to enter their respective queues without conflict.
2. It results in restriction of center lane entry points as vehicle queues of the adjacent through traffic movement waiting to clear the signal, causing left turning vehicles to enter well back from the traffic signal's. This creates a situation of "chicken": two cars traveling head-on at each other in the two way left turn lane with nowhere to go as they are blocked on both sides by cars waiting for the traffic signal to give them a green light.

3. It does not take into account or analyze for what happens during an "Event" traffic generation situation.

4. The signal operational analysis continues to assume a protected-permissive signal phase for the NB/SB approaches on Woodinville-Snohomish Road at 240th Street SE. Given conflicting traffic flows (northbound through) along Woodinville-Snohomish Road (>800 vph) permissive allowance would not serve demand. More importantly from a traffic safety standpoint, a permissive phase is typically not appropriate under such volume conditions. A similar conclusion was reached by the Snohomish County Public Works Department in their review of collision history at this location during an Inadequate Roadway Condition (IRC) review. When considering this signal operation and the implementation of just Phase 1, the TIA concludes that the available storage within the median would fail to adequately serve average vehicle queues as presented in the report (281 feet northbound at eastbound SR 522 intersection plus 166 feet southbound at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road/240th Street SE intersection equals average vehicle queues of 449 feet versus available storage length of 455 feet). These vehicle queuing estimates represent "typical" conditions occurring nearly every signal cycle. No room would remain for maneuvering or deceleration into the "shared lane". The result would be back queuing into the adjacent through lanes after only several cycles.

5. With back to back left turn lanes at adjacent signalized intersections as proposed, without appropriate channelization and lane assignments, the center median lane on Woodinville-Snohomish Road would operate like a "reversible" lane, creating direct opportunity for head-on and angle collisions within the roadway median area. In fact, the proposal is more dangerous than a typical reversible lane operation, which is no longer a recommended practice, because at least in a reversible lane there were signal controls in place to alert the driver whether or not the lane could be used in the selected direction of travel. Without proper lane assignment through channelization, overall safety and arterial traffic flow along Woodinville-Snohomish Road would be significantly reduced (based on driver uncertainty) and put the traveling public at great risk of adverse collisions and undue delay.

d. Significant adverse impacts are further likely because constructing an additional southbound left turn lane is problematic and expensive at this location, given limited right-of-way and the built environment adjacent to the intersection. These constraints (i.e., inability to construct added turning movement capacity) will cause traffic to naturally shift to available alternative routes. Given overall trip distribution, this diversion would be focused on the SR 522/NE 195th Street interchange. Site access via this interchange (within the City of Woodinville), includes access via a left turn at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road intersection at NE 195th Street (immediately east of the interchange) as well as left turns at the Woodinville-Duvall Road/156th Avenue NE intersection. Based on the "Event" analysis scenario, this entering trip diversion from northbound SR 522 is approximately 95 trips (45 percent of 210 entering trips).
e. The City's recently completed planning, traffic operational analysis, and improvement project constructed at the Woodinville-Snohomish Road/NE 185th Street intersection documented that the "weave" that currently occurs between the SR 522 northbound off-ramp and the eastbound left turn at this signalized intersection immediately adjacent to the ramp creates significant adverse vehicle queueing and delay at the intersection and on the freeway off-ramp. Currently, traffic diverts from this intersection to the SR 522/SR 9 interchange for trips destined north of NE 185th Street along the Woodinville-Snohomish Road intersection in light of this "weave" movement and its limited capacity. The recent improvements completed by the City have increased the capacity on the Woodinville-Snohomish Road approaches to this intersection in addition to maintaining the green time allocation to those critical movements from the adjacent SR 522 northbound off-ramp and east-west traffic going through the intersection, improving the overall level of service for the intersection. However, based on existing turning demand at the eastbound left turn lane at Woodinville-Snohomish Road/NE 185th Street intersection, there is capacity for less than 20 additional vehicles (maximum of 100 vph) during the PM peak hour. The "Event" traffic situation, by adding up to 95 vehicles trying to make the eastbound to northbound left turn at this intersection, would cause the level of service to fall to "F", an unacceptable situation.

f. Assuming traffic balances further based on limited available capacity of the direct route from this interchange, traffic would continue to travel further east along the Woodinville-Duvall Road corridor and turn left at its signalized intersection with 158th Avenue NE. Turning movement demand at this intersection is forecast to be approximately 275 vph with the project assuming no diversion occurs. But the single-lane geometry for left turns at this location means that there is effectively no additional capacity to serve the demand caused by this diversion of traffic unless additional turn lanes are constructed.

g. To accommodate the likely additional diversion of traffic from the proposed Wellington Hills County Park to this interchange, necessary mitigation would at least include completion of the Interim Interchange improvements at the SR 522/NE 195th Street interchange project (as determined by WSDOT and the City of Woodinville) in order to provide the added capacity needed to support the proposal. This would include widening and channelization improvements to both the northbound off-ramp and eastbound approach of NE 185th Street and Woodinville-Snohomish Road intersection to accommodate the increased demand for traffic entering the site during the PM peak hours. This would allow for traffic destined for the site to utilize the interchange and travel north on the Woodinville-Snohomish Road for a right turn onto 240th Street SE. However, the proposed project does not include this mitigation.

h. Given the limited capacity constraints of the adjacent interchanges at SR 522/NE 195th Street and at SR 522/SR 9, City street intersections, and County road intersections that serve the site vicinity, and the vehicle trips and non-motorized trips that would clearly be generated by the project, the County’s previously proposed side by side left turn lanes between the Woodinville-Snohomish Road/240th Street SE intersection and the SR 522 eastbound ramps intersection must, as a condition of approval of the over-all project be fully implemented with Phase 1. Additional measures will also be required to address other unmitigated impacts created by the proposed project.

i. The project documents and its appended transportation analysis offer minimal improvements for other important elements of the transportation environment/infrastructure and related adverse impacts, such as non-motorized safety, connectivity, and circulation. The proposal itself appears to accommodate pedestrian circulation and crossing treatments only along its frontage of 240th Street SE. While limiting pedestrian facilities to frontage
The comment regarding proposed revisions to the future land use map and zoning designations is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The recommendation by both the Planning Commission and the County Executive does not include the above referenced land use or zoning map amendments.
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. Based on the County's EIS scoping process, the Draft EIS only evaluated the City of Arlington docket proposal (ARL3) to adjust the UGA boundary to add 239 acres to the UGA and to remove 321 acres from the UGA for environmental impacts identified during the scoping process including transportation impacts under the Alternative 3 scenario.
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. Based on the County’s EIS scoping process, the Draft EIS only evaluated the City of Arlington docket proposal (ARL3) to adjust the UGA boundary to add 239 acres to the UGA and to remove 321 acres from the UGA for environmental impacts identified during the scoping process under the Alternative 3 scenario. There is a motion before the County Council as part of the 2015 Update of the Comprehensive Plan that requests a one-year rollover of the ARL3 docket proposal to allow for additional analysis by the city which may result in an amended proposal.

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The county has a substantial number of implementation measures in place including concurrency management, transportation demand management, and transit supportive programs that serve to mitigate the transportation impacts of the proposed adjustment of the Arlington UGA. Implementation of these measures can result in reduced trip-making, reduced travel-time delay and higher transit usage.

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. As noted in the Draft EIS, adoption of the docket ARL3 docket request is not anticipated to have any significant effect on petroleum consumption. Future development of either the UGA removal area or the UGA addition area is likely to result in significant additional vehicle trips and additional petroleum consumption. The Draft EIS states that the proposed UGA adjustment would not change the overall future level of urban development, merely its location.
A-007-005
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.

A-007-006
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The Draft EIS determined that providing water and sewer service to the ARL3 UGA expansion area is feasible as the City has indicated sufficient capacity to provide those services. The Draft EIS notes that the upgrading of the sewer infrastructure required to serve the proposed expansion area will be costly. However, the Draft EIS indicates that these infrastructure improvements to serve the UGA expansion area will be less costly than providing sewer and water service to the UGA removal area because the topography is relatively flat, the area is lower in elevation, and there is sufficient capacity at the west boundary of the current UGA.

A-007-007
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The Draft EIS indicates that the ARL3 docket request is unlikely to have any significant effect on the demand for natural gas. Natural gas is not an essential service. Service providers are not required to serve all customers or all areas of the County. Extension of service is based on customer requests and cost feasibility.

The comments on petroleum usage are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The Draft EIS indicates that the ARL3 docket request is unlikely to have any significant effect on the demand for natural gas. Natural gas is not an essential service. Service providers are not required to serve all customers or all areas of the County. Extension of service is based on customer requests and cost feasibility.

The comments on petroleum usage are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The Draft EIS indicates that petroleum usage will be higher in both areas as future development is likely to result in additional vehicle trips. The letter is correct to point out that the removal area is a greater distance to I-5 than expansion area. However, some potential destinations such as Cascade Valley Hospital and downtown Arlington are located closer to the removal area and could result in more vehicle miles traveled from the expansion area.
See Response to A-007-004 regarding petroleum consumption.

**A-007-008**
The Final EIS will contain a corrected Table 3.2-29 to indicate that the Arlington wastewater treatment plant’s rated capacity is 2.67 MGD.

**A-007-009**
Individual responses to each of the comments are included below.

General Comment #1: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

General Comment #2: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

General Comment #3: The commenter notes that a project to install a roundabout at the SR 530/Smokey Point Boulevard intersection is currently in the planning and engineering phase. The Draft EIS analysis using the existing configuration, and potential mitigation measures including a signal, is sufficient for a planning-level, programmatic EIS. Modeling of the intersection as a roundabout can be addressed as part of the project-level design analysis.

General Comment #4: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

General Comment #5: As noted in the Planned Improvements section on Page 3-64 of Volume II, the list of assumed improvement projects for state facilities includes projects on the PSRC’s Transportation 2040 Itemized Investment List that are expected to be completed by the horizon year of 2035 and have identified funding sources. A project to use WSDOT’s I-5 rest stops as a gateway onto city streets was not on
the Itemized Investment List, so it was not considered in the Draft EIS analysis. Should the I-5 rest stop access project go forward, its impacts would be addressed as part of project-level design analysis.
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The analysis has been updated to reflect the suggested language in the Final EIS.
A-008-002

Floodplains are addressed in the analysis of Water Resources (EIS Section 3.1.3 and the corresponding portion of Table 1-2), under the topic of flood hazard areas. Also please note that flood hazard areas have been identified in both the UGA addition area and the area proposed for UGA removal near Sultan (Draft EIS, page 3-43); therefore, granting the docket requests would not remove all floodplain areas from the Sultan UGA.

City of Sultan

The docket requests proposed by the City of Sultan would add 214 acres of unincorporated UGA in two areas north of the city and remove 380 acres northwest of the city limits, for a net reduction of 166 acres of unincorporated UGA. The rate and intensity of development would be expected to increase in areas proposed for UGA addition and decrease in the area proposed for UGA removal.

In the proposed UGA addition areas, Wagley Creek and two unnamed streams would face an elevated risk of adverse effects due to increased levels of development, as would the two small fish-bearing water bodies along the unnamed stream in the addition area east of the city limits. Conversely, the potential for adverse effects on Winters Creek, an unnamed stream, three unnamed water bodies in the area proposed for UGA removal, and on the Sultan River immediately adjacent would likely decrease because development pressure would be reduced. None of these water bodies is on the Section 303(d) list.
The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The suggested edit indicates that the removal area has a floodway that could develop with urban densities and there would be less impacts to land use patterns if it were removed. However, whether the removal area is included or excluded in the UGA, development is restricted by Ordinance. Thus, the Final EIS clarification is as follows:

City of Sultan. The proposal to designate the new UGA area ULDR would be generally consistent with current and planned land uses. No land use incompatibility impacts are anticipated from inclusion areas. The exclusion area would remove an area of floodway unsuited to development.
The requested language additions clarifying the percentage difference cost in service can be added to Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 including with a citation to the City’s letter.

**Page 1-17: City of Sultan.** The proposal meets the criteria of CPP DP-3 since there is no net increase in growth capacity and the area removed is not characterized on the whole by urban growth. Both the removal and addition areas have low-density residential lots. The addition areas would increase in density to ULDR levels. Areas to be removed are lightly developed for the most part, but there are some smaller subdivision lots in one location, separated from other urban areas. Water supply is sufficient, and extension of mains would be needed as areas develop. The City appears to have sewer treatment capacity. In the UGA addition area, there would be a need to plan for and implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. Both the addition and removal area would need to implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. The cost to serve the UGA addition area with sewer is estimated to cost 30-60 percent less than sewer service to the UGA removal area.(City of Sultan, October 2014)

**Page 3-99, paragraph above Table 3.2-12:** The City appears to have sewer treatment capacity. Wastewater treatment plant improvements are planned. Because there is no net increase in growth, there is no net effect on the plant. In the UGA Addition area, there would be a need to plan and implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. The cost to service the UGA addition area with sewer is estimated to cost 30-60 percent less than sewer service to the UGA removal area.(City of Sultan, October 2014)
and construction of service mains within development areas would be required as areas develop. This would be done at the expense of developers as projects are approved and constructed (Sultan 2014). The City’s water treatment plant has sufficient capacity for all anticipated development of the City and the UGA. The proposed UGA reconfiguration is capacity neutral regarding consumption of water in the city as the population allocation remains the same regardless of configuration (Sultan 2014). The water system plan is anticipated to be updated as part of the comprehensive plan update. The water system plan would be recalculated to accommodate removal of the north-west peninsula and inclusion of the north and east addition areas (Sultan 2014).

The City appears to have sewer treatment capacity. Wastewater treatment plant improvements are planned. Because there is no net increase in growth, there is no net effect on the plant. In the UGA Addition area, there would be a need to plan and implement mains to transmit sewage for treatment to the plant. The cost to serve the addition area is anticipated to be 30-60 percent less than for the UGA removal area since nearest transmission mains are almost 1 mile away from the nearest developable part of this area.

### Draft EIS Language under “Distinguishing Impacts of Alternatives”, page 1-17

| Draft EIS Language under “Distinguishing Impacts of Alternatives”, page 1-17 |
| City of Sultan. The proposal meets the criteria of CPP DP-3 since there is no net increase in growth capacity and the area removed is not characterized on the whole by urban growth. Both the removal and addition areas have low-density residential lots. The addition areas would increase in density to ULDR levels. Areas to be removed are lightly developed for the most part, but there are some smaller subdivision lots in one location, separated from other urban areas. Water supply is sufficient, and extension of mains would be needed as areas develop. The City appears to have sewer treatment capacity. In the UGA addition area, there would be a need to plan and implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. |

### Suggested Language

City of Sultan. The proposal meets the criteria of CPP DP-3 since there is no net increase in growth capacity and the area removed is not characterized on the whole by urban growth. Both the removal and addition areas have low-density residential lots. The addition areas would increase in density to ULDR levels. Areas to be removed are lightly developed for the most part, but there are some smaller subdivision lots in one location, separated from other urban areas. Water supply is sufficient, and extension of mains would be needed as areas develop. The City appears to have sewer treatment capacity. In the UGA addition area, there would be a need to plan and implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. Both the addition and removal area would need to implement mains to transmit sewage to the treatment plant. The cost to service the UGA addition areas with sewer is estimated to cost 30-60% less than sewer service to the UGA removal area.

### Justification for requesting language change

The estimated cost of serving the UGA removal area versus the UGA addition areas is an important factor in achieving population growth and a deterrent to development in the current UGA.

---

SM
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10/07/2014
The comment suggests a change based on cost considerations in the sewer service section, 3.2.11. The focus of the Sewer section is comparing the demand for sewer service. The considerations related to cost of service and appropriate boundaries for urban growth is addressed in Section 3.2.2. No text change is recommended.

**City of Sultan**

The City of Sultan’s sewer service area is smaller than the water service area; it is approximately 4.1 square miles and generally follows the City’s UGA boundary. As described in the City of Sultan General 2011 Sewer Plan, its current treatment system services a design flow capacity of 0.8 UGD. Prior to the 2011 Sewer Plan, the City had been experiencing high peak flows and peaking factors; therefore, the City completed an engineering report for wastewater treatment plant upgrades in 2006 to plan for future growth within the UGA. Using the 2006 plan and additional data obtained thereafter, the 2011 Sewer Plan determined that the projected flow rates for the wastewater treatment system would be exceeded between 2009 and 2015 if growth were to occur at or above the planned growth rate of 4.5 percent. At the time of the 2011 Sewer Plan, the City had experienced minimal to no growth between 2007 and 2011, and it was assumed that the system could decrease demand if the City evaluated and rehabilitated its inflow and infiltration, as well as require new development to construct with materials that reduce inflow and infiltration. The sewer plan outlines improvements that are necessary to preserve the integrity and condition of the system for future use (Sultan 2011c).

In 2015 the City of Sultan plans to initiate an update to its wastewater system plan as part of the comprehensive plan update. The wastewater system plan will include both UGA addition areas (Sultan 2014). Existing sewer lines are relatively close to the UGA addition areas (Sultan 2014). The UGA addition areas are also at elevations that do not require lift stations other than a main lift station at the existing station site. The City does not plan to provide additional infrastructure in response to the change in UGA areas and plans to impose a sewer connection moratorium on all development (including within the City limits) if the proposal would exceed force main capacity. The City is in the process of designing a trunk main, therefore, it is expected that the timing of the main upgrade will result in no moratorium on development (Sultan 2014). In addition, the cost of future development (major pipe and facility improvements) in undeveloped areas of UGA is considered developer-funded projects unless oversized providing benefits to the existing customer base (Sultan 2011d). The primary reason for removal of the existing UGA area is due to the infeasibility of connecting to the nearest transmission line which is approximately 1 mile away (Sultan 2014).

**City of Sultan**

Because the proposed UGA addition area would serve fewer housing units compared to the UGA removal area, and because the City has indicated sufficient sewer capacity, there would be minimal effects to the sewer system.

**Suggested Text**

Because the proposed UGA addition area would serve fewer housing units compared to the UGA removal area, and because the City has indicated sufficient sewer capacity, there would be minimal effects to the sewer system.

**City of Sultan**

Because the proposed UGA addition area would serve fewer housing units compared to the UGA removal area, and because the City has indicated sufficient sewer capacity, there would be minimal effects to the sewer system. The expense of providing sewers to the UGA removal area makes development in that area infeasible.
The city of Sultan would like to thank the staff and consultants for their efforts put into this proposal. The city requests the planning commission forward this docket item on to the county council with a recommendation to adopt the city of Sultan’s UGA amendments.

Regards,

Stacy MacGregor, Senior Planner
Department of Community Development
Attached are Community Transit's comments regarding the DEIS prepared for Snohomish County's 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Kate Tourtellot

Kate Tourtellot, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Community Transit
(425) 348-2314
kate.tourtellot@commttrans.org
The proposed amendments to the Transportation Element support the use of 164th Street as an important transit corridor and the importance of infrastructure considerations to support transit. For example, amendments to the Transportation Element designate 164th Street as a Transit Emphasis Corridor and show the arterial as a possible BRT corridor. Additionally, the transportation chapter of the General Policy Plan (GPP TR2.C.2) and amendments to the Transportation Element (Chapter 3.D.2) encourage investment in infrastructure that enhances operation of transit service on Transit Emphasis Corridors. The County is currently working on a project to identify specific needs and potential solutions on several key east-west corridors including 164th Street.
Swift BRT on 164th Street could be a game changer for mobility, livability and economic development along the corridor. As part of the growing network of Swift corridors, this service would provide fast, reliable connections to regional transit on Interstate 5 and I-405 as well as industrial, commercial and retail centers throughout urbanized Snohomish County. This corridor already has significant levels of public transit service. With dense residential development, activity centers and regional connections, the market is ready for a higher level of service investment. Community Transit has the plan to serve this demand and help the County accommodate population and employment growth.

The missing element is infrastructure. Swift relies on transit priority elements like dedicated lanes, queue jumps and signal technology to assure fast, reliable and efficient service. Without infrastructure, more service on 164th Street would be a wasted public investment with transit stuck in slow-moving single occupant vehicle traffic. Implementation of Swift BRT on 164th Street cannot move forward until transit infrastructure issues in the corridor are addressed.

Community Transit is excited to be moving forward with development of the Swift BRT network. We are optimistic that future growth of this system can include 164th Street. The time to begin planning is now. We look forward to working with Snohomish County as you consider infrastructure solutions in the corridor that would enable this vision for improved multimodal mobility.

In addition to the strategic issue of providing transit infrastructure to complete the Swift BRT network, Community Transit is also providing more technical comments regarding both Volumes I (Natural and Built Environments) and II (Transportation) of the DEIS. These comments are attached, Attachment A (Natural and Built Environment) and Attachment B (Transportation).

Sincerely,

Joy Munkers  
Director of Planning & Development

enclosures
The comments are noted regarding the commenter's support for policies. The following clarification is made on page 3-91 regarding the different potential for transit service along SR99 versus 35th Avenue SE:

Section 3.2.2, page 3-91, Transportation 2040 the following (emphasis added):

Congestion and Mobility—All alternatives would add traffic to county and state roads. Alternatives 1 and 3 update the Transportation Element. Alternative 2, the No Action Alternative, has capacity for growth but does not update transportation policies, nor fully update capital plans. For comparative purposes, all alternatives are reviewed with the same transportation network (see Volume II). Concurrency programs would address a match of facilities at the time of growth under all alternatives. More compact growth patterns under Alternative 3’s infill and up designation proposals could be slightly more supportive of transit particularly in major corridor with transit service such as SR 99. Other areas of the SW UGA that would have greater growth, such as the 35th Avenue SE would require improved transit service to meet future demand.

Environment—All alternatives assign urban densities in urban areas and allocate less growth in the rural area, benefiting the environment. Alternative 1 promotes more compact growth in the cities where transit service is more prevalent; Alternative 3 provides for more compact growth and a greater share of higher density and mixed use growth in the Southwest UGA with proposed infill and updesignations. In some areas of the Southwest UGA alternative modes such as transit would be more available (e.g. SR 99) than others (e.g. 35th Avenue SE).
changes in prior response.

However, the section referenced can be clarified on page 3-76, as follows:

There are over 300 proposed FLUM changes. Most of these changes are in the Southwest UGA, with a limited number of proposed changes located near Lake Stevens. Most of the proposed infill changes are at sites where the changes would be consistent with existing adjacent land use designations. These areas are generally meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Along arterial corridors
- Near services and existing or planned transit
- Adjacent to areas already planned for compact mixed-use development
- Near commercial areas that could redevelop to mixed-use areas over time

A-009-004

Individual responses to each of the comments are included below.

Page 1-3: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Page 1-7: The County acknowledges the comment that transit infrastructure is needed to ensure transit speed and reliability. The transportation chapter of the General Policy Plan (GPP TR2) and amendments to the Transportation Element (Chapter 3.D) encourage coordination of infrastructure investments to enhance the operation of transit service.
Page 3-26: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Page 3-29 through 3-33: The commenter is correct that travel time consistency is the metric used to assess reliability in the EIS analysis. This section is intended to demonstrate how increased congestion in the future could affect transit travel times. This metric was chosen since it could be readily forecasted into the future, unlike the other metrics cited. As requested, the County is willing to discuss the reliability analysis further with Community Transit.

Page 3-40: The commenter is correct that the Choice Connections program began in 2013.

A-009-005

Individual responses to each of the comments are included below.

Page 3-64: The County acknowledges that transit priority infrastructure is a key requirement for BRT service. Both the General Policy Plan (GPP TR 2) and the proposed amendments to the Transportation Element (Chapter 3.D) encourage investments in infrastructure that enhance operation of transit service on Transit Emphasis Corridors, many of which will become BRT corridors. The County is currently working on a project to identify specific needs and potential solutions on several key east-west corridors.

Page 3-71: See response to Comment A-015-004.

Page 3-117: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Page 3-118: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.
Appendix A-4: For this planning-level EIS analysis, the County took a conservative approach to project assumptions to ensure impacts were adequately disclosed. Only projects deemed reasonably foreseeable were included so that the network does not reflect unlikely improvements. As the commenter states, transit supportive infrastructure could improve transit reliability if implemented.

Appendix B-4: Table 4 summarizes the transit assumptions that Sound Transit used in the modeling for its 2014 long-range plan update, which forms the basis for the transit network included in the travel demand model. However, additional routes were also included in the county model including those cited in the comment. Table 4 has been revised in the Final EIS to clarify the model's transit assumptions.

Appendix B-5: The projects cited in the comments are reflected in the travel demand model.
Evans, Sally

From: sjbrautwein@comcast.net  
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 3:17 PM  
To: 2015Update  
Subject: 2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments  
Attachments: 2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments – Ashley Place Condo.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Completed

The text of this message is also reproduced in the attached MS Word file “2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments–Ashley Place Condo”

To: Snohomish County Planning Commission:

This letter is in response to action planned and outlined in the

DRAFT SNOHOMISH COUNTY TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
Table 14
Recommended County Arterial Improvement Projects
Projects Needed under Alternatives 1 thru 3
ID W-12
Ash Way from 164 St SW to Gibson Rd
Description: Urban 3-Lane Standards with Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities

This project appears to be driven by principles described in the Puget Sound Regional Council’s Housing Innovations Program “Featured Tool: Parking Reductions”. This tool focuses on the desirability of reducing parking standards as a means of reducing the cost of housing in new developments; it lists other salutary outcomes of reducing parking standards, all couched in terms of how developers of new housing projects can implement reduced parking standards in their plans. None of these salutary outcomes are demonstrated to apply to pre-existing housing developments. They do not address issues experienced by residents in pre-existing housing developments. The following information provides an example of how parking reductions will affect a pre-existing homing tract.
I am a resident of Ashley Place Condominium, located at the intersection of 134th ST SW and Ash Way, in unincorporated Snohomish County. Our condominium is comprised of 53 stand-alone units and was completed in 2005. Project W-12 will remove all on-street parking on Ash Way, including that in the 135th St block, which are currently available to residents of and visitors to Ashley Place Condominium.

For all of its 9-year existence, we residents of Ashley Place have been aware that the 20-foot wide access road within our compound is not available for parking. We have come to rely on 16 slots of on-street parking available on Ash Way. (Indeed, this public parking is identified as “overflow parking” in real estate listings of properties in Ashley Place Condominium.) “Overflow parking” has been our collective (and inadequate) answer to the problem of lack of parking at our homes. This problem has become more acute within the last few months, with the sacrifice of 4 of the aforementioned 16 parking slots to a new bus stop that has been established at our entrance. The implementation of widening of Ash Way and resulting loss of our “overflow parking” will undoubtedly degrade the quality of our neighborhood and result in a decrease in the value of our property.

This description of the consequences of county action that will remove parking for pre-existing housing is surely echoed by similar situations in numerous other housing tracts within Snohomish County. Although it is reasonable and prudent for the County to make plans to accommodate an anticipated population growth by 2035, it is the urgent plea of current home-owners in the affected areas that the County Commission be as creative as possible in balancing the competing forces of the needs of the population of the future with the plight of the population of the present.

One possible solution would be to alternate parking areas on either side of Ash Way, similar to the arrangement found in Edmonds, on 76th AVE W from 205th ST SW to 228th ST SW, as shown in the accompanying screenshot from Google maps (north is to the right).

Thank you for your considerations of our concerns.

Respectfully,

Steven N. Trautwein, President
Ashley Place Home Owners Association
1118 135th ST SW
Everett, WA 98204

Phone: 573.579.2240

Email: sjtrautwein@comcast.net
The commenter raises concerns about the potential removal of parking on Ash Way in the vicinity of 134th Street SW due to proposed Project W-12, which would widen Ash Way to three lanes with bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Draft EIS is a planning-level, programmatic document that identified Project W-12 as a potential solution to expected congestion problems on Ash Way. Should Project W-12 go forward, its parking impacts would be addressed during the project-level planning process.

I am a resident of Ashley Place Condominium, located at the intersection of 134th St SW and Ash Way, in unincorporated Snohomish County. Our condominium is comprised of 53 stand-alone units and was completed in 2005. Project W-12 will remove all on-street parking on Ash Way, including that in the 135th St block, which are currently available to residents of and visitors to Ashley Place Condominium.

For all of its 9-year existence, we residents of Ashley Place have been aware that the 20-foot-wide access road within our compound is not available for parking. We have come to rely on 16 slots of on-street parking available on Ash Way. (Indeed, this public parking is identified as "overflow parking" in real estate listings of properties in Ashley Place Condominium.) "Overflow parking" has been our collective (and inadequate) answer to the problem of lack of parking at our homes. This problem has become more acute within the last few months, with the sacrifice of 4 of the aforementioned 16 parking slots to a new bus stop that has been established at our entrance. The implementation of widening of Ash Way and resulting loss of our "overflow parking" will undoubtedly degrade the quality of our neighborhood and result in a decrease in the value of our property.

This description of the consequences of county action that will remove parking for pre-existing housing is surely echoed by similar situations in numerous other housing tracts within Snohomish County. Although it is reasonable and prudent for the County to make plans to accommodate an anticipated population growth by 2035, it is the urgent plea of current home-owners in the affected areas that the County Commission be as creative as possible in balancing the competing forces of the needs of the population of the future with the plight of the population of the present.
One possible solution would be to alternate parking areas on either side of Ash Way, similar to the arrangement found in Edmonds, on 76th AVE W from 205th ST SW to 228th ST SW, as shown in the accompanying screenshot from Google maps (north is to the right).

Thank you for your considerations of our concerns.

Respectfully,

Steven N. Trautwein, President
Ashley Place Home Owners Association
1118 135th ST SW
Everett, WA 98204

Phone: 573.579.2240
Email: sjctrautwein@comcast.net
Lollis, Lori

From: Carol <carol@aramburu-eustis.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 4:53 PM
To: Lollis, Lori
Subject: FW: 2015 Comp Plan Update - Comments on DEIS
Attachments: 2014-10-8 NSWP DEIS comment to SnoCoPC.pdf

Carol Cohoe
Aramburu & Eustis, LLP

From: Carol [mailto:carol@aramburu-eustis.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 4:52 PM
Cc: Rick Aramburu (rick@aramburu-eustis.com); Peter Eglick (peglick@eklaw.com)
Subject: 2015 Comp Plan Update - Comments on DEIS

Ms. Evans and Ms. Strandberg, please see comment letter attached.

Carol Cohoe
ARAMBURU & EUSTIS, LLP
720 Third Avenue
Pacific Building Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone (206) 625-9815
Facsimile (206) 623-1375
This message may be protected by the attorney-client and/or work product
privilege. If you received this message in error please notify us and
destroy the message. Thank you.
October 8, 2014

Snohomish County Planning Commission
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Terri Strandberg,
SEPA Responsible Official
Snohomish County Planning & Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Via Email: c/o sally.evans@snooco.org
Via Email: 2015update@snooco.org

Re: Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update Draft EIS: Comments from Neighbors to Save Wellington Hills Park

Dear Planning Commission and Ms. Strandberg:

This office represents Neighbors to Save Wellington Hills Park (NSWP), a Washington nonprofit corporation concerned with emerging plans for the development of the Wellington Hills site. The Wellington Hills site is a 104 acre property located in the rural area of Snohomish County near the King County line. The Parks and Recreation Department has issued plans for intensive development of athletic fields, more than 100,000 square feet of buildings and a parking lot with more than 700 stalls on this site. NSWP believes that the current plans for this development are inconsistent with the rural area. As the DEIS, volume 2 states: "Rural lands include those where open space, the natural landscape, and vegetation predominate over the built environment and where residential and economic opportunities consistent with rural character are found."

NSWP has asked me to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the revisions to the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan. In general, the plan is deficient in several areas, requiring additional analysis and documentation. Our detailed comments are as follows.
1. **FAILURE TO ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PARK DEVELOPMENT.**

Beginning at page 3-140, there is a discussion of how parks will be impacted by the Comprehensive Plan Update. In these pages there is discussion of park inventory, park programs, and level of service standards for parks. There is discussion of the 2007 Parks and Recreation plan and the status of various projects. Wellington Hills County Park is mentioned under the “Special Use” category as providing potential athletic field development.

However, this section of the DEIS fails to discuss the impacts of developing large parks such as Wellington Hills. Under the GMA, each comprehensive plan must include a parks and recreation element under RCW 36.70A.070(8). In turn, the Parks and Recreation Element must include “estimates of park and recreation demand for a ten-year period” as well as “an evaluation of facilities and service needs.” While some facilities are discussed (including the Wellington Hills site), there is no evaluation of why such a facility as proposed is needed and whether such a facility will meet community needs, especially within the service area of the proposal. This is a central defect of both the Parks and Recreation Element and the DEIS, that they fail to consider or address these issues and impacts.

Under SEPA, the DEIS must analyze the environmental impacts of implementing the comprehensive plan, including the Parks and Recreation Element proposed by staff. However, once again the DEIS is deficient. There is no discussion of any kind of the impacts of developing even the projects discussed. It is obvious that proposals such as intensive use of the Wellington Hills site, as planned by the Parks and Recreation Department, will have multiple and serious environmental impacts, including impacts on traffic, lighting, noise, stormwater, impervious surfaces, and rural character. The DEIS is fatally flawed without thorough analysis of these impacts.

2. **FAILURE TO HAVE A PARK IMPROVEMENT PLAN AS A PART OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SEPA REVIEW.**

As described at page 3-140 of the DEIS, Snohomish County has previously prepared, and adopted, two Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Plans, the first in 2001 and the second in 2007.

Also as described at page 3-140, a Draft Parks and Recreation Plan was prepared in 2013, but it has subsequently been abandoned.

A new Park Improvement Plan is expected to be created in 2015 to be adopted as part of the 2016-2021 Capital Improvement Program. The Park Improvement Plan will include descriptions of park projects to be funded in 2016, as well as funding sources and schedules for completion.

It is clear from the requirements of GMA for the Parks and Recreation Element of the

---

**C-002-001**

The purpose of the EIS is to address potential impacts associated with the adoption of the County’s updated comprehensive plan, which includes as one of its elements a Park and Recreation Element. The adoption of plans, policies and programs are considered “nonproject” actions under SEPA (WAC 197-11-704(1)(b)). The scope and content of an EIS on nonproject proposals is set forth in WAC 197-11-442 and is not intended to include analysis of potential impacts associated with single site specific projects. See WAC 197-11-442(3) (stating; “site specific analysis are not required”). Rather, the purpose of an EIS on a nonproject proposal is to address alternative policies as follows: “The EIS’s discussion of alternatives for a comprehensive plan, community plan, or other areawide zoning or for shoreline or land use plans shall be limited to a general discussion of the impacts of alternate proposals for policies contained in such plans, for land use or shoreline designations, and for implementation measures.” WAC 197-11-442(4). Project specific impacts associated with any single site specific park project (such as the proposed Wellington Hills County Park), would be subject to separate SEPA review as a project action at such time as land use permitting or other project specific action is undertaken.

The Draft EIS programmatically addresses the impacts of 20-years of growth and the demand for and distribution of parks and recreation facilities. See Draft EIS Chapter 2 Section 2.4.3 Level of Analysis which indicates the EIS is non-project and site specific development would be evaluated under Phased Review consistent with SEPA. The non-project Draft EIS addresses system level and cumulative impacts of development including transportation, stormwater, and other natural and built environment impacts.

The Draft EIS was issued with the Draft Parks and Recreation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, alternative LOS measures (Appendix E White Paper), and a Capital Facility Plan. The Capital Facility Plan can
be amended annually or as otherwise allowed by GMA. At the time of the Park Improvement Plan development, the County will determine if impacts are sufficiently addressed by the Final EIS or whether additional SEPA review is required at that time.

Comprehensive Plan that discussion of facilities to be developed must be a part the continuing review of the plan. However, it appears that the Parks Improvement Plan will not be available for public review until after SEPA review is completed. The public must have an opportunity to comment on the Park Improvement Plan, either under the Parks and Recreation Element or the Capital Improvement Plan before the Planning Commission. By delaying the preparation and public dissemination of the Park Improvement Plan until next year, both the public and the Planning Commission are denied the opportunity to address this important plan. So too under SEPA, there will not be discussion of the environmental impacts of the Parks Improvement Plan in the DEIS or FEIS.

The draft and final EIS are prepared to allow decision makers to make fully informed decisions concerning alternative courses of action. The DEIS as prepared fails to meet minimum requirements under SEPA because it fails to discuss the impacts of park development and because the required evaluation of proposed facilities is not presented, but delayed apparently until after the final EIS is prepared.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the DEIS. We look forward to additional SEPA documents that correct the serious deficiencies in the DEIS,

Sincerely yours,

ARAMBURY & EUSTIS, LLP

J. Richard Aramburu

SnoCoEIS
Snohomish County EIS -- Comments and Responses
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The area is developed currently at urban densities. Per SCC 30.23.032 Urban Residential Zone categories - Bulk matrix, the lot coverage by buildings is 35% in single family zones and 30% in the LDMR zone; the setbacks are greater in the LDMR zone compared to the single family zones. Thus the pattern of development related to impervious areas is likely not different under the present or proposed zoning. The setbacks would be greater under LDMR than single family zones, and the Uniform Building and Fire codes would apply to any new or redevelopment. Thus, no change to the Draft EIS analysis of stormwater or fire protection are proposed. Redevelopment would need to comply with County stormwater regulations in any case.

From a broader stormwater system perspective the area developed prior to modern stormwater regulations and much of the area is not part of a public stormwater infrastructure system. However the County is considering areawide opportunities for improvements as discussed with the Planning Commission in October 2014:

The outlet for Lake Serene is not part of the County’s public storm water drainage system, and the County has records of flooding in that location as early as 1981. Originally a natural open drainage channel that discharged into a ravine, it is now a mix of a series of privately installed pipes that “tightlined” the original drainage channel, with some areas left in a natural state. Over the years, the County has stepped in to make emergency repairs to sections of the line largely to protect the County roadway under which the drainage channel also runs.

Although the outlet for Lake Serene is not part of the public system for purposes of the County being able to step in and upgrade or maintain the outlet, Lake Serene does continue to drain much of the surrounding...
area. This area includes older neighborhoods, including properties adjacent to the lake itself, that have no storm water detention or treatment, and newer neighborhoods which are required to install storm water detention and treatment. In consideration of these circumstances, the County is proposing a project to improve the outlet of Lake Serene and reduce flooding for private properties around the lake. The project to improve the drainage at Lake Serene would be partially funded by the County, to address potential impacts of development, and partially funded by private property owners, to address the benefits their properties will receive. The funding has not yet been secured.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of zoning map amendments in this area to LDMR.
Everett, WA 98204
All attendees are granted three minutes to voice their opinion. We want to show the council our community's strength in numbers. Please come prepared to say something or to raise your hand/stand up, when we ask how many people are from the Lake Serene Community and are concerned about rezoning. Also, please note, it's possible, the meeting may carry on to October 8th and 9th as there are various other city groups; please attend the October 7th meeting if you can.

Lake Drainage
The County Surface Water Dept has been working on a number of different approaches for re-engineering the outflow from the lake. Broadly speaking, the choices are between improving the existing system (probably the least expensive option), or taking the outflow to public lines. The costs may need to be shared with the community. A meeting with Surface Water to discuss options is tentatively scheduled for Mid-November, so we will keep you informed. We are very grateful for the county's time at the ice cream social and look forward to meeting with them again.

Thank you,

The Lake Serene Community Association
The preference for Alternative 1 is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.
Alternative 1 will allocate lower population and employment growth to the unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and rural/resource areas, and direct this growth into the metropolitan city of Everett, and the core city of Lynnwood, both of which currently have or will have the needed multi-modal local and regional transportation facilities. Alternative 1 would allocate about 92% of new population growth into the UGAs and about 8% in the rural areas, which will best help our environment by providing opportunities for people to use transportation systems other than cars and will help reduce the pollutants to our air and water. Within the UGAs, about one quarter of the growth would go to the unincorporated UGA and three quarters to cities.

Alternative 1 meets the goals of the Growth Management Act (GMA), Vision 2040 and the Multi-County Planning Policies (MPPs). It has the least amount of significant adverse environmental impacts to our county, and locates more of the future growth into our cities, which includes the most growth into Everett. Snohomish County’s only metropolitan city, that can provide adequate urban services and transportation infrastructure in the most cost effective way that new residents will need and want. The MPPs provide that the region, countywide planning bodies, and local jurisdictions will work together to set population and employment growth targets consistent with the regional vision. So the population and employment targets must be consistent with the regional vision. It is clear from the recent Buildable Lands Report that Snohomish County’s existing cities and urban growth areas can accommodate the projected growth without expanding urban growth areas, which is important to help ensure adequate densities in our urban areas where infrastructure exists or is planned and funded to be built.

Alternative 1 meets the goals, policies and objectives of the county’s General Policy Plan, giving more opportunities to provide for transit-oriented development in our urban centers and at major transit areas. With the Light-Link Rail in Lynnwood by 2023 and with the high probability of light rail from Lynnwood to Everett before the end of this planning period, ensuring our cities along these important transportation corridors will also be planning for future growth will benefit all residents, provide for a more sound economy, and best protect our environment from impacts from climate change.

Alternative 1 will best provide for urban densities to protect our rural and resource lands as well as our water quality and supplies. Compact higher density urban growth areas brings significant benefits. Here are some examples that you are all familiar with:

Compact, higher density urban growth areas reduce the costs of public facilities and services. This can help control costs for taxpayers and ratepayers.

If urban growth areas provide for high density zoning, then an abundant supply of housing can be provided. Higher density housing types also tend to be more affordable.

---

More compact urban growth areas protect working farms and working forests from development. This allows the farms to continue to produce food and forests to continue to produce fiber. Protecting farms is important because in the United States most urban development is “taking place on the best soils.” Further, some urban growth area expansions in Snohomish County, at Island Crossing and the Foster Farm, were designated agricultural lands before they were included in the urban growth area.

As the percentage of urban development and impervious surfaces increase within a basin, water quality and biotic integrity decline. So focusing development within urban growth areas helps maintain water quality and protects drinking water supplies. This is why the Puget Sound Action Agenda directs growth into existing cities and towns and calls for the protection of rural areas and natural resource lands including farms and forests. Consistent with this policy direction, the action agenda also calls for the implementation of Vision 2040.

Alternative 1 will cost the taxpayers less for transportation improvements and will help reduce the amount of traffic on our rural roads. Again, and very importantly, Alternative 1 will have the least amount of environmental impacts to our air and water quality, which are significant contributors to climate change and the acidification of Puget Sound.

**C-004-002**

Comments regarding Alternative 2 and lack of the Comprehensive Plan Update and environmental implications are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Note that the EIS Air Quality analysis found "Because 90 percent new growth is targeted to urban areas, both incorporated and unincorporated, and employment growth is consistent among all alternatives, transportation impacts to air quality on a regional scale would be similar among alternatives."

---


5 Id. at 177.


7 Id. at p. 31.
C-004-003
The comments regarding lack of support for Alternative 3 are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Draft EIS notes that transportation air quality impacts are similar among alternatives.

C-004-004
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The proposed redesignation to P/IU is not considered a residential, commercial, or industrial land use designation and does not increase population or employment capacity. However, the proposal complies with the intent of GPP LU Policy 1.A.10 to require consistency with the GMA and the CPPs and compliance with CPP DP-2, which permits expanding a UGA to include community facilities such as churches and parks that primarily serve urban populations within the UGA.

C-004-005
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The City of Arlington docket request (ARL3) would remove 321 acres of land from the Arlington Urban Growth Area (UGA) that is within the current city limits located along the eastern UGA boundary and redesignate as Rural Residential (RR). Concurrently, the City proposes to add a 239 acre expansion of the northwest UGA boundary and redesignate from RR and Rural Urban Transition Area to Urban Medium Density Residential. The ARL3 docket request to adjust the UGA was analyzed in the Draft EIS under Alternative 3 and included an evaluation to determine consistency with relevant local, regional, and state plans and policies (see Draft EIS Section 3.2.2 Plans and Policies). In order to remove the 321 acres of land in Arlington’s city limits from City jurisdiction, de-annexation would also be required. The Draft EIS concluded that the ARL3 docket request meets the criteria of Countywide Planning Policy DP-3 for a UGA adjustment since there is no net increase in population capacity, the area to be removed is not characterized by urban development, and the removal area would be...
While it is unfortunate for the city that the price of providing those services may be more expensive than previously thought, expanding to the west of I-5 creates another set of problems. For example, Countywide Planning Policy DP-1e provides "[b]oundaries such as natural features, roads, or special purpose district boundaries when feasible."] Currently, I-5 provides an identifiable western boundary for the City of Arlington; expanding west of I-5 will lose this identifiable boundary and the city is not proposing any new identifiable physical boundary. In addition, crossing I-5 will require extending public facilities and services under the freeway, increasing costs to the city and property owners.

As stated in the county's staff report, "the ARL3 proposal was originally submitted to the county by the October 31, 2012, docket deadline as a 3.39 acre expansion of the UGA along its northwest boundary. The above deadline was the last opportunity to submit a major docket proposal (e.g., alteration of a UGA or a substantial policy change), for possible final action coinciding with the 2015 update of the comprehensive plan. The ARL3 UGA expansion proposal was evaluated by PDS for consistency with the initial docket review criteria in chapter 30.74 SCC. PDS concluded that the ARL3 proposal did not meet all of the initial review criteria including inconsistency with the State Growth Management Act (GMA), the Multi-County Planning Policies (MPPs) and the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) and recommended to the county council that the proposal not be further processed.”

In addition, the Transportation Element shows a higher shortfall of dollars needed for infrastructure for Alternative 3, which includes four projects for the Arlington UGA expansion across Interstate 5. This expansion would allow medium density residential that will be directly adjacent to commercially designated farmland. Allowing such residential density near farmland has the consequences of putting pressure on neighboring farmland to be changed into other uses. People tend to complain of farm noises, smells, and slow-moving tractors. Just like in the case of Island Crossing, once sewer service is available to neighboring land, the city can make the argument (as they did with Island Crossing) that this land is no longer functional as farmland and has become urban in nature and therefore should be used for urban development.

Snohomish County has a responsibility to its farmers and present and future residents to stop the threats for conversion of farmland. We recommend that this UGA swap be denied since this application violates the GMA and the Countywide Planning Policies and will replicate the same problem the city is trying to solve—high capital facility costs.

EVR1—While we do not support conversion of agricultural land, it appears that this land cannot be farmed and part of it is already being used as a mitigation site; based on that information, we will not oppose this proposal.

---

10 Countywide Planning Policies for Snohomish County p. 21 (EF, June 25, 2011).

Additionally, the proposed UGA expansion would maintain a UGA boundary that provides a distinct edge between urban and rural uses according to criteria in Policy LU 1.C.1 of the General Policy Plan. The outer boundaries of the proposed UGA expansion area are primarily defined by roadways (200th St. NE, 23rd Ave. NE, 188th St. NE, 19th Ave. NE, and 184th St. NE) which are considered physical features for purposes of delineating a boundary. The Draft EIS determined that providing water and sewer service to the ARL3 UGA expansion area is feasible as the city has indicated sufficient capacity to provide those services. The Draft EIS notes that the upgrading of the sewer infrastructure required to serve the proposed expansion area will be costly. However, the Draft EIS indicates that these infrastructure improvements to serve the UGA expansion area will be less costly than providing sewer and water service to the UGA removal area because the topography is relatively flat, the area is lower in elevation, and there is sufficient capacity at the west boundary of the current UGA. The Draft EIS noted that potential transportation impacts can be expected for the ARL3 docket proposal. The Draft EIS listed three recommended mitigation measures for intersections potentially impacted by the ARL3 expansion area. The ARL3 docket proposal is not projected to cause significant unavoidable adverse impacts to any County arterial. The ARL3 proposed UGA expansion is adjacent to Arlington’s city limits and Interstate-5 on the east, adjacent to the Marysville city limits on the south and adjacent to designated Rural Residential lands on the north, west and south. The UGA expansion area is not adjacent to any designated farmlands.

C-004-006

The comment noting characteristics of the Everett proposal and lack of opposition to its inclusion in the UGA are forwarded to County decision
The comment noting lack of opposition to the Stanwood proposal has been forwarded to the County decision makers.

C-004-007
The comments regarding opposition to the Sultan UGA proposal are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Please see Draft EIS Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment and Appendix B for a discussion of growth capacity and targets.

The Sultan UGA proposal has been recommended with amendments - only the exclusion would be authorized - as part of the recommendations by the County Executive and the Planning Commission. The inclusion area would not be added.

C-004-008
The comments regarding elimination of RUTAs are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The proposal has not been included in any of the Draft EIS alternatives. The County may consider it in a future docket or Comprehensive Plan Update process.

The comments regarding changing net minimum densities from 4-6 units per acre to 4 units per acre have been forwarded to the County decision makers.

The changes proposed to GPP LU Policy 3.A.2 were included in the Planning Commission recommendation.

We recommend that Policy 2.A.1 not be amended to reduce the range of required minimum urban densities from four to six dwelling units to four dwelling units. One way of encouraging housing affordability and the efficient use of land, which reduces costs for both taxpayers and developers, is to set minimum densities. Policy 2.A.1 now requires that the minimum density must be four to six units per acre. The proposed amendments would reduce this to four units per acre. While the range in this policy does allow a minimum of four dwelling units per acre, but including the six units per acre jurisdictions may consider setting a higher minimum density. To support transit requires at least seven dwelling units per net acre.11 Given rising housing costs and the limited resources counties and cities have to build infrastructure, the county should consider deleting the four rather than the six dwelling units per acre and raising the minimum density to seven dwelling units per acre.


We support the characteristics of urban centers in Policy 3.A.2 and the specific distance criteria in policy 3.A.3. An overarching goal of Puget Sound Regional Council’s Vision 2040 states that “the region will focus growth within already urbanized areas to create walkable, compact, and Transit Oriented Communities that maintain unique local character.”12 However, Policy 3.A.2 would better fit this Vision 2040 goal if it contained criteria for planning for transit-oriented communities. We recommend that the policy incorporate the measures from our report Transit-Oriented Communities: A Blueprint for Washington State.13 Research documented in Transit-Oriented Communities shows that these measures produce valuable community and environmental benefits consistent with Vision 2040. Our additions are double underlined and our deletions double struck through:

3.A.2 Urban Centers shall [(be compact (generally not more than 1.5 square miles), pedestrian-oriented areas within designated Urban Growth Areas with good access to higher frequency transit and urban services. Pedestrian orientation includes pedestrian circulation, pedestrian scaled facilities and pedestrian convenience. These locations are intended to develop and redevelop with a mix of residential, commercial, office and public uses at higher densities, oriented to transit and designed for pedestrian circulation. Urban Centers should also include urban services and reflect high quality urban design. Urban Centers shall emphasize the public realm (open spaces, parks and plazas) and create a sense of place (identity). Urban Centers will develop/redevelop over time and may develop in phases.)] be located within a UGA and:

---

11 Boris Pashkarev & Jeffrey Zupan, Public Transportation and Land Use Policy p. 30 (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1977) “[densities in the 2 to 7 dwellings per acre range produced only marginal use of public transportation ...]”. Cited page enclosed with this letter in a separate email.


Thank you for your comment. This land use policy was extensively re-written in 2010 as part of a package of GPP and Future Land Use Map amendments pertaining to the County’s Cathcart properties. A separate policy LU 5.B.6a was also adopted in 2010 relating to the nearby properties in the adjacent lands referred to as the Cathcart “L.” The proposal evaluated in the Draft EIS would retain policy LU 5.B.6, but repeal policy LU 5.B.6.

C-004-009

We support this policy wholeheartedly. Futurewise worked several years ago with the county to adopt this policy as part of the GPP. It is important that we use the county land at...
The comments regarding small scale freeway interchange commercial areas are noted. The case referenced is specific to the facts in Grant County and whether such designation was appropriate given GMA requirements. Snohomish County has considered GMA requirements (RCW 36.70a.070(5)) for limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRD). No future land use map changes are proposed. The County's policies on LAMIRDS are not substantively changing in this Comprehensive Plan Update; one policy that has been implemented is proposed for removal.

¶ 31 We begin our analysis with amendment 10–12. First, Ellison argues the hearings board erred in deciding the travel center would not be “isolated” as required by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii) and KCCP 8.5.8(a). The hearings board defined “isolated” according to Whitaker v. Grant County, No. 99–1–0019, at 13–14 (E. Wash. Growth Mgmt. H’gs Bd. Nov. 1, 2004), which decided proposed developments on contiguous Type 3 LAMIRDS would not be isolated but would permit low-density sprawl. Thus, the hearings board concluded the proposed development must stand apart from other similar uses. Giving this GMA interpretation substantial weight, we reject Ellison’s argument because the undisputed facts show a fuel station and retail store exist on the Type 3 LAMIRD across the highway from the proposed development. This is a sufficient quantity of evidence to persuade a fair-minded person the travel center would not be isolated from other similar uses. In reaching this decision, the hearings board correctly interpreted and applied the law upon thorough reasoning with due consideration for the facts.

Second, Ellison argues the hearings board erred in deciding the travel center would not be “small scale” as required by RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)(iii) and KCCP 8.5.8(a) and (c). The hearings board defined “small scale” according to state and local standards for Type 3 LAMIRDS, which require proposed developments to be appropriate for and visually compatible with a rural community. Thus, the hearings board concluded the proposed development must be small relative to surrounding uses. Giving this GMA interpretation substantial weight, we reject Ellison’s argument because the undisputed facts detailed below support the hearings board’s decision.14

We recommend the policies be amended to require that “small-scale, freeway interchange commercial uses” be isolated and small-scale. The development regulations applicable to these areas should also be update to incorporate these requirements.

---

The comments regarding rural densities and water availability are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The comment regarding minimum lot size for rural areas is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The focus of the present Comprehensive Plan Update is accommodating the 20-year growth projection in a manner that minimizes growth allocated to rural areas. The County growth trends have shown continuing focus of growth in urban areas instead of rural areas. The County does have other incentives to protect agricultural lands including a transfer of development rights (TDR) program.
C-004-013
The comment regarding support for Affordable Housing policies is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

C-004-014
Thank you for the suggested General Policy Plan (GPP) language additions. The Natural Environment chapter includes a section on Climate Change and Sustainability. The first suggested policy on transportation and greenhouse gas emissions may be addressed through Policies TR 6.D.2 and NE 10.B.2. The second and third suggested policies are covered under Goal NE 11 and the associated objectives and policies. The County Council may consider these suggested policies as a part of their review.
Rural Arterials with Urban Levels of Service: Rural Arterials with Urban Traffic are County arterial roadways outside of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) that are primarily accommodating higher volumes of traffic between or oriented to UGAs and rural areas of more intensive commercial development. As noted on Page 3-15 of the Draft EIS, Volume II; the County’s level of service (LOS) standards reflect the concept that the more intense the land use surrounding the arterial unit, the lower the LOS that can be expected and tolerated. Rural Arterials with Urban Traffic are not directly within UGAs, but they connect UGAs thus attracting traffic that is more urban in nature.

Urban Arterials: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Transit Emphasis Corridors: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Employer Commute Trip Reduction (CTR): The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM): The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Concurrency Amendments: The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Amendments to Chapter 30.66B SCC, Concurrency and Road Impact Mitigation, will be considered after the adoption of the Transportation Element to implement changes that have been made to the plan.
Employer Commute Trip Reduction (CTR)
According to the TE, "In 2013, Snohomish County and eight other Snohomish County jurisdictions submitted an alternate CTR plan through the WSDOT pilot rulemaking for implementing the State Commute Trip Reduction Law. WSDOT approved the Snohomish County alternate plan as one of five adopted statewide to run through 2017. The alternate CTR plan focuses on both large and moderately sized employers in the more urban parts of the county where there is a higher level of transit services. In addition to the requirements contained in the CTR ordinance, the plan calls for increased support and incentives for employees at these employment sites." We commend the county for expanding the focus of the CTR to include more employers in the county.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
According to the TE, TDM refers to a set of strategies aimed at maximizing the efficiency of the transportation system by reducing automobile transportation demand, particularly during the most congested times of the day. Reducing such demand can be achieved in a variety of ways, including:

- Travelers switching from driving alone in a single occupant vehicle (SOV) to carpooling in a high occupancy vehicle (HOV), vanpooling or using transit
- Travelers switching from driving to biking or walking
- Travelers changing the time of day of their trip to avoid the most congested periods
- Travelers eliminating trips through consolidation of trips, flexible work schedules, or telecommuting.

There are many benefits to a TDM strategy including the reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), improving air quality, alleviating traffic congestion, preserving roadway capacity, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

We comment the county for their efforts at TDM, including the adoption of proposed SCC 30.66B.600, and support current and future efforts.

Concurrency Amendments

SCC 30.66B.110 Designation of ultimate capacity pp. 19 and 20 of 67
Facilities, really roads, designated as being at ultimate capacity should have all planned pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities not just vehicle lanes. This is particularly important for ultimate capacity facilities as the concept is that alternative travel modes will be used to help alleviate congestion. So we recommend that SCC 30.66B.110(5)(a) and (b) be amended to read as follows with our additions double underlined and our deletions double struck through.

(a) The total number of vehicle lanes and the built pedestrian, bicycle, transit facilities are consistent with the adopted transportation element of the county comprehensive plan and the facility meets the ((standards of the Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS))) EDDS; or
(b) All of the following apply:

(i) The number of general-purpose travel lanes (excluding turn lanes) and the built
pedestrian, bicycle, transit facilities are consistent with the adopted transportation and
park and recreation elements (if appropriate):

[No additional changes are proposed to SCC 30.66B.110(5)(a) and (b)]

Also, as development continues to funnel traffic to an ultimate capacity facility, the
increased traffic may lead to safety problems and the County should have the ability to
require mitigation to address these safety problems. So we recommend that SCC
30.66B.110(6) be amended to read as follows with our additions double underlined and
our deletions double struck through.

(6) Developments impacting arterial units designated as ultimate capacity will be
required to provide additional mitigation pursuant to SCC [(30.66B.160(2)(e))]
30.66B.160(2)(d) for the purpose of improving efficiency, preserving roadway capacity,
and improving operations, and improving motor vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit
safety.

SCC 30.66B.165, Arterial unit in arrears - special circumstances, on p. 30 of 67.
SCC 30.66B.165 currently requires that where a traffic signal is needed to meet the level of
service standards, but the traffic signal warrants are not met, the development may
proceed as long as the other level of service and transit improvements are constructed. The
amendments to SCC 30.66B.165 eliminate the requirement to construct transit
improvements. We think the transit improvements should be required as they will be
helpful addressing the congestion likely to occur because the traffic signal is not being
installed.

SCC 30.66B.225, Comprehensive plan amendment - analysis of change in capacity needs,
p. 37 of 67.
We support this section, which requires an analysis of the transportation impacts of a
comprehensive plan amendment generating more than 25 trips. This will help the county
and the applicant understand the transportation impacts of the amendment and help
evaluate whether the amendment meets the community needs and makes sense for the
developer.

SCC 30.66B.310, Road system impact fee - required, on p. 37 of 67 & SCC 30.66B.340, Road
system impact fee - timing of payment, p. 40 of 67.
One of the changes proposed to SCC 30.66B.310 is to provide that a project pays the road
system impact fee in effect when the project is determined to be complete. While we
recognize this rule was previously in SCC 30.66B.340, the Washington State Court of
Appeals has held that local governments should require developments to pay the impact
fees in effect when the building permit is issued. As the court wrote:
Thank you for your comment. Your statement of preference and support for the updated policies of the Parks Chapter of the GPP will be forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.

C-004-015

The Legislature has stated that the indirect effects of growth can be recovered. If the fee were frozen, then new growth could take place without the developer paying its fair share for improving public facilities. The developer could be paying an impact fee that reflects a planning effort and a cost that is no longer relevant. The [transportation impact fees] TIFs must be calculated when the growth is to occur, at the time of the building permits; otherwise cities would be underfunded to pay for the indirect costs of new growth.20

This is particularly important since the county road levy, state grants, and federal grants are not keeping up with transportation needs. Snohomish County needs to require that the impact fees paid are those in effect when the building permits are issued.

We have not had time to find information related to the last update of the impact fee schedule. Our recommendation is that if the impact fees have not been updated in the last couple of years, they need to be reviewed and updated during this comprehensive plan update.

Parks and Comprehensive Plan Update

C-004-016

We support the new Parks Chapter of the GPP. These Goals and Policies will help ensure an adequate supply of park land for Snohomish County as growth and develop continue under any of the three Alternatives. However, clearly it will be a less financial burden to provide the needed parks under Alternative 1 since no additional parkland will be necessary to serve the Alternative 1 growth target and will require a smaller amount of investment for needed park facilities.

Regarding the Park Element, there are two Park Level of Service scenarios being proposed (one that is currently used for community parks only, and the second scenario that includes neighborhood parks, trails and regional parks as well as community parks). We support the second scenario. Snohomish County working collaboratively with cities for neighborhood parks that will eventually be annexed into cities will best provide more opportunities for residents to enjoy their communities, the outdoors, and will help lead to healthier, happier lives. Again, planning for additional park land and facilities will be more financially achievable under Alternative 1, as only 0.66 parks will be needed under Alternative 1, and 2.37 parks would be needed under Alternative 2 and 3.

We support the policies in the Park Element, and the implementation strategies.

Mr. Guy Palumbo
Snohomish Planning Commission
2015 Comprehensive Plan Update
Public Hearing, October 7, 2014
Page 16 of 16

Thank you for consideration of our recommendations.

Most sincerely,

Kristin Kelly
Snohomish/Skagit County Program Director, Futurewise
Smart Growth Director, Pilchuck Audubon Society
1429 Avenue D, #532
Snohomish, WA 98290
(425) 923-8625
Kristin@futurewise.org
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perience of these studies has not been sufficiently summarized on a national basis, nor are its lessons widely appreciated. Selected data—condensed for readability—from one of the few studies synthesizing this experience are presented in Exhibit 5.4, along with data based on the Home Interview Survey conducted by the Tri-State Regional Planning Commission in 1983 in the New York Region.

In the exhibit, both total weekday trips per person by all vehicular modes and weekday trips per person by public transportation are plotted against the density of the residential area in which the person making the trips lives. In contrast to the small variation in density presented earlier, the variation here is very large—from 0.8 dwellings per acre all the way to 200 dwellings per acre. The differences in travel demand are, accordingly, also very dramatic.

The average individual living on a 1-acre lot in one of the six urban areas shown—ranging in size from Springfield, Mass. (population 531,000), to the New York Region (population 16,300,000 within the survey area)—made anywhere from 2.0 to 2.6 trips by all vehicular modes on an average weekday. His or her propensity for making trips did not change much if the density increased to 3 dwellings per acre. However, as the density increased from 3 to 30 dwellings per acre, the number of trips per person was reduced anywhere from 50 percent in Springfield and Milwaukee to 10 percent in Seattle, with the New York Region about in the middle with a 30 percent reduction in total trips, very similar to Boston. This reduction in total travel demand was due to a reduction of trips by auto. Transit trips, by contrast, increased even more dramatically with rising density. At a density of around 1 dwelling per acre, the transit demand in any one of the six urban agglomerations was minimal—anywhere from 0.03 to 0.14 trips by public transportation per person per day. This demand did not increase much up to a density of 7 dwellings per acre, where it amounted to 0.03 to 0.22 trips by public transportation per day. However, with a density increase from 7 to 30 dwellings per acre, transit demand roughly tripled in the New York Region, in Philadelphia, and in Boston, to around 0.6 trips per person per day. In the three smaller urban areas, the absolute number of trips per person by public transportation at a density of 30 dwellings per acre was not as high, but the relative increase compared to the lower density was even greater.

Densities above 30 dwellings per acre are not frequent in American cities; in the three larger urban areas shown, transit trips per person continue to increase in this high density range, but at a declining rate. At a density of roughly 50 dwellings per acre, transit trips become more numerous than auto trips in the New York Region and Philadelphia; at a density of 85 dwellings per acre or more in New York, reductions in total travel demand by mechanical means appear to cease, even though transit travel continues to increase.

Summarizing, we find that densities in the 5 to 7 dwellings per acre range produced only marginal use of public transportation within major urban areas of the United States in the early 'sixties. We have seen that the average areawide densities of virtually all urbanized areas in the nation fall into this density range. Densities of 7 to 30 dwellings per acre were necessary to sustain significant transit use—indeed, in the range of 5 to 40 percent of all trips. Moreover, an increase in density from about 7 to 30 dwellings per acre produced not only a very dramatic increase in transit use, but also a sharp reduction in auto travel.

The general consistence of these patterns notwithstanding, there is still a fair amount

EXHIBIT 5.4 continued

Note: Densities based on population of intact census tract areas for which data were available.

* Considering usual-mode trips as one trip by the dominant mode.
Public Transportation and Land Use Policy

BORIS S. PUSHKAREV
JEFFREY M. ZUPAN

INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS / Bloomington & London
Dear Snohomish County Planning Commission Representative,

Please find attached a letter to the Snohomish County Planning Commission Members from the Greenleaf Homeowners Association regarding our concerns and interest in the 2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan. Also, find attached a petition with over 180 signatures by Greenleaf residents and our neighbors in Highlands East stating their support for our letter. Please forward this email with attachments to the Planning Commission members, if possible, before the Oct 7th public hearing. We will also bring copies of the letter to the public hearing.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us at the email below or at (425) 379-5349.

Thank you for your consideration,

Greenleaf HOA Board
Email address: board@greenleaf.hoaspace.com
October 5, 2014

Snohomish County Planning Commission
Snohomish County Dept. of Planning & Development Services
MS 604, Rockefeller Ave.
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Planning Commission Members:

On behalf of the Greenleaf Homeowner’s Association (“Greenleaf”), we are writing to you today to express both our interest and concern with the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment known as Alternative 3. Greenleaf is comprised of 118 single family homes located in the Silver Firs Gap MUGA, immediately east of two parcels (nearly 46 acres) that are being considered for proposed land use/zoning changes. The 40-acre parcel (see attached map) is currently zoned R-7200 with a Use Code of ‘880 DF Timber Acres Only RCW 84.33’. This property was recently logged and is subject to a 10-year moratorium on development (Forest Practice Application permit is FPA# 2812533, dated 5-25-12). However, it has come to our attention that upon payment of all back taxes, a developer could bypass the moratorium and proceed with developing this property. The adjacent 6-acre parcel is currently zoned R-9600 with a Use Code of ‘910 Undeveloped (Vacant) Land’. In anticipation of future development, the County has proposed to up-zone both of these parcels to Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR). Please note that this property is sandwiched between two existing residential developments, each of which are designated for Urban Low Density Residential Use. Greenleaf and Highlands East are zoned R-9600. All of the surrounding neighborhoods have similar low density, single-family zoning. Any changes to the land use and zoning of these properties, upon expiration of the development moratorium, should be done in a manner consistent with the surrounding community for low density single-family residential use.

Similarly, the north side of the County’s property abutting Greenleaf (see attached map) is currently zoned LDMR. This is not consistent with the land use or zoning of Greenleaf either. We urge you to consider changing the land use/zoning of this property also, in a manner consistent with the land use/zoning of the adjacent neighborhood (R-9600).

While we understand that the County is required to plan for future growth, we believe that growth should occur in areas where there is existing infrastructure to support it (i.e. in the cities). It does not make sense to place LDMR in areas adjacent to or surrounded by Urban Low Density Residential. If additional housing units are needed, they should be placed in a location where the zoning is consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and where they can be served by existing roads. It is important to note that neither of the properties identified above may be reached by existing roads and would likely rely on new roads going through both Greenleaf and Highlands East for access purposes. The streets in both Greenleaf and Highlands East are not wide enough to accommodate parked cars and un-obstructed 2-way traffic. It would create a safety hazard where none currently exists. And, it would create a “cut-through” from Lowell-Larimer to Cuthcart, that would only exacerbate safety concerns.

The comments regarding preferences for the Alternatives and future uses of the property adjacent to the Greenleaf Neighborhood are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Please also see EIS Section 3.2.7 Police, Fire, EMS regarding public safety services.

The above referenced amendments to the future land use and zoning maps are recommended by the County Executive. The Planning Commission is recommending the future land use and zoning designations not be amended.
On behalf of the residents of Greenleaf, we urge your consideration of the following:

1. **Do not approve Alternative 3.** Future development should occur where there is existing infrastructure in place to support such development (i.e. the cities). This is consistent with the Growth Management Act and we support Alternative 1 for this reason.

2. **If you approve Alternative 3, do not include the proposed land use/zoning changes for the 46 acres that are adjacent to both Greenleaf and Highlands East.** Most of this acreage is zoned Forestry and it should stay Forestry until the 10-year re-growth development moratorium has expired.

3. **If you approve Alternative 3, and feel compelled to rezone the 46 acres, rezone it in a manner consistent with the surrounding properties - R-9600.** This property is view property and would be suitable for larger, more expensive homes.

4. **Change the land use/zoning of the County property just south of Greenleaf.** This is currently LDMR - please change it to Low Density Residential, consistent with that of its neighbors. None of us want to see higher density housing, particularly multiple dwelling units immediately adjacent to our properties. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan Objective 1.U.2.C - “Provide for reasonable flexibility in land use regulation and planned mixing of uses, where appropriate, while maintaining adequate protection for existing neighborhoods.”

5. **If either of the properties adjacent to Greenleaf are ultimately developed for residential use, do not provide access to them via Greenleaf.** Our streets simply cannot handle the large volume of additional traffic that this would generate. Lowell-Larimer already is nearly at maximum capacity. We understand that a separate road has been proposed by a property owner of the Cathcart "L" site - we encourage your consideration of this option rather than making our neighborhood the short-cut from Lowell-Larimer to Cathcart.

We invite you to visit our neighborhood and to see for yourselves what the existing community looks like. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at (425) 379-5349.

Sincerely,

Kevin Ruoff
Board President, Greenleaf Homeowner Association

Scott Nilsen
Board member, Greenleaf Homeowner Association

Bill Conn
Board member, Greenleaf Homeowner Association

Scott Greesley
Board member, Greenleaf Homeowner Association

Ryan Stimich
Board member, Greenleaf Homeowner Association

Kathy Putt
Board member, Greenleaf Homeowner Association
Encl. (1)

Cc: Greenleaf Homeowners Association
This petition has collected 183 signatures using the online tools at iPetitions.com.

Printed on 2014-10-07
Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Changes - Greenleaf & Highlands
East Area

About this petition

Hello Neighbors,

We need your help! Snohomish County is in the process of amending their Comprehensive Plan ** and is considering options that will negatively impact the Greenleaf and Highlands East neighborhoods. We have identified 3 major concerns with the plan, as listed below. The county is currently soliciting public input on the plan, and that’s where you come in.

- We ask you to sign an online petition stating your support for the HQA’s letter to the county. And, we need a lot of signatures to get the county’s attention. An online petition has been setup at the link below, and will include a link to board’s letter when it’s finalized. The petition needs to be signed preferably on or before October 6th. http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/comprehensive-plan-and-zoning-changes-greenleaf

We ask that you show your support for our neighborhoods by attending the County’s public hearing on the plan. Several board members will be speaking at the hearing but we need as many people there as possible. Let us know if you can attend, and also if you’re interested in speaking on our behalf. The hearing is October 7th at the Snohomish County Administration Building, 1st Floor Public Meeting Room (3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett) from 5:30pm to 9pm, and possibly continuing on to October 8th and 9th ***. We have 3 major concerns with the county’s plan:

1. The ‘Alternative 3’ Plan proposes to rezone 46 acres west of Greenleaf (top of Phase II) and east of Highlands East to Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR), which allows 11 housing units/acre. This is out of character with the surrounding neighborhoods – Greenleaf is zoned 4 houses per acre, and Highlands East is zoned 6 houses per acre. This could result in having over 500 apartments/condos/townhomes built between Greenleaf and Highlands East.

2. County-owned property south of Greenleaf and north of the high school is already zoned LDMR. Again, this is out of character with the surrounding neighborhoods. The property is approximately 43 acres, and could result in another 440 apartments/condos/townhomes built on the south side of Greenleaf.

3. The roads & traffic will likely go through our neighborhoods to serve these new developments. Greenleaf has several future road extension points, including: 82nd St and 79th St in Phase I, and 134th St in Phase II. The latter two could be used as access points into the above properties. Highlands East has several road extension points, too. If this happens, our neighborhood streets will likely be used as cut-thru’s from Cathcart Rd to Lowell Larimer, drastically increasing the traffic.


**Unfortunately, the public hearing has a first-come, first-serve signup for speaking, so it’s not clear what time or even which night we’ll be presenting, but we’ll be trying for the 1st night.
Thanks for your consideration and please reach out to anyone on the HOA if you have questions or concerns.

Greenleaf HOA Board

Email address: board@greenleaf.hoaspace.com
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<td>Post this petition link at Little Cedars Elementary for all parents to sign</td>
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<td>10/3/2014 14:25</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Katryna Harris</td>
<td>10/3/2014 22:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Jennifer Shevitz</td>
<td>10/3/2014 22:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Kevin Ruoff</td>
<td>10/3/2014 22:53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Heather Young</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Brett Wills</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dustin Coe</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Stacy Benson</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Melissa Turner</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>David Shevitz</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jeff Hesselborn</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Michelle Kelly</td>
<td>10/3/2014 23:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Erica Erdozain</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Lichin Chang-Meneses</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ashley Zimmerman</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Nikki Schiebel</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Julie Jorde</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Scott Greeley</td>
<td>10/4/2014 0:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tria Cooke</td>
<td>10/4/2014 1:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lauren Waltzing</td>
<td>10/4/2014 1:44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Joy Butz</td>
<td>10/4/2014 2:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Erika Andahl</td>
<td>10/4/2014 2:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Johnny Menses</td>
<td>10/4/2014 2:33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Noelle Hader</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Alison Challender</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Connie Hellmund</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Jamie Scherzing</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>David Radlke</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- County will be taking on more liability by mixing increased traffic with kids in neighborhoods. Why are they even considering this?
- No more LDMR in this area. Traffic is bad enough already!
- There are many other options at this point. Additional constructions of units of this type bring down property values and greatly effects the traffic situation.

As the President of HE HOA I am against the proposed changes.

Please do not go through with this! This will destroy our lovely neighborhood.

This area is changing too drastically too quickly and setting up unsustainable growth to maintain good home values and quality of living.

I am AGAINST the Alternative 3 Plan proposes to rezone 46 acres west of Greenleaf (top of Phase II) and east of Highlands East to Low Density Multiple Residential (LDMR)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Amy Maley</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Kelly RiesJones</td>
<td>10/4/2014 3:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Lisa Lewis</td>
<td>10/4/2014 4:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Lisa Lewis</td>
<td>10/4/2014 4:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Zachary Whitman</td>
<td>10/4/2014 4:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ali Mann</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Molly Marsicke</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Harlan Yee</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tamra Blasco</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>David Guglielmi</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Leilani McPadden</td>
<td>10/4/2014 5:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Stacey Fesken</td>
<td>10/4/2014 8:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Cindy Jones</td>
<td>10/4/2014 13:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Bruce Lovers</td>
<td>10/4/2014 13:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>ashleigh schultz</td>
<td>10/4/2014 14:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Katie Russell</td>
<td>10/4/2014 14:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Art Bori</td>
<td>10/4/2014 15:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Donna Hudson</td>
<td>10/4/2014 15:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Stephanie Apin</td>
<td>10/4/2014 19:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Jim &amp; Chris Bloor</td>
<td>10/4/2014 15:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Steve Murphy</td>
<td>10/4/2014 15:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Tony Binek</td>
<td>10/4/2014 16:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Scott Chase</td>
<td>10/4/2014 16:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Satoko Erling</td>
<td>10/4/2014 16:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Laurel Stockton</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Kerrie Doramus</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Lance Doramus</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Jennifer Hope</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Colleen Ferrari</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Donna Baldini</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Barbara Wenders</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Marcus Halley</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Angie woellholf</td>
<td>10/4/2014 17:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Nadim Ijab-Rusher</td>
<td>10/4/2014 18:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Scott Ruther</td>
<td>10/4/2014 18:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Mike Ramsey</td>
<td>10/4/2014 18:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Cristina Leffingwell</td>
<td>10/4/2014 18:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Steve woellholf</td>
<td>10/4/2014 18:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Cindy Perry</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Sandra Krause-Ayers</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rob Cooke</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Krisy Clark</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>kalee woellhof</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Kevin Brannon</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Doug Dickey</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Nancy Szpara</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Jason Turner</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Leif Harrison</td>
<td>10/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Dan Smith</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Kristen Curtis</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Shane Smith</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Bertrand Hauss</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Tam Nguyen</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Sandra L. Brannon</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Susan Ridley</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Jayme</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Erika Landis</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Ryan Simich</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Chelsea Jamerson</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Matt Lipetska</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Rhonda Smith</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Gwen Lipetska</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Kristin Flores</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>James Flores</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Connie Carlson</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Steve Udy</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Sara Johnson</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ailis Tyler</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Jim McSpadden</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Laurent Nicolov</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Jeff Jones</td>
<td>10/5/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Stefan Thom</td>
<td>10/6/2014 23:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Rouven Thom</td>
<td>10/6/2014 23:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Maria Domann</td>
<td>10/6/2014 22:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Alberta Jones</td>
<td>10/6/2014 23:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Catherine Ruoff</td>
<td>10/6/2014 23:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Mickey Brandt</td>
<td>10/6/2014 1:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Cynthia Lichfield</td>
<td>10/6/2014 2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Don Lichly</td>
<td>10/6/2014 2:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Lisa Baker</td>
<td>10/6/2014 2:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Richard Brannon</td>
<td>10/6/2014 2:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Michael Putt</td>
<td>10/6/2014 3:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Gregory T Dootson</td>
<td>10/6/2014 10:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Kelly Walker</td>
<td>10/6/2014 15:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Julie Dow</td>
<td>10/6/2014 15:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Aaron Walk</td>
<td>10/6/2014 15:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Steve Brannon</td>
<td>10/6/2014 16:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Angela Trindle</td>
<td>10/6/2014 16:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>10/6/2014 17:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Monica Burgmaier</td>
<td>10/6/2014 17:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Tracey Roth</td>
<td>10/6/2014 17:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Bryan Burgmaier</td>
<td>10/6/2014 17:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Daniel Martin</td>
<td>10/6/2014 18:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>David Krismer</td>
<td>10/6/2014 19:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Kevin Hogan</td>
<td>10/6/2014 20:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Steve Russo</td>
<td>10/6/2014 20:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Doris Axelson</td>
<td>10/6/2014 22:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Bruce and Tonya Knutson</td>
<td>10/6/2014 23:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Jeremy Burfening</td>
<td>10/7/2014 0:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Lisa Kotrba</td>
<td>10/7/2014 2:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Sandra Paige</td>
<td>10/7/2014 3:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Evans,

Attached please find a comment letter from MBA for the Planning Commission’s public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Thank you,

Mike

Mike Pattison, North Snohomish County Manager

t (425) 460-8203 - e (206) 605-8875 or f (425) 646-5985
335 116th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004
masterbuildersinfo.com
C-006-001
The comments regarding preferences for Alternative 3 are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

C-006-002
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The percentage of the unincorporated County land capacity that is accounted for by pending development is discussed in Draft EIS Section 3.2.3, Population, Housing, and Employment.
Housing Choices
Alternatives 1 and 2 largely plan for expected growth in major cities such as Everett and Lynnwood. However, very little buildable land remains in those jurisdictions to accommodate single family housing. Consumers continue to demand single family detached housing options. An over-reliance on multi-family housing in core cities ignores the market reality that home buyers are willing to move further from job centers to find the housing that meets their needs.

Alternative 3 is the best option to better create more housing options and ultimately better use available land within urban growth areas and closer to job centers.

Thank you for your consideration,

[Signature]
Mike Pattison
North Snohomish County Manager
## 5 Year Lot Supply Snohomish County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snohomish</th>
<th>% of regional sales</th>
<th>New M.F. ownership demand</th>
<th>New S.F. ownership demand</th>
<th>Overall Supply by 2519</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current recorded vacant lot and spec count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current unrecorded lot count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of estimated lots to fall out due to being under earnest money contracts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical fall out of remaining lots in the pipeline is</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed viable unrecorded lot Supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 2013 to Q2 2014 Sales</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>3,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten year running average</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>-2,086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018 Population growth (CIRM forecast yearly average between 2010 and 2020 *80%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new Housing Demand 2014-2018 (population/2.7 per household) with home ownership at 55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Years of total inventory based on last 12 months of sales</td>
<td>1,332 annual sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.34 years of supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Years of total inventory based on ten year running average</td>
<td>2,415 annual sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95 years of supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed Years of total inventory based on projected population growth</td>
<td>2,970 annual sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29 years of supply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic driver are Boeing, Aerospace, Microsoft, Google, Amazon, Health Care, Everett Naval Station

© 2014 Metrostudy, Inc. (425) 742-8040
Source: Metrostudy, Inc.
The comments regarding preferences for the Alternatives and future uses of the property adjacent to the your neighborhood is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Regarding traffic and responding to future growth:

1. The EIS addresses impacts at the planning level. Traffic impacts from specific development proposals will be addressed during permit review. Programmatic review of traffic is in the Draft EIS Volume II.

2. The County has an obligation to accommodate anticipated growth over a twenty-year period within the Urban Growth Areas (UGA) and take reasonable measures to accommodate growth within the existing UGA boundary before considering an expansion. One way to accommodate additional growth is to require upzoning of properties to provide enough capacity to accommodate growth targets as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). The County seeks to balance the need to provide diverse housing options and protecting single-family neighborhoods from adverse impacts.

The above reference amendments to the future land use and zoning maps is recommended by the County Executive. The Planning Commission is recommending the future land use and zoning designations not be amended.
1. Do not approve Alternative 3. Future development should occur where there is existing infrastructure in place to support such development (i.e. the cities). This is consistent with the Growth Management Act and we support Alternative 1 for this reason.

2. If you approve Alternative 3, do not include the proposed land use/zoning changes for the 46 acres that are adjacent to both Greenleaf and Highlands East. Most of this acreage is zoned Forestry and it should stay Forestry until the 10-year re-growth/development moratorium has expired.

3. If you approve Alternative 3, we urge you to retain the current zoning for the 6 and 40 acre parcels.

4. Change the land use/zoning of the County property just south of Greenleaf. This is currently LDMR - please change it to Low Density Residential, consistent with that of its neighbors. None of us want to see higher density housing, particularly multiple dwelling units immediately adjacent to our properties. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan Objective LU 2.C – “Provide for reasonable flexibility in land use regulation and planned mixing of uses, where appropriate, while maintaining adequate protection for existing neighborhoods.”

5. Our streets simply cannot handle the large volume of additional traffic that would be created with higher density housing.

We invite you to visit our neighborhood and to see for yourselves what the existing community looks like. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us at (425) 379-5349.

Sincerely,

Erica Erdemian, Board President, Highlands East Homeowners Association
Carly Antal, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
John Diehl, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
Brian Farman, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
Bruce Lavers, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
Steven Court, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
Sue Ramsey, Board Member, Highlands East Homeowners Association
From: Carol <carol@aramburu-eustis.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2014 4:51 PM  
To: Evans, Sally  
Cc: Rick Aramburu  
Subject: Letter to Snohomish County Planning Commission  
Attachments: 2014-10-7 NSWP to SnoCoPC.pdf

Ms. Evans,

This letter addressed to the Planning Commission is sent c/o your email, the contact link for the Planning Commission on the county’s website at http://snohomishcountywa.gov/154/Planning-Commission. Please provide these comments to the PC, the hard copy is being mailed.

Carol Cohoe  
ARAMBURU & EUSTIS, LLP  
720 Third Avenue  
Pacific Building Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Telephone (206) 635-6615  
Facsimile (206) 682-1376  
This message may be protected by the attorney-client and/or work product privilege. If you received this message in error, please notify us and destroy the message. Thank you.
C-008-001
Please see Response to Comment C-002-001.

October 7, 2014

Snohomish County Planning Commission
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Via Email: c/o sally.evans@snoco.org

Re: Park and Recreation Element of Proposed Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Dear Planning Commission:

This office has been retained by Neighbors to Save Wellington Park (NSWP), a Washington nonprofit corporation formed by local residents concerned with plans for intense development of the Wellington Hills property.

Snohomish County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has announced plans for the creation of an intensive, regional park at the Wellington Hills site. The plan includes at least seven athletic fields, two large buildings and other facilities in a 104 acre site. As indicated in the last iteration of the plan, Parks and Recreation proposes 739 parking stalls for those that will use the site. The plans for the site include several lighted fields with artificial turf and pubic address system; features not necessary in a community park. The site is located in the rural area and is zoned R-5.

NSWP generally supports the language of the Parks and Recreation element of the Comprehensive Plan, but writes today to assure that the plan is properly and correctly applied to the Wellington Hills site.

1. COMMUNITY PARK v. REGIONAL/SPECIAL USE PARK.

The GMA requires that any comprehensive plan include a "Parks and Recreation Element", which is described as follows:

A park and recreation element that implements, and is consistent with, the capital facilities plan element as it relates to park and recreation facilities. The
element shall include: (a) Estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a
ten-year period; (b) an evaluation of facilities and service needs; and (c) an
evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional
approaches for meeting park and recreational demand.

RCW 36.70A.070(8).

The Parks and Recreation Plan contains a "Park Classification" scheme based
on location, size and service area. We believe that this is a useful method to assure
that other elements of the comprehensive plan and the GMA are met.

As noted on page 10 of the draft Parks and Recreation Element, "Community
Parks" are to provide features or amenities for the nearby community (within a five mile
radius). As noted, the average size of a community park is 32 acres, though the plan
indicates that some may be smaller if it is a densely developed area or if special
features are found, such as waterfront access. Methods of access to a community park
are by foot, car or public transportation.

The Wellington Hills site is somewhat unusual because it was purchased with
funds available as mitigation for the Brightwater Sewage Treatment plant. However, it
is noted that the Brightwater Plant did not in any manner create demand for additional
park or recreational facilities, as its sole purpose is the treatment of sanitary waste. Nor
did the Brightwater operation displace any existing park or recreational amenities.
Because of the manner in which the site was selected, there was no "evaluation of
facilities and service needs" related to the Wellington Hills site.

As noted above, the intensity of use and the size of the plans for the Wellington
Hills site greatly exceed the criteria for a community park. The Wellington Hills site is
104 acres, more than three times the size of the typical community park. The large
buildings at 120,000 square feet, which include the necessity for private funding, are
well beyond what is envisioned as a community park by the Plan. The establishment of
a huge number of parking stalls, 739 in the last iteration, further demonstrates that the
current plan is something other than a community park.

2. LOCATION OF PARK IN A RURAL AREA.

A distinguishing feature of the Wellington Hills site is that it is located in the Rural
Area. While the draft of the comprehensive plan addresses several requests for
moving the Urban Area Boundary, no such proposal exists in the vicinity of the
Wellington Hills site. The Future Land Use Map shows the Wellington Hills site as
Rural, with R-5 zoning. Though there is urban zoning to the west and north of the
Wellington Hills site, this designation and zoning was to recognize existing
manufacturing uses along the Highway 522 corridor, which would never extend to the
east to the vacant Wellington Hills site. While a "Rural Urban Transition Area" is found
adjacent to the corridor, it also does not extend to the Wellington Hills site.
GMA requires that all county comprehensive plans have a "Rural Element" as follows:

5) Rural element. Counties shall include a rural element including lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. The following provisions shall apply to the rural element:

One of the requirements of the Rural element found in RCW 36.70A.070(5) is the adoption of the following:

(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:

(i) Containing or otherwise controlling rural development;
(ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area.

(Emphasis supplied.)

The draft Parks and Recreation Element correctly provides that community parks are to be located inside the Urban Growth Boundary:

Community Parks are typically located in incorporated areas, UGAs, or in areas expected to become UGAs at some point, although exceptions to this guideline exist.

As noted above, the Wellington Hills site is not in an urban area and the future land use map shows no indication it will be within a UGA during the current planning cycle.

However, as is clear from the current proposal, the Wellington Hills plan does not meet the Community Park standard; it is too big, with an activity level beyond that of a community park. The Wellington Hills site also does not meet the standard for a "regional park" because it lacks the "unique features or amenities" which allow users to "experience some of the fantastic natural features of Snohomish County." Draft Parks and Recreation Element at 10. While the Wellington Hills site is attractive and offers opportunities for rest and relaxation, it does not have unique features or amenities.

The Wellington Hills site is best described as a "Special Use" facility, meeting the criteria found on page 12 of the Draft Parks and Recreation Element. The guideline for classification of such parks is as follows:

Special Use Parks typically have one dominant, specialized amenity that users are willing to travel for. These parks most commonly serve that portion of the population which is interested in the amenity the facility offers.
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The number and intensity of athletic fields and other specialized recreational activities
plainly put the current Wellington Hills site plan into this category.

The guideline that Community Parks be within the Urban area applies even more
to a Special Use park. Here the level of activity, including lights, heavy traffic, large
buildings and substantial parking lots indicate that the Wellington Hills plan is not
appropriate in the Rural Area. Land use Goal 6 requires that the comprehensive plan
"Protect and enhance the character, quality, and identity of rural areas." Objective 6.B
in the Snohomish County General Policy Plan (page 36) elaborates on the fundamental
goal by stating that the plan should "Encourage land use activities and development
intensities that protect the character of rural areas,..." The intense activity planned for
the Wellington Hills site violates the basic GMA criteria for rural areas, which must
assure "visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area."

The planning commission should adopt provisions that assure that new plans for park
development do not conflict with established and planned rural areas. In the case of
the Wellington Hills site, permitted activities must reflect the criteria for rural area
development.

Sincerely yours,

ARAMERU & EUSTIS, LLP

J. Richard Aramburu

JRA:cc
cc: NSWP
Peter Egllick / City of Woodinville
Tom Teigen, Parks Director
C-009-001
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Planning Commission and Executive recommendations for the Cathcart "L" area, including the PAWS property, is to retain the current R-5 zoning.

October 7, 2014

Dear Snohomish County Planning Commission Members,

As you consider public comment on the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update for Snohomish County, we would like to familiarize the Commission with PAWS and the vision for our recently purchased property located within the area referred to as the "Cathcart L."

PAWS was incorporated in 1967 and has served the Snohomish County community at our current location in Lynnwood for more than 40 years. A champion for animals, PAWS rehabilitates injured and orphaned wildlife, shelters homeless cats and dogs, and educates people to make a better world for animals and people.

PAWS' facilities are now quite dated and were not built to accommodate the wide variety of services we presently provide to the public. As such, PAWS recently purchased a 25-acre assemblage of properties along Highway 9 in order to build a new, world-class animal care and educational facility. We chose to purchase this property in large part because of its current zoning designation (R-5), which allows companion animal shelters and wildlife facilities as an outright permitted use.

While it will be a few years before PAWS breaks ground at the site, our vision for the property is already well in hand. PAWS does not plan to densely populate this property with numerous large structures, but rather to leave much of the acreage natural in order to create a quiet, peaceful environment for the animals recuperating in our care. A natural, vegetative buffer of approximately 30 feet in width will border the entire perimeter of the site, both in the interest of insulating the animals from human activity as well as to help us be an inconspicuous neighbor. Such low-intensity development proposed by PAWS will complement the existing character of the surrounding vicinity.

Prior to PAWS' purchase of this assemblage, PAWS retained a Project Manager and a wide variety of consultants and engineers to perform months of due diligence studies on the property. We shared our reports and findings with Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS), and attended a thorough pre-application meeting with PDS staff to discuss PAWS' proposed facility. PDS staff did not identify any site-specific or project-specific concerns which would preempt PAWS' intended use of the site under the current development regulations. Additionally, PAWS has engaged in preliminary conversations with the Washington State...
Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to identify potential improvements to accommodate access to PAWS' proposed development on Highway 9. PAWS has placed an allowance in our project budget for potential intersection upgrades.

The relocation of PAWS to upgraded facilities has been a long-held dream for this organization which has served the Snohomish community for more than 47 years. PAWS is a well-respected business and local employer, and we serve multiple municipalities in the area through our contracts for stray services, classroom-based humane education programs, and as a comprehensive resource for the region's animal needs. With the successful completion of this project, PAWS will look forward to meeting the needs of our community for another 50 years to come.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Best regards,

Annette Laico  
Chief Executive Officer  
425.412.4030 | alaico@paws.org
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I open with these words from Ansel Adams, the nature photographer and environmental advocate:

“It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment.”

But that’s exactly what we, Neighbors to Save Wellington Park, are doing – we’re fighting to save a community asset from destruction.

Harking back to the beginning of all this ... Brightwater funds were intended to mitigate for the effects of the nearby sewage treatment plant; the funds were not intended to create a countywide, regional tournament level facility.

Furthermore, the size and scope of the proposed plan for the sports complex at Wellington Hills Park are inconsistent with its surroundings and the rural designation of the area.

Wellington Hills is a rurally zoned area and rural areas should not be easy targets for urbanization. Developments in rural areas should be limited to activities that continue to promote rural character.

But the current proposal for multiple lighted fields and hundreds of parking stalls is clearly urban ... as are the noise and traffic that will be produced by sports events.

Fundamentally we believe: Neighborhoods should have a voice in what happens to their community and the community’s needs should have precedence over those of special interest groups.
We are not opposed to sports or sports fields - that has never been our issue. What we object to is the inappropriate development of Wellington Hills Park as well as the persistent disregard for our community's thoughts, needs and vision for a community park.

In many ways, the proposed "tournament level sports complex" is no different than when a big box store elbows its way into a quiet rural town ... and radically disrupts and negatively impacts the quality of life and the daily life of established neighborhoods.

I encourage you as members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission to represent the interests of our community ... and all communities in rural areas ... by insisting that the guidelines for development of parks be respectful of citizens, their input and be harmonious with the surrounding communities.

I blog about Wellington Hills Park at
http://neighborstosavewellingtonpark.blogspot.com/
and http://savewellingtonpark.typepad.com/blog/

Bill Stankus
23525 – 71st Dr. SE
Woodinville WA 98072
Snohomish County
Also included:

1. Neighbors to Save Wellington Park "Manifesto"
2. May 2014 letter, which was signed by over 350 people recommending alternative possibilities for Wellington Hills Park.
3. July 2012 petition, which was signed by over 300 people.
4. Various photos of views of Wellington Hills Park and the park’s “gateway” at 240th St. SE and Route 9.

Note 1: In the photos - the dump trucks and side-loading truck are going to and leaving a concrete/asphalt recycling business located on 240th St. SE.

Note 2: The western boundary of Wellington Hills Park is at the top of the cliff that's located behind The Woodinville Business Park, aka “the Primus site”.

The Whidbey Island fault zone is directly beneath this cliff (and the park).

All of these have been given to Snohomish County government and the City of Woodinville.
How We See It

1. The Brightwater mitigation agreement did not include "Sports Complex" or "Tournament Level Athletic Fields" or other similar words.

2. The ad hoc committee created by the Dept. of Parks to design Wellington Hills Park represented special interest groups, not the Wellington Hills neighborhood. In fact, the basic design had been established BEFORE the first public disclosure in May 2012.

3. The Department of Parks privately eliminated all possible variations for a community park and then publically stated a sports complex featuring numerous soccer fields, stadium lights and giant parking lots were a "done deal" and would be built on Wellington Hills Park ASAP.

4. There's no data suggesting a multi-field sports complex is necessary, especially in a rural residential community with two-lane roads.

5. Geographically and infrastructure-wise, Wellington Hills Park is a terrible location for a sports complex. The proposed plan has the same footprint as that of Safeco Field and would require extreme modifications to the area.

6. Numerous attempts from people in the local community to engage members of the Snohomish County Council, Executive Office and the Dept. of Parks to discuss the future of Wellington Hills Park have been minimized and largely ignored.

7. Publicly staged events masquerading as forums for public input, poorly prepared SEPA checklist, incomplete LDA application ... and now it appears the Dept. of Parks is attempting to bury their plans for Wellington Hills Park into the County's new Comprehensive Plan.

What We Want

1. No tree cutting, no earth digging, no demolition, no construction of any sort until there's been public input, discussion and proper assessment of community wants and needs regarding Wellington Hills Park.

2. Listen to your constituents and heed your own survey results - People want "Trails, Leisure, Conservation & Wildlife Areas" much more than they want "Sports Facilities and Special Use Facilities".
To: Snohomish County Executive, Deputy Executive & County Council

I agree with Neighbors to Save Wellington Park ... that Snohomish County’s plan for the Wellington Hills Park should be in harmony with local neighborhoods. Furthermore, the park plan should include features that residents in the surrounding communities would enjoy on a daily basis.

Instead of artificial turf fields, stadium lights, 750 car parking lots and limited amenities for people of all ages - there are better options.

For example -
• Multi-purpose grass sports fields (2-3); no lights, no artificial turf
• Groomed walking trails, with some exercise stations
• Off-leash dog areas
• Tennis courts (1-2)
• Basketball courts (2-3 half-courts)
• Nature Center (see Brightwater Education Center)
• Picnic tables & shelters throughout the Park
• Children’s “Spray Pad” (see Willis Tucker Park)
• Enhanced play structures for children in multiple locations (see Redmond’s Grass Lawn Park’s play structures)
• Conveniently placed pedestrian walkways (2) to both sides of the park; no traffic circles

I recommend Snohomish County rethink the plans for a “tournament level” sports complex and work with the residents of South Snohomish County to create a showcase park in keeping with the rural character of the greater Wellington Hills area.

Signed __________________________ Date ____________

Print Name __________________________

Street Address __________________________

City __________________________
**Petition to Save Wellington Park from Over-Development**

**Petition summary**: Snohomish County is fast-tracking the development of the Wellington Hills Golf Course into a giant sports complex with parking lots for 700+ cars and 110,000 sq. ft. buildings. There will be increased traffic congestion on neighboring streets, excessive noise during evenings and weekends as well as tall, artificial lights affecting nearby homes. This is a "Cut and Fill" project that will level the rolling hills and destroy the natural beauty of the landscape.

**Action petitioned for**: We, the undersigned, are concerned citizens urging the Snohomish County government to partner with the Wellington Hills neighborhood in order to develop a community park that is compatible with a residential neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Home address</th>
<th>email address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Stankos</td>
<td>Bill Stankos</td>
<td>23525 - 11 st SE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwstankos@earthlink.net">jwstankos@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>7/3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everett WA 98207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good evening neighbors,

We had an excellent turnout for the ice cream social and discussed two serious topics proposed by Snohomish County: rezoning the SW portion of Lake Serene to LDMR (12 homes per acre, detailed in the Comprehensive Plan) and long-term lake drainage options/cost sharing.

Expanded LDMR Zoning
The county's plan does not consider the following in its zoning proposal:
- The lake is full, and it cannot accommodate more water without seriously damaging lake-front homes and downstream water quality. The outflow "system" is years past its designed lifespan and future floods are inevitable.
- Fire District One does not favor LDMR building. It has issues with access, lack of sprinkler systems, ladder space between buildings, etc.
- Road access restrictions due to inadequate on-site/off-site parking often results in illegal parking
- There is no public open space planned for accommodating all the additional density

The Lake Serene Community Association asks that there be a moratorium on rezoning until the long term lake drainage issues are resolved.

How to Comment
- Email your comments about Snohomish County’s Comprehensive plan to Sally Evans at: sally.evans@snoco.org and cc Stephanie Wright: stephanie.wright@snoco.org
- Mail written comments to: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk, Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604, Everett, WA 98201
- Most importantly, please attend the public hearing on Tuesday October 7th between 5:30pm-9:00pm:
  Snohomish County Campus
  1st Floor, Robert Drewel Building
  3000 Rockefeller Avenue
  Everett, WA 98204

All attendees are granted three minutes to voice their opinion. We want to show the council our community's strength in numbers. Please come prepared to say something or to raise your hand/stand up, when we ask how many people are from the Lake Serene Community and are concerned about rezoning. Also, please note, its possible, the meeting may carry on to October 8th and 9th as there are various other city groups; please attend the October 7th meeting if you can.

Lake Drainage
The County Surface Water Dept has been working on a number of different approaches for re-engineering the outflow from the lake. Broadly speaking, the choices are between improving the existing system (probably the least expensive option), or taking the outflow to public lines. The costs may need to be shared with the community. A meeting with Surface Water to discuss options is tentatively scheduled for Mid-November, so we will keep you informed. We are very grateful for the county's time at the ice cream social and look forward to meeting with them again.

Thank you,
The Draft EIS addresses programmatic impacts of future development over the 20-year period including drainage and transportation. Specific impacts related to development are addressed during the permit review process such as traffic and stormwater drainage. Opportunities are provided to review permit application materials and submit comments during permit review.
The Comprehensive Plan Update and Draft EIS address planning and impacts at the programmatic level and do not address project specific design details or impacts. Project level design issues, such as retaining or planting trees, are dealt with during the permitting process, which allows for the review of application materials and the submission of public comments.
The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The allocation of land for future employment within and outside of Urban Growth Areas (UGA) is dictated in large part by employment targets based on projections from the Office of Financial Management (OFM). UGA's may only be expanded when justified to meet growth targets. Industrial developments outside of UGA's may only be authorized when there is not a suitable site located within a UGA or if it is a natural resource based industry requiring a location near agricultural land.

The County Executive and the Planning Commission are not recommending the above referenced Maltby UGA expansion.
The site of any parcels existing in the Malton USA. We feel that any property could be more suited to adding back some industrial jobs to the south county than its current use as horse pasture.

We would ask that you keep our property in mind if industrial land is requested for development where a large parcel is required. RCW 36.70A.365 states that the Growth Management Act allows counties to establish a "process" for reviewing and approving proposals to site "specific major industrial developments" "outside of USA" and "the county may expand an existing USA for all major industrial development if the criteria are met."

Thank you for considering our request.

Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:
Attention: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@secoo.org
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decisionmakers. The process by which the County considers docket requests is addressed in SCC Chapter 30.74 Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.

I-004-002
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Sultan proposal would not create a net increase in UGA capacity. A comparison of 2012 land capacity to the 20-year growth targets is addressed in Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment as well as Appendix B.

Mr. Countryman and Ms. Strandberg:

I am writing to you asking for help in making sure our governments work the way they are supposed to work and you have a role in these processes.

I am concerned about the Comprehensive Plan petition for amendment to the County’s plan submitted by Sultan. It petitions to exchange and expand upon its UGA. I have two main concerns:

I-004-001 What happened to “We the people” who are to play a role in this? Sultan just went ahead and submitted this without any public involvement – no hearings, no announcements, no notice to the land owners, no nothing – they just decided they wanted to do this and did it. When the land owners found out about this, they spoke up against it and so far have been completely ignored. Is this what our governments have come to? What's more the city is pre-zoning this new UGA, changing it from the rural farmland and creating dense housing land. Can you imagine being one of those land owners? This is not what our governments are supposed to do.

I-004-002 There is no need to create additional city growth. There has only been one or two building permits in the last several years; currently there are around 92 properties within the city limits for sale or foreclosed; the population estimate was substantially decreased (and the actual population has only grown by 14 people in the last 5 years); the number of kids in the schools has declined; the newest estimated population growth indicates that there is more than enough infill within the current city limits to well beyond 2015 and the current infrastructure can handle the estimated growth; expanding to an even larger UGA would definitely create sprawl; and the Fire District, School District, and Hospital District all do not anticipate growth that would require the requested expansion.

I hope my comments don’t fall on deaf ears. We do not need this type of government.

Thank you,

Gerry Gibson
1102 Dyer Rd., Sultan, WA 98294
360-799-1736
I am writing to express my concern about the planned development at Wellington Hills Park. The 4 turf fields, three additional fields, 700 parking spaces, two buildings and numerous impervious surfaces cannot be considered a community park by any stretch of the definition. They are more appropriately referred to by the Parks Department as a "tournament athletic facility."

The area surrounding Wellington Hills Park is rural, full of winding two lane roads. Residences are typically R1 or R5, and most residences and farms in this area are on dead-end streets served by a two lane access road -- 75th Ave SE or Bastian Rd. The significance of the surrounding area cannot be understated. The entire area is zoned rural, outside the urban growth boundary. The area does not have the infrastructure to accommodate commercial development such as the tournament athletic facility.

By siting a commercial development in this area, the County would significantly impair the community's access in and out of their homes. Bastian is the only access in and out for many residents, and there is no fix for this problem.

The DEIS does not adequately address the impact of violating the GMA by placing these commercial facilities in a rural area, and I respectfully ask the County to move the planned facilities to a more appropriate, commercial location.

Katrina Stewart
23526 82nd Ave SE
Woodinville, WA 98072
I-006-001

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The above referenced amendments to the future land use and zoning maps are recommended by the County Executive. The Planning Commission is recommending the future land use and zoning designations not be amended.

---

Evans, Sally

From: Dakotalandco <dakotalandco@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 1:33 PM
To: 2015update
Subject: 2015 update Greenleaf tracts #801, #804, and #806

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Good afternoon,

I-006-001

My name is Lee Johnson and I am the owner of tracts #801, #804, and #806 of Greenleaf at Snohomish Cascade Division two. The ownership name will show up on your data base as North Coast Investors.

I would like to show my support for the neighboring properties being included in Alternative #3 of the 2015 update to the Comprehensive Plan to be zoned as Urban Medium Density / LDMR.

Along with this I would like to add my three properties listed above to be included in the 2015 update as Urban Medium Density / LDMR. Accommodating density within the existing UGA on properties destined for development is the basis for the success of the Growth Management Act.

I appreciate you adding these properties to the update and look forward to this preferred alternative. Please feel free to call or e-mail me with any questions.

Thank you,

Lee Johnson
North Coast Investors
2810 West Park Drive East
Seattle WA 98112
(206) 665-8628
October 7, 2014

Snohomish County Planning and Development Services:

Subject: Docket XVII, Sun5

On Sunday, September 28th, 2014 a sign was posted on the corner of Woodland Road and Pioneer Highway notifying area residents of impending changes to the Urban Growth Boundaries as initiated by the city of Stanwood in putting a proposal to that effect on the 2015 county docket. Since I have been a long-time resident of the area I appreciate this opportunity for public in-put to offer some observations concerning the proposed UGA boundary changes.

One: The main reason for including UGA area 1a and 1b in the Stanwood UGA was the pressing need to have another main traffic artery into and out of Stanwood, namely 300th. State Highway 532 is maxed out with traffic to and from Stanwood/Camano Island. A stoplight at the intersection of SR 532 and Woodland Road (64th) possibly routing traffic South onto 64th would, in my opinion, be disastrous. Woodland Road is and has been for decades a minor county road ill equipped to bear more traffic than it takes already. Aside from this, the intersection of 64th and 261st ST. NW is truly a 'BLIND INTERSECTION' and extremely dangerous under the best of circumstances let alone added traffic. I challenge planning council members to actually visit this site in reality rather than by means of maps and aerial views.

Second: The City of Stanwood assertion about the much higher cost in bringing sewer and water to the area targeted for exclusion from the original UGA plan versus bringing it to the areas suggested for addition to the UGA seems contrived. The residential developments in the direction of area 1a &1b already have sewer and water. Taking sewer and water lines across Douglas Creek

I-007-001
The basis for the proposal is described in Appendix D of the Draft EIS; the docket proposal notes the need for traffic analysis, which is addressed programmatically in Volume II of the Draft EIS.

I-007-002
The ability of the City to provide for sewer service to the proposed UGA boundary is addressed in Appendix D, and Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.11 of the Draft EIS.
I-007-003

The comment regarding preference for maintaining a rural status for the Urban Growth Area (UGA) addition area is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The UGA expansion is being recommended for approval by the County Executive and the Planning Commission with the Executive Recommendations including road rights of way as well.

I-007-004

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. See Appendix D. The City notes that sewer service is more cost effective to the UGA addition area than the UGA removal area. The means by which sewer service would be expanded (e.g. by developer extension and other funding sources) would be determined by the City in its sewer plans.
The comment regarding the zoning of the surplus school site and desire for the protection of significant trees as part of any development plans is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Development impacts, such as the retention of significant trees and buffer requirements would be addressed during development review. Snohomish County has several requirements for the retention of significant trees and providing buffers to reduce impacts from adjacent development. Section 30.25.020 of the Snohomish Unified Development Code provides an example of the existing code requirements for tree protection and buffers.
I-009-001

The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps.

Gentlemen,

My name is Khaled Sabra and the owner of a property located at:
13101 12th Drive SE
Everett, Washington 98208
Parcel # 00574100013000

I support the rezoning of the above property to an Urban High Density Residential (Multiple Residential)

Please feel free to give me a call if you have any questions.

Sincerely

Khaled Sabra
425 338 0342
The commenter raises concerns related to increased traffic in the vicinity of 29th Avenue SE and 128th Street SE if a roadway extension is completed. The Draft EIS does not include plans for any roadway extensions in this vicinity. Any potential future extensions, and their associated impacts, would be addressed during project level analysis.

The EIS reviews impacts at the planning level. Specific impacts associated with development, such as traffic, stormwater and other secondary impacts are reviewed in more detail to permit review.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps.
To the Planning and Development Committee

I-011-001

Alayne Johnson our two kids and I, Tim Johnson live at 24105 75th ave se Woodinville WA 98072.

We live directly west of Hooven Bog which was just purchased earlier this year for $1.6 M by the parks department.

We are writing to discuss the proposed Wellington hills park and our concerns on the impact that it will bring to the Wellington community.

Per the Mitigation Fund agreement between King County and Snohomish County the county parks department has already developed new parks in the area around Brightwater including Miners Corner Park of which are very nicely built and truly benefit the neighborhoods that around these newly built mitigation funded parks. The location of the proposed Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex is perplexing for us as neighbors and our local community.

Today like most days when I went for a jog along 75th ave, towards the King county line and I had to stop at every driveway and jump into a couple ditches as their is no shoulder on our road of 75th ave se. And I didn't want to get clipped by a car as it is Simply the white line of the road and then it's the ditch. This road is a typical rural road with open ditches on both sides with only two Covered ditches from the county line to 240th and these covered ditches were put in by my family and our next door neighbor otherwise it's all open ditches from 240th street (golf course road) until you reach the King County line where there is very nice shoulder/bike path.

So what does this mean? It means these roads can't handle the traffic of a regional sports complex and our kids and our neighbors will not be able to walk to their park without putting their lives at risk. This is a distance that as a 10 yr old kid (I grew up on the home we live in now) I would walk down to the golf course to golf with my friends and we never felt that we were in danger of getting hit. It is certainly not that way today. With the proposed regional sports complex traffic will simply become nuts on our rural roads.
As a Snohomish county resident I don't understand why Snohomish County Parks is determined to build this massive sports complex at the most southern point in the county? Can someone answer this for us? Why are they determined to make this happen when so many of us have said Please No. I have not heard of any family that is excited about this proposed park.

Our family is excited to see a park in our neighborhood if it had a couple ball fields a large play area, tennis and bball courts and walking paths picnic areas and even open area that our community could use not a park designed to attract the entire region to a small rural neighborhood. The last thing that I believe this so called "mitigation money" should be used for is to drop a regional sports complex in a rural area that is zoned R-5.

This is an area that currently struggles to handle the traffic from Hwy 9 that is already clogged with Costco traffic as well as traffic headed to Woodinville and traffic from dump trucks that use the JEV concrete recycling plant on 240th. If traffic were to depart from the park on 75th and go south towards Woodinville Duvall road it would be just as bad, not to mention that safety issue with that amount of traffic on that rural road. Currently it is already scary with bicyclist and weekend Costco traffic. 240th street (golf course Road) has already had a bicyclist killed on it just two years ago and the increased traffic and lack of proper roads will only increase the chance of another death on these rural roads.

Our family would propose a true community park that will maintain the rural zoning that you as a planning commission have designated for our area.

Thanks for your time we appreciate your hard work.

Timothy and Alayne Johnson
Snohomish County Residents
Project specific impacts, such as traffic, are addressed during project level review that includes opportunities to review the project application materials and submit comments.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps.

On Wednesday, October 8, 2014 3:45 PM, Rosalie Alyea <ramblinrosie1942@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Planning & Development Committee,

I am Rosalie Alyea and I reside at 1102 - 119th St. SE; Everett Wash. 98208. In the letter we received in early September was notice that our zoning was possibly changing from single residence to high density zoning. Years ago developers attempted to put a street thru to our local shopping center and also to change the zoning. The neighborhood was able to defeat that proposal.

Now, it seems, the developers are wanting to put multi-story buildings in our quiet neighborhood. That will only increase theft and vandalism. We have the potential of having multi-story buildings right next door. Our quiet neighborhood will be overrun with additional traffic and higher taxes. With new people coming to our area, the crime rate will only increase. Just recently our neighborhood has had two vehicles stolen and at least one break in. Our property is paid in full and we are too old to start over with rent and/or time payments. Please leave our single residence zoning in tact.

Thank you for your time and patience. Please feel free to call me anytime.

Sincerely,
Rosalie Alyea
(425) 357 7254
The proposed rezoning of property from R-9600 to R-7200 represents an approximately 36% increase in development capacity from 4.5 units per acres (R-9600) to 6.1 units per acre (R-7200). Many of the issues raised in the comments are applicable to project level review of a development proposal. The Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes regulation regarding low impact development (30.63C), Tree Retention (30.63B.160), Concurrency and Road Impact Mitigation (30.66B), and compatibility design standards for residential development (30.23A.030). The compatibility design standards address the compatibility between higher and lower density developments. However, the proximity of R-7200 and R-9600 would not be subject to additional design standards under the current code. Project level review will require compliance with the above standards and opportunities to review the application materials and provide public comment.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps.
density, the potential high density housing development is incongruous with the character of both the existing development, and the surrounding mature development pattern in the area. Once again the legal questions of evidence to support the increase, and proof of compatibility is severely lacking. A density increase of such magnitude is effectively an unsupportable “spot zone” within the current land development conditions. The surrounding houses will have up to 3 houses looking in to their back yards if a rezone is approved.

Rezone to higher density: The massive increase in density around my property, resulting from the proposed R7200 zoning over the current development conditions, is unsubstantiated in the factual record. Just wanting something doesn’t make it correct or warranted. The substantial up-zoning and density increase proposed is the equivalent of a classic 1960s-1970s urban renewal project. This kind of density incompatibility is a time tested and proven land use planning disaster with devastating impacts to the existing community. This is currently a desirable place to live because of the existing development pattern, the neighborhoods and sense of community. Such a high density development would be a parasite development, not contributing to, but instead feeding off the benefits provided by others. Again, where is the factual justification in the public record for this rezone? My neighbors and I should not be expected to provide the desirable community attributes for others to profit from without their own contribution. Mitigation of impacts and buffering from the negative attributes of dense development are just two of the responses that the final decision on the rezone must incorporate.

Natural and Man-made Environment: In addition to the ambiance and amenities currently provided by the property owners in the adjacent neighborhoods and residents, the adjoining property owners and the proposed rezoned area currently have extensive natural vegetation and habitat areas. This includes measurable tree inventory and substantial tree canopy that create habitats for the native animals in the area. The State of Washington, following national standards has promulgated policies and guidelines to local governments on the values of maintaining mature trees and tree canopy in naturally managing stormwater and water quantity, achieving air and water quality standards, building firewise communities, and protecting habitat in urban and community forest tracts. These natural systems perform significantly better, and are fiscally and environmentally sustainable over the long term, particularly when compared to the artificial contrivances necessitated by the high density R7200 proposal. Once again, the rezone materials do not address these issues, and therefore fail to provide the evidence to support the request for higher density.

Compatibility with existing adjoining properties: As noted above, the proposed rezoning area and the adjacent property owners share an extensive habitat and community forest environment. Any rezoning proposal needs to incorporate the retention and protection of a
meaningful and viable tree/vegetative buffer. This is essential to mitigate the negative impacts of any permitted development in the R9600 zone. The size and functional quality of the buffers would need to be significantly increased to offset the even higher negative impacts should the high density R7200 rezone somehow be found to be justified.

A meaningful and viable buffer would be at least 50' in width, with retained understory and undisturbed canopy (no commercial thinning or logging of mature trees). A viable buffer would insure that trees within and directly adjacent to the proposed rezone area would remain in healthy clusters. There is substantial information, including national and state studies documenting that sentinel trees created by thinning and narrowing buffers create hazard conditions leading to blow downs, uprooting and property damage. Allowing this rezone and then potential development to strip its existing buffers and/or knowingly create sentinel trees on adjoining properties is not only poor planning practice, but it clearly opens the County, developer and subsequent lot owners to legal liabilities. It is critical to insure that the potential future subdivision is conditioned to require the proper buffers and to insure the maintenance of the correct trees in the correct locations. A Certified Arborist to properly prepare this kind of analysis must be required as part of the potential future subdivision review and approval process. This certified arborist study also needs to identify any dangerous trees in the buffer that should be removed or converted to standing snags (for habitat). Stumps should be retained in place, no disturbing of the ground and vegetation, identified trees cut but not felled. If a rezone and a development is approved in the area surrounding my property, I am very concerned for the safety of myself and my property if all of the trees in the surrounding area were removed creating this unsafe environment that did not previously exist.

**County Policy for newly rebuilt roadway:** Most counties have policy regulations protecting new roadways from being cut or altered for a specific amount of time after they have been rebuilt. I would like to see the County's written policy for this item since 45th Ave SE was just rebuilt using Brightwater mitigation monies (as was 228th). This would include the sewer and water connection to the plat. From which direction will the sewer be connected as we are all on septic systems? How much of the new roadway will be torn up again to install any new connections for a development in a rezone area?

**Low Impact Development:** The area around my property under the existing R9600 zoning seems like a good candidate project for low impact development. The proposal for higher density is instead presented as a traditional, wasteful and environmentally incompatible high impact development potential without factual justification, and without meaningful mitigation. There are just too many unanswered and unsupported ideas contained in the proposed rezone.

**Traffic Mitigation:** When I purchased my house over 12 years ago, there was a County proposal to extend 39th Ave SE from 240th SE to 228th St SE. This was never installed to alleviate the
north/south traffic going to all of the hundreds of homes just north of 228th and hence, all of this traffic must travel on either 35th Ave SE or 45th Ave SE. I want to know why this was not built to mitigate the development north of 228th. During a recent shutdown of 35th Ave SE for a private development connecting the sewer for over 2 weeks in length, the traffic on 45th backed up to 240th St SE and then down the hill to 120th Ave NE in the evening. The impact with that amount of traffic including transit buses and large commercial vehicles was huge. In addition, there was the physical destruction of a roadway that was not built for this heavy traffic. This real example needs to be reflected accurately in the required traffic study. There will also be additional traffic on 45th since the park is now completed. I want that traffic to be added to the capacity on this county roadway since. The traffic study needs to accurately address this increase that will not be reflected in current traffic counts. The cumulative impacts must be evaluated. This rezone proposal needs be viewed in the larger picture.

In addition to all the environmental and regulatory issues I have raised, State law also requires that infrastructure improvements must be concurrent with the development that comes with rezing, which would include roadways, drainage and sanitary sewer. These issues have not been addressed in the available public record for rezone.

I am requesting a written response to all points in my letter.

Karen McKenzie
4420 234th PL SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Kmck37@sprynet.com
This EIS addresses impacts at the planning level. Impacts from specific development proposals, including impacts to individual wetlands and streams, will be addressed during permit reviews for those proposals. Many of the requirements in the Snohomish County Code provide protection for critical areas such as wetlands and streams. As discussed in the Draft EIS (e.g., pages 3-39 and 3-56), potential adverse effects on these resources can be avoided or minimized through compliance with critical areas rules (SCC 30.62A) and elements of the Snohomish County Code that address land-disturbing activities (SCC 30.63B).
The comments regarding zoning are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion and associated future land use and zoning maps.
1. 264 yards East of an existing development zoned, R-9,600sqft.
2. Directly North across the street from an existing development zoned, R-5,400sqft.
3. 450 yards Northeast of an existing development zoned, R2,800sqft.
4. 500 yards East of an existing development zoned, R-9,400sqft.
5. 120 yards Northeast of an existing Park.
6. 1,100 yards South of the new Miner’s Corner Park.
7. 540 yards Northwest of Woodinville High School.
8. And now...directly across the street east of the proposed 2015 Zoning Change Proposal of R7,200sqft lots.

Please take this in deep consideration to add our properties to the 2015 Proposed Zoning changes. If not R-7,200sqft zoning, then something else (R-9,600?). But please don’t let our R-5 acre minimums go another decade with us having to live a “Farmer’s Life” in a “Medium Density World”.

Feel free to contact me.

Thank You,

Tony Miller
425-754-3899 (c)
Support for the land use and zoning changes in the vicinity of the intersection of Highway 99 and Highway 525 is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps.
Again - A major "FACE LIFT" in WAP

Frankly - we are surprised that the City of

We wish you all luck as you move forward

Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:

Attention: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org

Debra Perry
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and the Planning Commission are recommending approval of the Standwood UGA amendments. Executive Recommendations also include road rights of way.
Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:

Attention: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.
Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:

Attention  Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County P/OS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA  98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org
I-019-001
The comments are noted and forwarded to the County decision makers.

The planning process is based on developing 20-year growth targets using the State Office of Financial Management (OFM) and the County's consultation with the cities through Snohomish County Tomorrow. They are estimates of likely growth based on the State OFM medium forecast.

---

I-019-001
Looking over Volume 1, I am surprised by the false exactitude of the projected growth numbers. Tables 2-1, 2-3, and 2-4 on Pages 2-11, 2-16 and 2-18, respectively, for example, project total population growth for the period 2011-2035 as exactly 238,281—to six significant figures! This is ridiculous. Some sort of statistical analysis must have been used, and, with the extraordinary number of variables which must have been included in the projection over many years, the number is bogus without some sort of range presented. One or, perhaps, two standard deviations up or down from the most probable number might be appropriate. Even with the ranges presented, the most probable number should have been rounded to one, or, at most, two, significant figures. Snohomish County would be better served (and the DEIS more robust) if planning is for a projected growth for the period of, say, 240,000 plus or minus 50,000. Exactly 238,281 is nonsense. The ranges should be expressed and addressed for the subcategories of analysis (Metro City, Core City, etc.), as well.

I live in Seattle, but own several properties in Snohomish County. I appreciate having the draft document available for review, and for the opportunity to comment.

Wayne Thurman
3011 Humes Place West
Seattle, WA 98119-1987
Home 206-453-3746
Cell 425-870-5550
Your comments regarding the zoning of your property are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning maps of the adjacent acres.
Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:
Attention: Sonya Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County P.O.S.
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S E34
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sonya.evans@snoco.org
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. See Draft EIS Section 3.2.2 for the analysis of the docket request in relation to regional and county planning policies.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.
I-022-001

Please see response to I-021-001.

To: Members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission
From: Waudita M. Potnam
Address: 9110 72nd Ave W
Arlington WA 98223
Phone: 360-482-9969
Email: 
Date: 9.29.14
Subject: 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Please include the following comments in the official Planning Commission record for the 2015 Update Project of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and give them consideration when formulating your recommendation to the County Council. Thank you.

This is in reference to Alternative 3, City of Arlington Docket Item:

My tax ID # are 3105120400200 and 3105120400400 and I own 59+ acres of the 300+ acres in what is referred to as the Beachside Beach Addition to the City of Arlington TDR Receiving Area. The Docket the proposed would exclude.

As an assurance to removal of my property from the Arlington VEA, I am opposed to any proposed action. However, I would support a revision to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan that would in effect remove the required size of TDRs for any future development.

Waudita Potnam

See reverse side for mailing instructions or if more space is needed.
To: Members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission

From: Robert E. Putnam
Name: Robert E. Putnam
Address: 9104 Twent Rd
Arlington, WA 98223
Phone: 360-485-2405
Email: skmac123@earthlink.net

Date: 9/24/14

Subject: 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Please include the following comments in the official Planning Commission record for the 2015 Update Project of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and give them consideration when formulating your recommendation to the County Council. Thank you.

This comment is in reference to Alternative 3 City of Arlington docked Item. My tax # 20 12 3 10 120 040 2 300 and I represent 5 acres of the 300+ acres in what is referred to as the Brekhus Beach annexation to the City of Arlington. TDR receiving area. The docked as proposed would include the de-annexation and removal of my property from the Arlington DPA. I am opposed to this proposed action. However, I would like to see a revision to the 2005 Comp Plan that would in effect remove the required use of TDRs for any development.

See reverse side for mailing instructions or if more space is needed.
I-024-001
Please see Response to I-021-001.

2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update Project
Citizen Comments to the Planning Commission

To: Members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission
From: Alisa Denise Putnam
Name: Alisa Denise Putnam
Address: 9104 10th St SE
Arlington, WA 98223
Phone: 360 425-9064
Email: Denise.Putnam@earthlink.net
Date: 9.24.14
Subject: 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Please include the following comments in the official Planning Commission record for the 2015 Update Project of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and give them consideration when formulating your recommendation to the County Council. Thank you.

This comment is in reference to Alternative 3, City of Arlington - Street item.

My tax ID # is 8105 1200 402300 and I grew up on 5 acres in what is referred to as the Freihus/Peach Association to the City of Arlington TOD receiving area. The project as proposed would include the annexation and removal of our property from the Arlington URA. I am opposed to this proposed action. However, I would like to see a review of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan that would in effect remove the required use Zoning and future development.

Sincerely,
Alisa Denise Putnam

See reverse side for mailing instructions or if more space is needed.
The areas identified in your comments have been shown on the County's map of public comments for consideration, which will be forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.
Jerry and Teresa Wells
24103 47th Ave. S.E.
Woodinville, Wa. 98072

9/23/2014

Sally Evans
Snohomish County PDS

Thank you in advance for taking time to read through my story. I have been a small businessman / home builder in Snohomish County for almost 40 years. In 1996 my wife and I purchased this 5 acre property on which to build our home, raise our family and invest for our retirement. In 1998 I began the short plat process in order to build a new home on our property. I went in to the county with the intention of cutting my 5 acres into 4, 1.25 acre pieces. After explaining my intent with county staff, they recommended I cut off one 1 acre piece for the new house and hold the remaining 4 acre for 5 years at which time I could cut it into 4 pieces netting a total of 5 lots from my 5 acre property. As I only needed the one acre cut off at that time it made perfect sense to wait, after all it was for my retirement anyway. I never dreamed that property could be up zoned to 5 acre minimums.

In 2006 I and many of my neighbors applied to the zoning commission to have our neighborhood zoned down to 9600 sq. ft. to bring us into a more appropriate size based on the surrounding properties. My neighbor, Tom Davidson’s property abuts the King county line to the South, and sewer is across the street from his property corner. Across the street (47th) to the West is the City of Bothell which is R-4 and there are several very small pieces existing between there and our property. To the North of my and the Miller’s property is an existing HUD project put in back in the 1960’s which are 9600 sq ft lots on Septic systems many of which are falling or have failed with no options until sewer comes to them. I made these arguments in 2006 and we were denied. I was told by Steve Scorenly that it was not a matter of if, but only when we would be allowed to develop. He said that we had to get Bright Water completed before we would be allowed. Since that time I know people in that HUD project who are “bootlegging” repairs on their systems because they have no options. Allowing us to develop would bring a sewer main to within feet of that project.

Now it is 2014, I have been patient, but can't help but feel I have been “dumped upon” by my County for the second time now. The housing business has been terrible for most of the past 6 years and I have exhausted much of my savings trying to hang on to this property, knowing that this was the year of the “re zone” I am getting on in years and can not continue to afford to stay here much longer. I can not understand how anyone could drive around our neighborhood and think we should be 5 acre min. We have the most sophisticated sewage treatment plant in the world less than a mile from my property and we are 5 acre min. We have sewer available across the street, and we are 5 acre min. Our property is flat, with no standing water of any kind to deal with and yet we remain 5 acre min. In 2006 you tried to tell me we couldn’t develop because we had no city water,
but I have and continue to pay my water bill every month since I have owned the property. I can't help but wonder if anyone from the County has ever been out here to see our neighborhood.

In conclusion I will include the map of our neighborhood from the Docket XII Please note the HUD project to the North as well as the sewer location to our South. I will also include the letter to the council I submitted back in 2006. We are not "Johnny come lately's" we have been asking for your help for well over 10 years and would very much appreciate you taking another look at our area.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry W. Wells
Jerry & Teresa Wells
24103 47th Ave. S.E.
Woodinville, Wa. 98072

4/6/2006

Snohomish County Council:

Thank you for taking the time to consider our property for redesignation from Rural Residential to Urban Low Density Residential. For the past several years we have been trying to be reclassified to no avail. I purchased this property some 15 years ago as a place to raise my family as well as provide for my retirement someday. Hopefully, with your positive consideration, that day will come soon.

It is our contention that we should be redesignated for the following reasons,

1. Our property is located in the very southernmost part of the county. King County is across the street to the South, which is also the City of Woodinville, where the sewer system is available. Bothell city limits are directly across the street to the West. Snohomish County has rezoned a large area of property just to the North of us. With development all around us, we seem to be a forgotten little corner of the world.

2. Our impact on transportation in the area will be minimal. We have two major freeway on-ramps onto Hi-way 522 within one mile of our proposed development, and a third onto Hi-way 405 approximately 1.25 miles away. The first two are directly south of our property, all surface streets are in King County, the third flows West into Bothell of which most surface streets have recently been improved to provide for the development there.

3. As we are at the very top of the hill, surface water flow has never been a concern. Even with this years record setting rainfall we have no standing water on our property. When we develop the property any on-site retention will only serve to release what surface water we might have at a mere regulated rate of flow.

4. We have a wide variation of property sizes in our neighborhood from 5 acre, to 1 acre, down to 5600 sq. ft. in some of the older properties. All are on septic systems, some of which have failed. On these small pieces there is not enough reserve area to properly take care of the problem. In many cases the repairs have been “boot-legged” in because they do not have enough area to attain the necessary permits. Occasionally on a warm summer evening the aroma will tell the tale. Approval of our development would not provide a proper fix for our neighbors, but would get the ball rolling in their direction.
We understand the Council’s concern that opening up the entire South West area might put a strain on the system, however we believe that starting with our property, where services are already available would serve a logical starting point from which to begin the process.

Along with Mr. Davidson, who adjoins me to the South of my property, we will be able to build a project that we all will be proud of. As I intend to live out my retirement here in my current home, and hope my children will build their homes on the land they grew up on, I have every reason to want this development to be a model which the Council can point to with pride for the rest of the area to follow.

Sincerely:

Jerry & Teresa Wells
I-026-001

Insufficient information was provided to respond.

2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update Project
Citizen Comments to the Planning Commission

To: Members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission

From: Ruby J. Hanson
Address: 12002 Little Begin RD
Sultan, WA 98294
Phone: 360-793-1056
Email: 

Date: 

Subject: 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Please include the following comments in the official Planning Commission record for the 2015 Update Project of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and give them consideration when formulating your recommendation to the County Council. Thank you.

NO

0 0

You don't take care of the City of Sultan. There is no benefits to it!
The commenter raises concerns about the existing congestion along the 164th Street corridor and suggests potential improvements at the I-5/164th Street interchange and the Maple Road/Butternut Road intersection. Snohomish County’s adopted 2015-2020 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes a project, D.60, to replace existing signal controls with an adaptive signal control system on the Airport Road/128th Street SW/SR 96 corridor, from SR 526 to Seattle Hill Road, and the SR 527 corridor, from SR 96 to 228th Street SE. In the 2015-2020 TIP, preliminary engineering is programmed for 2015 with deployment anticipated in 2016. TIP project D.60 is being used as a “test case” for the adaptive signal control system. If this system proves successful in reducing traffic congestion along the above corridors, then the Snohomish County Department of Public Works intends to pursue the installation of this system along the 164th Street corridor. The Draft EIS does not include any improvements at the Maple Road/Butternut Road intersection, but this location may be reviewed in the future as part of the County’s project prioritization and programming process, which includes the Transportation Needs Report, TIP, and Annual Construction Program. This process includes the prioritization and programming of roundabouts and intersection improvements.
I-028-001

Your support for Alternative 3 and the UMDR/LDMR designations (or a higher density designation) on the subject parcel is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the proposed future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the proposed future land use and zoning amendments.

---

I-028-001

Thank you all for your long hours and hard work toward planning Snohomish County’s future growth. We are owners of Parcel No. 28053500200100 in Southwest Snohomish County and favor proposed Alternative 3 as it seems the most realistic approach for addressing the rapid growth trends that will continue to challenge the County in the coming years. We ask that you support the designation of “UMDR” and zone “LDMR” proposed in Alternative 3 for this parcel (approximately 40 acres), or even consider a higher density if the Planning Committee finds it advantageous. Here are the salient reasons for supporting our request:

- This parcel is already within a designated UGA or Urban Growth Area, and so approving our parcel for this higher density will allow for more of the County’s future growth to take place within these areas already set aside for higher density, rather than in other rural areas that would need to constantly be subdivided to accommodate similar growth.
- This parcel is conveniently located near all of the following:
  2. Schools – Glacier Peak High School, Valley View & Gateway Middle Schools, and Totem Falls & Silver Firs Elementary Schools
  3. Shopping & services
  4. Other adjacent properties with LDMR/UMDR proposed under Alternative 3.
- The recommended zoning under Alternative 3 for this parcel would be consistent with federal & state planning guidelines and may also accommodate nearby city governments’ wishes. While at the same time, since this parcel is already within a UGA, the new zoning is not out of place.
- With other designations nearby of “Urban Village,” “Urban High Density Residential”, and “Urban Industrial” a higher density of UDMR/LDMR for this parcel would aid in economic development of this area overall, and therefore make the area more attractive for potential developers and businesses.
- The suggested developing of the surplus County property to the south of our property, which includes a proposed road from Cathcart Way to our parcel, would eliminate increased traffic and funnel it away from the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
- Finally, a higher density for this parcel would practically and aesthetically provide the greatest benefit to the greatest amount of County residents, as this parcel is elevated at the very top of the ridge looking north and east (approximately 270 degrees), with sweeping views of Mount Baker to the north, Mount Pilchuck, the Snohomish Valley, and the rest of the Cascade Range to the east. It’s simply breathtaking! Why not allow more people to enjoy it and better identify with the unique area in which they choose to live – Snohomish County!

Thanks again for your time and efforts. Please consider these advantages we listed here for approving Alternative 3 and a designation of “UMDR/LDMR” for this parcel, or a higher density if you so choose. If you have any questions, we would be happy to try to answer them.
2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update Project
Citizen Comments to the Planning Commission

To: Members of the Snohomish County Planning Commission

From: Grace H. Wilkins
Name: Grace H. Wilkins
Address: 1999 Sultan Basin Road
Sultan, WA 98294
Phone: 360-793-0815
Email: gin079c@frontier.com

Date: Sept. 26, 2014

Subject: 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Please include the following comments in the official Planning Commission record for the 2015 Update Project of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan and give them consideration when formulating your recommendation to the County Council. Thank you.
September 26, 2014

Dear Planning Commission,

I wish to strongly object to the City of Sultan’s request to put my property along with my neighbors in the urban growth area to be annexed to the city in the future.

First of all, I do not believe that the City of Sultan needs my property or that of my neighbors to meet any growth criteria. I wish to remain in the county as do my neighbors. I am elderly and would be taxed off my property for the benefit of speculators.

It seems that only a few influential landowners have a voice in this process, leaving us who have no desire to change our property designation from Rural/Agriculture with no voice!

I have lived on five acres on the Sultan Basin Road for over 30 years. I have four horses. The owner in front of me has one horse and keeps it on a pasture next door (south) that contains seven other horses.

The new owner next to me on the north has four horses. In addition, some of that property has been fenced off and designated wet lands. The property next to them on the north (going up the Basin Road) is an organic farm growing vegetables, raising chickens and farm animals. This property also contains a small pond. In addition, the property is next to the Bonneville Power lines and a gas line. Hardly desirable for future building sites.

It would be more desirable and make more sense to annex the property that is adjacent to Rice Road (339th) east with it’s easy access to Highway 2, bus line, city water, sewer, etc. than a steep up grade rural county road that would not add nearly as much to the city tax base and be more expensive in the long run.

Please consider my request and keep this area saved for environmental and rural/agriculture open space.

Thank you.

Grace H Wilkins
12932 Sultan Basin Road
Sultan, WA 98294
360-793-0723

I-029-001

The comments regarding Sultan UGA boundaries are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.

I-030-001

I am writing to tell you why I think we should be put into the UGA. In 2008 the county council was going to put us into the UGA, we had a builder and all things looked good until the last minute when for some reason you decided not to allow us in. We have never been told why other than Gary Nelson decided against it. When we bought our property and built our home on a dead end street where our children could ride their horses and bikes on the street without worrying about someone hitting them with a car. We had all the animals we wanted and raise. Because the street was dead end kids and animals were safe. We knew the children on our street and looked out for them. The back pasture fence line on the west side of the street was owned by Mr. & Mrs. Goemaere and had a herd of Herford’s. Never was a problem with all the cattle. Then came Fernwood Elementary, not so bad. As far away as it is from my house we can hear the bells ring before and after school, lunch recess, children playing on the field and all the ball games. Then you decided to put 300 homes on the east side of 43rd, and more on the west side of our dead end road. Before long a side walk was installed from the side of the ditch into our already narrow road. That made our road even narrower. Then they put a fence on the side walk and today they are taking it down and rebuilding it again. Two trucks can’t pass without one stopping. Then mail boxes were installed on the edge of the other side of the road. Way to close to the street. Now you want to build a High School in our back yards. With Football fields, baseball fields, soccer fields, track and I’m sure the band will practice on the fields with light shining and loud speakers. Not something I really want to listen to day in and day out.

We enjoy the quite evenings on our deck having dinner and conversation. That will all be gone, it is now with all the machines, back up bells, dozers, trees falling, double truck and trailers going up and down the street every 15 to 20 minutes 6 days a week 10 hour days. Just being out side at any time of day is loud.
We should be given the same opportunity our neighbors Mr. Goemaere, Mr. Krause, Mr. Sturgell, Pulte Homes - Trov'as on 196th and 51st Ave. S.E. Polygon Homes - the Reserve at North Creek were given.

You have approved development all around us while ignoring our wishes to be included in the UGA Urban Growth Area.

Caroline Atwood

Mike Atwood
Preferences regarding zoning and density of the neighborhood are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County's public process for Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and Zoning amendments includes public notice (mailed) and hearings and the County may redesignate and rezone properties when the County Council makes its deliberations and decision by June 2015. Additional public process is not required. The County's approach to public involvement is described at the project website: http://2015update-snocon.org/public-involvement/.

A Use Code is assigned by the County Assessor and relates to tax collection. It may be changed without a public process. The appropriate point of input into the use of the property is the land use and rezone process associated with the Comprehensive Plan Update.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the proposed future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the proposed future land use and zoning amendments.
I-032-001

The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Snohomish County and the cities within the county collaborate on the designation of Urban Growth Areas (UGA). Cities have the opportunity through that process to request that areas be removed from the UGA. In order to meet obligations under the Growth Management Act, UGAs must be sized appropriately to accommodate established growth targets for population, housing and employment. Therefore, any UGA reduction may require additional areas to be included in the UGA.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending a UGA reduction in the subject area.
I-033-001

The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update is the correct process to request amendments to land use and zoning designations. Your request has been documented on the "Planning Commission Inputs" maps located on Snohomish County's website for consideration by the County Council.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments to designate the property for industrial use or inclusions in the UGA.
The comments regarding preferences to avoid changes to the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the Sultan UGA expansion.

I-034-001

The following comments are in regard to Sultan's proposed UGA #1. I own land within the area and am opposed to the UGA designation for the following reasons:

1) AGRICULTURE
   - It is a rural agricultural area with an active, CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) farm on 30 of these acres. I myself grow organic apples and blueberries on my 30 acres, with the majority of the land forested and in wetlands with a fresh water pond fed by springs.

2) LOCATION
   - On a map this area appears at the same elevation as Sultan. It is not 300-400 feet above Sultan, which is slightly above sea level. The Bonnieville Power Line crosses my front pastures and the Williams Natural Gas Pipeline is a few dozen feet outside my southern boundary. To look at...
my land as residential and subdivided into 7300 square feet lots is ridiculous.

3) DEVELOPER

The driving force behind this proposed VCA #1 is a developer who owns 60 acres on the north side of 194th Street S. E. across from my land. In order to get a sewer line down 194th to his property (county regulations for a project like this are too tough for him) he needs to be able to go through land in a VCA. He has been working with the city for a long time, since before 2006, helping them with their comprehensive plans so his development could go through. Public participation? Zero.

There is documentation for this. Recently at a city council meeting he thanked the mayor and the council for recognizing his business (chee-ton on Hwy 2 east of town). He mentioned helping with annexations, sewer lines and zoning and said he was disappointed there is not more development.

4) LANDOWNERS IN PROPOSED VCA #1

My neighbors and I have contacted the people who are affected and no one has said they want to be in the proposed VCA.

Thank you for your time and effort in this land issue.

Jean Roberts

Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:
Attention: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org
Gentlemen,

Attached is a letter regarding seven acres of land owned by the Mietzner's requesting the change of plan designation and zoning to Urban Village with a rezone to Neighborhood Business. Please let me know your receipt of this letter.

Leslie A. Patchen
President
Metco Management Group, L.L.C.
425-218-1474
Your request for amended land use and zoning designations has been noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" maps located on the Snohomish County website for consideration by the County Council. Any land use and zoning amendments must be consistent with the provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the Countywide Planning Policies.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments to change the designation of the subject property to Neighborhood Business (NB). The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the map amendments.
Evans, Sally

From: James Mayer <mayajcm@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 2:55 PM
To: 2015 Update
Subject: 2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments
Attachments: 2014100144707.pdf

On behalf of my father-in-law, William C Harvey, I am enclosing the attached letter of comments.

Thank you,

James P Mayer
DATE AND TIME: October 1, 2014
TO: Snohomish County Planning Commission
FIRM: 
RECEIVING FAX #: 425-388-3670
FROM: William Harvey
RE: 2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments
REMARKS: Please see attached comments.

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS SHEET - 2
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction in Arlington.

Comments to the Planning Commission for the 2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update Project

My name is William C Harvey. I own the property at 9415 Twelt Road, Arlington, WA 98223.

My comments are in reference to Alternative 3, City of Arlington Docket Item.

My tax ID number is 31051200400300. I own 9 acres which is part of the 300+ acres in what is referred to the Breihus/Beach annexation to the city of Arlington TDR Receiving area. The Docket as proposed would include the de-annexation and removal of my property from the Arlington UGA. I am absolutely opposed to this proposal.

In addition, I would like to see a revision to the 2005 Comp Plan that would, in effect, remove the required use of TDR's for any development. I, as my neighbors, believe that the TDR requirement may be in violation of ROW 82.02.020.

Thank you taking the time to consider my comments and I would appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

William C Harvey
P.O. Box 25
Lakewood, WA 98259

360-652-0868
mayajpm@gmail.com
The comment regarding opposition to the rezoning of the two subject parcels has been noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" maps located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by the County Council. Impacts associated with utilities and traffic would be addressed during project level review and the project must comply with the Snohomish County Code. Any project permit application would be available for public review and comment.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments on the subject parcels.
Hi Sally:

We’ve lived on Lake Serene for the past 35 years. The outflow of the lake is inadequate and defective. Until the problem is fixed an increase in residential density should not be contemplated by the Snohomish County.

Some suggestions:

The outflow of the lake should be built in a public R-O-W. Presently the outflow of the lake runs through private property and the culverts are worn out and inadequate in size. The surface water fees we are paying should cover the cost of replacing the line.

Another way of financing a resized outflow culvert in a Public Right Of Way is charging the developers $1,000 plus for every new residential dwelling unit created in the watershed.

Marc Bhend
4125 Serene Way
Lynnwood, WA 98037

ph 425-743-5544
My name is Esther Bandelin Rodriguez and I am a member of Salish Sea Industries. I know you have voted to not allow any more applicants in the Commercial R5 zone. After watching the meetings on Monday and Wednesday I believe you maintained the discretion to say who is vested. I also heard you say this would be on a case by case basis. I implore you to consider the work we have done to date with the county as vested and allow us to honor our October 20th appointment.

We have an appointment to deliver our commercial building permit for an IS02 license on a property zoned R5 on October 20th. We started the process of moving our business to Snohomish County in early August. To date we have had a PDS Certificate of Transportation Concurrency and our commercial Preapplication Submittal deemed complete and successfully submitted as well as having our Permit Intake appointment scheduled for October 20th. We have in good faith followed the county process which takes time and are a mere two weeks away from our permit application appointment.

The main reason for moving forward with a pre application meeting was to ensure that we had everything in place the county would require and that we went in as transparent as possible. We received feedback that we had provided a very thorough pre application package. If we forewent this step in the process we would have had our Commercial Permit Intake appointment complete before your decision.

This is a pivotal time for our company and represents almost two solid years of work for us. To be two weeks shy of a permit is devastating. Please let us move forward in this process.

Kind Regards,

Esther Bandelin Rodriguez
Salish Sea Industries
206-290-8068
The comments regarding the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to the County decision makers. Please note the UGA addition and removal areas are identified for residential uses, not business uses.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the expansion of the Sultan UGA.
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.
The comments regarding preferences to avoid changes to the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The County's docket process is detailed in SCC Chapter 30.74 Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.

Hello Sally,

I am the owner of a 30-acre parcel of land included in the UGA Addition 1 being proposed by the City of Sultan. This beautiful agricultural property is being cultivated as a working farm, producing fruits and vegetables sold at local area farmer's markets. It also is a boarding facility for horses. We believe the City of Sultan's "secret" plans to modify the exiting UGA to allow high-density developments are un-justified and un-constitutional. The City has done an inept job of informing landowners of their planned adjustments, and are catering to cosy developers rather than the common good of the entire area. We fear the dramatic increase in traffic, large shared infrastructure costs required to support this development, and the erosion of valuable agricultural lands which are equally important to the fabric of the area.

In addition, I was not informed or involved in the city's docket amendment process as required by state law RCW 36.70A.140 "Each city is required to establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program .....for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans." The other glaring deficiency is that the city's population target has been reduced by 25% and they have ample capacity within city limits to accommodate future growth without needing to include my property in the UGA. Developing the infrastructure to support a highly-questionable dense housing project should not be a higher priority than preserving valuable agricultural lands for farming, horses, livestock, and wildlife.

I hope you will reject Sultan's heavy-handed plan to re-structure the UGA to benefit one large developer.

Thank you,

Bryan Ashbaugh
Owner
12718 Sultan Basin road
Sultan, WA 98294
The areas identified in your comments have been shown on the County's map of public comments for consideration, which will be forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of a UGA expansion.
Please see response to: C-003-001 Lake Serene Community Association. The effects of growth on services is addressed in Chapter 3.2 of the Draft EIS, and the potential for transportation impacts is addressed in Volume II of the Draft EIS.

This letter is in regards to Expanded LDMR zoning. I have several concerns. The first being that Lake Serene is full, and it cannot accommodate more water without seriously damaging lake-front homes and downstream water quality. The outflow "system" is years past its designed lifespan and future floods are inevitable. Fire District One does not favor LDMR building. It has issues with access, lack of sprinkler systems, ladder space between buildings, etc. Road access restrictions due to inadequate on-site/off-site parking often results in illegal parking. There is no public open space planned for accommodating all the additional density.

Additional there is now a very large apartment complex that is new on the Mukilteo Speedway. This has 16-5 bedroom units, 56-4 bedroom units, 72-3 bedroom units, 64-2 bedroom units and 7-1 bedroom units. This families who live here will have to be bussed to Serene Lake Elementary due to overcrowding at the closest elementary to this apartment complex. Please don't approve these LDMR building permits when the infrastructure can't handle it.

The impact of the traffic and congestion is going to be harder to deal with then it is now. My reason for bring this up is where are these kids going to attend school if all the Mukilteo schools are over flowing with students and no room to put more?

The safety issues with LDMR housing is scary. We have already had one home burn down and a second one caught on fire due to them being too close together. The fire department can't get their ladders up to second or third floor windows due to the limited space between the houses. How many people will be hurt or worse lose their lives due to not being able to get help.

Next, what do you plan today to help with the growing traffic that we have now? Not to mention added more homes? Our district can't keep trying to build schools are the rate of your development in the county. We can't even get law enforcement out here due to lack of staff.
Do any of you live in our neighborhood? Would you want this built in your backyard? Would you like your children or grandchildren to attend schools with 33 plus students in their classroom or being transported by overloaded buses? Have you considered the how important it is to listen to the communities this effects? Look at Oso and if the county would have listen to people who said it was a bad idea to build there, the 43 lives would not have been lost nor the families who were torn apart.

I hope you will think long and hard about this LDMR housing. No one wants it nor needs it. Just because a developer pays their fees and the county get more money, it is the taxpayer who pays for your decisions. The poor choices you make cost all of us dearly. You should listen to how this affects people's lives and their community. Make the right choice and reject the LDMR building in all of Snohomish County.

Thank you,

Kim and Kirk Benson
4223 Serene Way
Lynnwood, WA 98087
425-745-3055
I-045-001

Please see response to comment I-019-001.

Dear Commissioner Norcott:

Regarding the 2015 Update to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS):

The public was invited to send comments on the DEIS to Planning & Development Services. I e-mailed the following comment to 2015update@snooco.org on September 13, 2014:

"To Terri Strandberg, Planning & Development Services:

"Re: 2015 Update DEIS SEPA Comments

"Looking over Volume 1, I am surprised by the false exactitude of the projected growth numbers. Tables 2-1, 2-3, and 2-4 on Pages 2-11, 2-16 and 2-18, respectively, for example, project total population growth for the period 2011-2035 as exactly 238,281—to six significant figures! This is ridiculous. Some sort of statistical analysis must have been used, and, with the extraordinary number of variables which must have been included in the projection over many years, the number is bogus without some sort of range presented. One or, perhaps, two standard deviations up or down from the most probable number might be appropriate. Even with the ranges presented, the most probable number should have been rounded to one, or, at most, two, significant figures. Snohomish County would be better served (and the DEIS more robust) if planning is for a projected growth for the period of, say, 240,000 plus or minus 50,000. Exactly 238,281 is nonsense. The ranges should be expressed and addressed for the subcategories of analysis (Metro City, Core City, etc.), as well.

"I live in Seattle, but own several properties in Snohomish County. I appreciate having the draft document available for review, and for the opportunity to comment."

I doubt that PDS will give the false exactitude issue much consideration. The Planning Commission would do Snohomish County a significant service if it did.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Wayne Thurman
206-453-3746
425-870-5550
wrightman@comcast.net
Your comments regarding the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The population capacity and targets are addressed in Draft EIS Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment. The County's approach to public outreach for Dockets is identified in Chapter 30.74 of the Snohomish County Code, Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the UGA reduction.

I-046-001

I attended the County Planning Commission briefing on Tuesday, September 9 and received a notice of it because my property is off of Trout Farm Road in the current UGA that would be affected by the proposed changes. While I am not speaking for it, I am a member of Sultan’s Planning Board and so have knowledge of and care for the city’s future development. The City’s proposal regarding transfer of lands was made before I moved to my home in the UGA of Sultan. It wasn’t until I attended the County meeting that I more fully understood its ramifications and the cause of complaints of residents of the proposed UGA south of 124th St. SE. I have since driven the areas of the proposed transfer and thought about what would be best for the future of Sultan.

First, I agree with the city’s recommendation that the properties along Trout Farm Road should be removed from the UGA because it is much too expensive to put sewer and other utilities into that area. And, the Sultan River needs all the protection it can get for salmon recovery and more development near the river will not help.

However, I would like the County to refrain from adding the land north of the city and south of 124th St. to the UGA. It is rural land the Growth Management Act is trying to protect. The property owners currently in the area were not consulted by the city in adding this area to the UGA. The City of Sultan does not need that area to meet its projected population increase and, in fact, the city has not shown any significant growth in the last several years so even the lowered projection is unlikely. Developing sufficient roads and access to public transportation in that area is expensive, controversial and unlikely. There are high power lines over portions of the area so it should not be zoned residential.

See reverse side for mailing instructions or if more space is needed.
In addition, I recommend that the land north of 124th St. also be transferred out of the UGA. It is agricultural land that was originally forest, but in any case rural, which is exactly what the Urban Growth Boundary is designed to protect. It is far from the proposed city centers, unlikely to receive bus transportation or a connecting road on the west side while introducing too many cars for only one exit road. Development would require putting sewer lines on private property south of 124th.

However, I would keep in the UGA swap the area near Rice Road, above Highway 2, that is projected to be an urban center. Given that the downtown area is subject to flooding and many business properties for sale there have not sold or rented for several years given the expense of renovation and raising the ground floors above the flood plain, the Rice Road area is the best area for development of a town center for the future. It is flat, it is near Highway 2 and public transportation, has a roundabout and much car traffic. It is good to have housing development, including apartments, within city limits, near such a commercial center. The resources of the city could then be used in a meaningful and economic way to promote development for the city, and utility development would be much more limited and more reasonable in price. Sewer lines have already reached the MacDonalds' area. With planning and a smaller footprint we have the possibility of attending to the aesthetics of this town center which would attract people to our community as the current hodgepodge along US 2 and the hidden nature of Main Street do not.

I also wish to comment on process. It is important that the City and County make their decisions regarding its land on reason and democratic process not on pressure from landowners who want their property developed and happen to be friends with decision-makers past and present. Showing respect for and the flexibility to change with public input encourage people to participate, not grumble in the background.

Thank you for your attention.

[Signature]

Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:
Attn: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
2000 Rockefeller Avenue, MS 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org
I-047-001

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.

In reference to Alternative 3, City of Arlington

Docket Item:

My Tax ID # is 31051200401000 and I have 5.91 acres of the 300+ acres in what is referred to as the Brekhus Beach annexation to the City of Arlington. The receiving area. The Docket as proposed would include the de-annexation and removal of my property from the Arlington UGA. I am opposed to this proposed action. However, I would like to see a revision to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan that would in effect remove the required use of TDRs for any development.
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.
Information on the 2015 GMA Update may be found at http://2015-update-snoco.org, via e-mail at 2015update@snoco.org or by calling 425-388-3311.

Hello Sally,

I have been looking at the list of topics for this meeting and see 5 areas listed. I also looked at the proposed map which includes my property but this area East of 45th Ave SE is not listed on the agenda. Will it be discussed on October 7? I have tried finding information on the web site but am not very good at that and have not been able to find any mention of this area at any meeting. Could you please advise me what is or has been decided or when I can attend a meeting to see what is being presented. What can I expect from these changes? I am retired and 70yr so these changes are of great concern to me. Any help you can provide will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you,

Judi Schlegel
4521 224th St SE
Bothell, WA 98021
425-483-1256
I-050-001
Your comments regarding the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The population capacity and targets are addressed in Draft EIS Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment. The County’s approach to public outreach for Dockets is identified in Chapter 30.74 of the Snohomish County Code, Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the UGA retraction but not the UGA expansion proposed by Sultan.
I hope my comments don't fall on deaf ears. We do not need this type of government. I oppose the city's petitions to include UGA 1 and 2 in the swap and support the removal of the Trout Farm UGA and hope you will too.

Gerry Gibson
1102 Dyer Rd., Sultan, WA 98294
360-799-1736
The comments regarding opposition to the Sultan UGA proposal are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the Sultan UGA retraction but not the UGA expansion.
traffic to a corridor already unable to safely mitigate its current challenges. I also question the population numbers that support this plan.

Until a viable alternative route to US 2 exists, I feel the population of the area will be fairly neutral. Extending the City of Sultan further into rural areas also increases social isolation, environmental degradation & stretches city services/needs that are already not being met adequately.

Again, I wish to register my opposition to the Sultan UGA 1 and 2 requested changes. The City of Sultan urban core is exactly why I moved to Sultan and it needs attention, yes, careful infill/density planning, yes, to be abandoned and moved East/North, NO!

Sincerely,
Toni Reading
300 4th St
Sultan, WA  98294
I-052-001

Your comments regarding the Sultan UGA are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The County used the notice requirements in Chapter 30.74 of the Snohomish County Code, Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending the Sultan UGA retraction but not the UGA expansion.

---

I am the owner of a 30-acre parcel of land included in the UGA Addition 1 being proposed by the City of Sultan. This beautiful agricultural property is being cultivated as a working farm, producing fruits and vegetables sold at local area farmer's markets. It also is a boarding facility for horses. We believe the City of Sultan's "secret" plans to modify the exiting UGA to allow high-density developments are un-justified and un-constitutional. The City has done an inept job of informing landowners of their planned adjustments, and are catering to cosy developers rather than the common good of the entire area. We fear the dramatic increase in traffic, large shared infrastructure costs required to support this development, and the erosion of valuable agricultural lands which are equally important to the fabric of the area.

In addition, I was not informed or involved in the city's docket amendment process as required by state law RCW 36.70A.140 "Each city is required to establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program ... for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans." The other glaring deficiency is that the city's population target has been reduced by 25% and they have ample capacity within city limits to accommodate future growth without needing to include my property in the UGA. Developing the infrastructure to support a highly-questionable dense housing project should not be a higher priority than preserving valuable agricultural lands for farming, horses, livestock, and wildlife.

I hope you will reject Sultan's heavy-handed plan to re-structure the UGA to benefit one large developer.

Thank you,

Bryan Ashbaugh
Owner
12718 Sultan Basin road
Sultan, WA 98294
I-053-001

The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

Site specific impacts associated with development projects, such as traffic impacts, are addressed during the permitting process. The permit process allows for public review of application materials and opportunities to provide public input on the proposal. The Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes standards that address concurrency and road impact mitigation (SCC 30.66B).

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
Ms. Evans,

Attached as 'written testimony' is a cover letter and attachments for comment and consideration by the Planning Commission for tomorrow's meeting.

Sincerely,

Karla J Crawley
Paralegal

This email is confidential and may also be attorney-client privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you may not use, disseminate, distribute, or copy any portion of this email. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify us by reply email and delete the message.

NOTE: This office does not accept service of pleadings or process service by e-mail or fax except with prior written approval.
I-054-001

No zoning or land use designation changes are proposed at the Lynnwood High School.

--

I-054-001

October 6, 2014

Snhomish County Planning Commission
c/o Sally Evans, Commission Secretary
3000 Rockefeller Ave, M/S-604
Everett, WA 98201

Re: Planning Commission Meeting, October 7, 2014

Dear Commission,

I write on behalf of myself, Roy Grossinger, and the long suffering residential community that surrounds Lynnwood High School. After years of rowdy disruption of our lives, we officially object to any changes in zoning for the school. It should remain residential and in our view the conditional use permit should be revoked or modified to make it compatible with a residential community. The current permit exempts the school from the Snhomish County noise ordinance and Lynnwood High School has made full use of the exemption. Although Edmonds School District did not have a permit for a sports field, it has rented its outdoor facilities to over 250 teams.

Attached are a few of the letters I wrote and emails Mr. Grossinger sent complaining of the noise. They explain the issue more fully.

Edmonds School District refused to meet with us or do anything to remediate the problem. We even volunteered to plant trees at our expense but were ignored.

As a result we are planning a major class action against Edmonds School District to obtain compensation for the loss of property value and nuisance created by its sport rental business.

Please do not compound our pain by changing the zoning.

Sincerely,

John J. Tollefson
Tollefson Law
I-055-001

The comments regarding preferences for the Alternatives and future uses of the property adjacent to the Greenleaf Neighborhood are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. See Volume II of the Final EIS.

The above referenced amendments to the future land use and zoning maps are recommended by the County Executive. The Planning Commission is recommending the future land use and zoning designations not be amended.
The comment regarding the rezone of your property from R-9600 to R-7200 is noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map for consideration by County decision makers. The map is located on the Snohomish County Website. While the proposed rezoning would increase the residential development capacity on the property, there is no obligation to further develop or redevelop the property.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
The City of Bothell has substantial development capacity for population, housing and employment growth to the year 2035. As a result, Bothell is expected to see increases in population, housing and employment during the 20 year planning period. Increases in population, housing and employment may occur without increasing the boundaries of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) or the city limits.

Your support for Alternative 1 and opposition to Alternatives 2 and 3 is noted and shown on the “Planning Commission Inputs” map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by the County Council.

I-057-001

I support the original proposal of Alternative 1 and I support the majority of the proposed growth within those cities. Alternatives 2 and 3 are very costly to the current citizens and potential citizens of Snohomish county especially in the areas of new and modified infrastructure support. The current infrastructure in the metro city (Everett) and core cities (Bothell and Lynnwood) can support the majority of the proposed growth.

I was surprised to hear at the Snohomish County Planning Commission briefing on September 9th, that the city of Bothell is proposing zero growth between 2015 and 2035. I find considerable mystery about this, as within the Snohomish county portions of the Bothell city limits there are still significant open areas of vast development potential. Perhaps the city of Bothell planning development requirements currently make development unattractive to land developers. I recently read that the City of Bothell is considering making changes to their development requirements making the area more developer friendly. Surely the city of Bothell has a significant amount of growth potential and can absorb some of the growth that is being diverted to the unincorporated UGA areas of the county are proposed in Alternative 3. I believe a similar situation exists for the city of Lynnwood.

I am also opposed to the infill and zoning changes proposed in Alternative 3. I believe that as part of the Snohomish county development process, developers propose to the planning department how they can best utilize land parcels and propose zoning changes at the time they submit their proposal. From the perspective of development and growth, those zoning changes proposed in alternative 3 are unnecessary.
If UGA boundary's within other cities that requires changing due to areas that have been recently declared a development hazard, Alternative 1 should be amended to include those changes that those cities considers necessary.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Brian Gamble
21803 39th Ave. SE
Bothell, WA 98021
gamblebd@comcast.net
Please see Response to: C-003-001 Lake Serene Community Association.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of zoning map amendments in this area to LDMR.

---

We are residents who live on Lake Serene. We were saddened to hear of many of our neighbors’ plights with flooding of the lake this year which resulted in the flooding of their homes. We have already recently added a 60+ unit subdivision on the north end of the lake. Run-off issues are of concern as are other factors.

Please postpone any rezoning until the lake issues have been resolved.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

David and Kelly Van Horn
14414 Lake Road
Lynnwood, WA 98087
I-059-001
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Please note that the UGA proposal addresses residential uses.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending the UGA retraction but not the UGA expansion proposal by Sultan.

I plan on attending the county council hearing this evening, but wanted to submit my opposition in writing here as well, in case things don’t work out as I planned. My husband is out of town on business and I have 3 small children for whom I’ve arranged a babysitter, but I want to have all bases covered.

My husband and I purchased our property on 140th Street two years ago. We moved from a neighborhood (Sky Harbor) to our current home on 10 acres where we grow a vegetable garden, fruit trees, have farm animals, and enjoy the peace of being out of town.

There seems to be a lot of confusion around Sultan. People are wondering why the town is wishing to expand when we have several buildings standing empty and abandoned IN town. There are subdivisions that are not complete (Sky Harbor and Timber Ridge), several foreclosed homes, and vacant lots in town. To sprawl east would only cause worsening traffic situations, which are terrible as they are, and be detrimental to the wildlife, specifically, the salmon in Wagley Creek. The creek is a spawning ground, and we’ve watched the salmon come up 3 years now. Wagley Creek bisects my property and floods every year in the low spot at the south end of my acreage, making my land unbuildable everywhere except where my home and outbuildings stand now.

Why not work harder to bring business into the downtown area? When travelers come through, it would be nice for them to see restored older buildings with character. Leavenworth was able to completely save their town from near extinction, so can Sultan. Erecting new buildings and sprawling out seems to me like giving up on Sultan. If it’s a goal of the city of Sultan to even come close to meeting those projected population numbers, they should be doing things to make people want to move here. Trust me, no one wants to move to a town where half the buildings are empty, the streets are crawling with homeless, and the only successful businesses are taverns.

I hope the council will make their decision based on the feelings of the property owners directly affected by this land swap/grab. From what I’ve heard the vast majority is in opposition.

Thank you for your consideration,
Julianne Williams
34117 140th St SE
Sultan, WA 98294
360-348-1092
I-060-001

Please see response to Comment C-002-001.

---

Hello Sally,

Please include the following and attached as my comment to the 2015 update.

I am requesting the Planning Commission direct the SC Parks department develop a **new** Master Plan for Wellington Hills Park that complies with SC Laws (SCCP, CFP, Zoning, etc), doesn't start with non-negotiable items (synthetic fields/lights/PA system), complies with GMA/SEPA and includes everyone not just the special interests of sports organizations.

- SC failed (in violation of the Brightwater Settlement Agreement) to include the community/neighbors in the Wellington Hills Park Design.
  - See slide #3-4 of the attached.
  - Additional Proof - Snohomish County simultaneously announces purchase of Wellington Park and the release of their Sports Complex RFQ in Jan 2012. The scope for that RFQ reflected sports stakeholders only and is today's design - 4 synthetic fields, 3-4 natural lights, PA, 700 parking spaces, mountain bike facility, community center, etc.
  - Listen to the 6/24/14 SC Operations Mtg video at 1:16:30 where Tom Teigen admits that I am correct in that some design **decisions were made early on in 2004-5 but that funds accepted on park being "active" recreation based...**
    - My response would be to ask *exactly* what design **decisions were not made then?** Again SC's RFQ dated 1/2012 has a scope that matches today's design and that was also the same date SC announced the park's purchase. One has to ask who exactly did they consult with in 2004-5? It certainly wasn't the neighbors who have to live by Brightwater and now an industrial Regional Sports Complex.
  - SC can also amend the BW Settlement agreement - KC doesn't care whether Wellington is "active" or not.
    - Proof the settlement agreement can be changed - the expiration date has been changed from 12/2015 to 9/2020. as of Spring 2014.

Please see attached for detail and substantiating documentation. Thank you -

Linda Gray
22629-78th Ave SE
Woodinville, WA 98072
Wellington Hills Park

The Wrong Place for a Regional Sports Complex
Wellington Hills Park

- Golf course for nearly 100 years and it still could be.

- A beautiful jewel (outside the SW UGA) buffering rural residential homes Zoned R5, from urban industrial activities and blight.

- Per GMA 365-105-240(7)(b)(vi) 1992, WAC 365-105-550 This Park is to be mitigation, (NOT a regional sports complex) for the surrounding community who have to live by an Essential Public Facility - The Brightwater Sewage Plant

- Though purchased 2 years ago, no progress has been made. To date, all SC’s Park Plans and corresponding Legal Actions represent multiple violations of SC code, SEPA, GMA, Concurrency, etc, wasting tax payer time/money
Failure to Include Surrounding Community & Park Neighbors in Design As Required

SC Plan Reflects Sports Stake Holders & Tournament needs only

- Since before the Brightwater Settlement in 2005, nearly 10 years ago, Snohomish County has excluded the local community/surrounding neighbors from the Wellington Parks design in violation of the BW Mitigation Agreement, GMA, SEPA, etc.
  - Per Everett Herald 1/24/12: "Discussions from likely park users before the Brightwater settlement suggested that active recreation, including fields for team sports, were what the community most wanted to see. "That was loud and clear in that process," Teigen said. Having enough ball fields at the park to host large sports tournaments should raise money to cover ongoing maintenance and operations, he said."
  - Per Tom Teigen's History of Wellington Hills Update, "...Citizens in the "active use" sports community expected to see at Wellington Hills county Park. They were hoping for 8 – 12 soccer/lacrosse fields plus 5 baseball/softball fields, trails, playgrounds, concession areas, parking, off-leash area, indoor spaces, mountain biking area, etc. We've consolidated the high use sports fields into only 4 synthetic turf lighted fields with overlay marking to accommodate soccer, lacrosse, football, and baseball.

- Per Tom Teigen's History of Wellington Hills Update: The Park Design Included only "...Snohomish County Parks and our "active use" stakeholder groups decided early in the process to strive for a more balanced approach in creating a truly amazing community park asset that better integrates the natural and built assets."
Failure to Include Surrounding Community & Park Neighbors in Design As Required (cont)

- Design now cast in STONE - Note scope in Snohomish County's RFQ for the park plan designer
  - SC WH Regional Sports Complex RFQ dated January 2012, page 12. Scope of work, 
    #10 Note Name of Project "Provide construction management and Prepare final as-buils 
    for the following infrastructure - 8 fields, 4 synthetic (lit fields) and 4 grass (potentially 
    synthetic), parking, trails, extreme courses, climbing wall" 

- First three Ad Hoc Meetings ALSO excluded park neighbors
  - April 30, 2012 Ad Hoc minutes - note no neighbors and name of the project, for example - Alan 
    MacDonald, Northshore Youth Lacrosse; Tom Tietjen, Snohomish County Parks, Dave Shipway, Northshore Youth 
    Soccer; James Yap, Snohomish County Parks, Joey Wyck, Northshore Youth Soccer; Russ Bauman, Snohomish 
    County Parks, Tom Campbell, Northshore Soccer FC Alliance Hal Gausman, Snohomish County Parks, Patia 
    Townesel, Northshore School District Steve Dixon, Snohomish County Public Works, Rich Loehr, City of Woodinville 
    Tammy Dunn, Snohomish County Sports Commission, Consultants Bruce Dees, Bruce Dees & Associates, Brian 
    Patnode, Bruce Dees & Associates, Derrick Ebete, Bruce Dees & Associates 
  - May 4, 2012 Ad Hoc minutes - note no neighbors, also revisions to messaging they plan to give 
    those neighbors when they finally get to meet 
  - 5/11/12 Ad Hoc Meeting minutes - no neighbors from NSWP 

- First public meeting for community/park neighbors -- Don't bother IT'S A DONE DEAL 
  - SC Parks Dept. held the first public meeting about their "plans" for Wellington Hills Regional 
    Sports Complex on May 8, 2012. At that meeting, the Parks Director said, "It's a done deal ... and 
    you're going to love it." He also stated the Parks Master Plan will be presented to the SC 
    Council for approval on July 10, 2012 and the County plans to break ground by September 2012.
Snohomish County’s Current Plan is still A Regional Sports Complex

Note: On 6/1/12 SC changed the name to Wellington Hills County Park, but failed to address any neighbor/community requested plan changes. 9/2013 Tom Teigen told me the synthetic fields were never receivable.
There's Been a Dramatic Increase in Sports Fields Since 2005

- In the past 10 years, there's been a dramatic increase in the number of fields County-wide. Yet SC’s focus for this park doesn't reflect those increases.
- Tournament facility needed in Marysville not Woodinville per SC Parks & Recreation Element of Capital Facilities Plan
- Contrary to Tom Teigen's comments - There aren't any Community Parks/Sports Complexes in our state that are adjacent to residential areas with lighted, multi-use fields, and constrained access like Wellington is with Route 9 and 75th streets.
- This Park is for the broader community as mitigation, it must be appropriate and is not just for Northshore Youth Soccer & other commercial ventures
**Plans Not Supported by Snohomish County’s 2014 Parks & Recreation Visioning Plan**

Per 2014 Snohomish County Parks and Recreation Visioning Plan

- "Survey Results - Respondents rated these categories as follows (1 being the highest ranking, 6 being the lowest): Trails 2.28, Leisure – 2.87, Water access 2.99, Conservation and wildlife areas 3.15, Sports facilities 4.25, Special use facilities 4.69"

- Out of the 5 public meetings only one identified any need for sports fields, in the central and northern county area NOT Woodinville “…Five public meetings were held to ascertain what the public valued about parks and get specific comments about areas of focus…Snohomish County Administration Building interest expressed in more soccer fields in central and northern county…”

- "Summary of Public Input - Generally speaking, the public is very supportive of parks and appreciates access to park facilities and the benefits parks provide to individual users and also the community. Snohomish County residents who participated in development of this Plan reflected state-wide prioritization of trails and walking/hiking opportunities as their top priority for facilities, followed by ‘leisure’ (picnic areas, camping and viewpoints) and water access as their next highest priorities.”
## Snohomish County Sports Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Snohomish County Sports Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Located in the beautiful Paciﬁc Northwest, Snohomish County is less than 30 minutes north of Seattle. The county is bordered on the east by the Cascades Mountains, on the west by Puget Sound, on the north by the Skagit River, and on the south by the Snoqualmie Pass. The county is home to the city of Everett, the largest city in Snohomish County. Everett is the commercial and urban center of Snohomish County. Everett is served by the Everett Airport. The county is served by the Snohomish County EIS. The Snohomish County Sports Commission is located in the county and is in charge of making your event a success. The Snohomish County Sports Commission offers a wide variety of services to event organizers, including: 

### City of Activity  
### Site Information  
### Site Amenities  
### Site Facilities  
### Site Capacity  
### Site Availability  
### Site Coordinates  

With over 5,000 hotel rooms, there will be no shortage of accommodations available. 

Accommodations in Snohomish County are on average 45% less than downtown Seattle providing affordable housing. There is something for everyone and every budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Activity</th>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Site Amenities</th>
<th>Site Facilities</th>
<th>Site Capacity</th>
<th>Site Availability</th>
<th>Site Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Stevens</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountlake Terrace</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanwood</td>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Site Amenities</td>
<td>Site Facilities</td>
<td>Site Capacity</td>
<td>Site Availability</td>
<td>Site Coordinates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Internal Use Only -- 05/27/2015 11:53 AM
SC Claims Only 25% will be developed.
But what does that mean?

Take a drive through the park on 240th. Look around and note: All that you see will be flattened, paved over, and lit from 7am – 10pm 7 days per week!!

Essentially – The Footprint & Impacts of Safeco Field plus parking like that of Costco in a rural residential zone.
Fatal Flaws

- Plan is out of character with surrounding rural residential area – violates SC Code, Concurrency, SEPA, GMA, etc.

  - 1. Defective Notice and SEPA Checklist
  - 2. Lack of Authority to Submit Application and Incorrect Route to SEP A Review
  - 3. Incorrect Use Type – “... However, the Parks Department proposal for Wellington is not simply for a public park. The Wellington complex is more accurately categorized as a "Recreational Facility Not Otherwise Listed" which requires Conditional Use approval. In the alternative, the proposed use reflects characteristics in common with a Motocross Racetrack, which also requires Conditional Use approval”
  - 4. Failure to Address Unmitigated Impacts
  - 5. Failure to Address GMA Issues Related to the NonProject Proposal

- Outside UGA, no sewer allowed. SC Septic studies in question. Hundreds of Porta Potties won’t suffice. Leota & Wellington Schools septic tanks must be pumped daily.

- Proforma – No formal business plan identifying enough money to build or maintain
  - No money left to finish plans - $16,900,000 KC mitigation funds, yet - 10M already spent to purchase. $500K Traffic Mitigation, $1M Bruce Dees, $10-12M to build Fairfield fields (yet nothing presented for Wellington’s cost to build their fields)
  - $250K annual maintenance required yet inadequate proof there will be the revenue to support or what it will cost to replace the artificial fields in the future.
Fatal Flaws (cont)

- Traffic – Under-reported volumes. Didn’t account for tournaments, Rt 9 commerce, problems associated w/steep hill, Primus employee traffic, etc. Due to road narrowness, congestion & collisions are inevitable. Traffic revisions from SC study sited as potential for head on collisions.
  - For example: Traffic through the Park before Costco was approx. 90/day. After Costco opened (6+ yrs ago) it rose to over 1600/day.
  - SC 2014 traffic studies have the volume at 464k/additional cars per day. Rough more accurate estimate would be 2,300 additional per day without considering the impact of tournament events.
- Of specific interest, the current analysis of the traffic flow patterns suggests that 65% of the anticipated park users will originate from King County and only 35% will originate from Snohomish County.
- Noise/Lighting – Failures include comparable sites, expected volumes/attendance, time-frames and the impact of full tournament events. No mention of PA system noise effects.
  - For example: Comparable (timeframes/sites/tournament volumes, etc were not used
  - Woodinville (2 fields) studied for 15 minutes of game time on a Saturday from 4-5pm. No average hourly Leq
  - Kasoch (5 fields) only 3 in use for the study, for less than 2 hrs from 8-10pm on a Sunday evening. No average hourly Leq
  - Wellington Hills (7 fields) studied for 5 days, 24 hours a day. Average hourly Leq computed – did they pick the noisiest days?
- Safety – Emergency response & access is in question. No provisions for pedestrians outside of park, no side walks along 75th or Rt. 9. Wellington Hills Business Campus retaining wall failure – What’s next?
I-061-001
The comment in support for Alternative 3 and the upzoning of properties to allow for increased residential density is noted on the “Planning Commission Inputs” map for consideration by the County Council. The map is available on the Snohomish County Website and detailed maps are also provided in Chapter 4, Comments and Responses, of the Final EIS.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

Good day,

Regarding the above-mentioned properties, I write today in support of “Alternative 3” to change the comprehensive plan designation from UMDC to UHDC with a companion rezone from LD/2R to MR. I am working with an apartment builder that is seeking to develop an apartment site on this property, along with the existing MR parcels between the subject properties and 21st Dr. SE.

Allowing higher density would foster a more-coherent development pattern along an intensely developed segment of the 128th/132nd St. SE corridor. Future homes would have pedestrian access to a significant commercial center at the intersection of 132nd and SR-527, and excellent vehicular access to Everett, Mill Creek, and Interstate-5. Further, allowing connection of these parcels to 21st Dr. SE which has an existing traffic signal to 132nd, would eliminate the need for these properties to take uncontrolled, direct access to 132nd.

Considering the existing development intensity in this area, and the ability to direct traffic to 132nd via existing traffic signal, permitting this reclassification to move forward is a responsible course and should be carried forward.

Thanks very much for your time and consideration,

S. Michael Smith

CP|H Consultants
733 7th Avenue, Suite 100 | Kirkland, WA 98033
(425) 285-2390 x115 | mobile: (206) 755-2660
www.cpahconsultants.com
I-062-001

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.

---

I-062-001

I mailed in our comments 2 weeks ago and have not heard back. Therefore I have included what was sent.

My name is Vernon Beach. I along with my wife Margaret Beach live at 9111 Tweit Rd Arlington WA 98223
My tax ID number is 3105120001000500 and I have 26.5 acres of the 300+ acres in what is referred to as the Brehkus/Beach annexation to the city of Arlington TDR Receiving area. The Docket as proposed would include the de-annexation and removal of my property from the Arlington UGA. I am opposed to this and would consider such an action as a 'takings' under state and federal law.

I would like to see a revision to the 2005 Comp plan that would in effect remove the required use of TDR's for any development. I believe that the TDR requirement may be in violation of RCW 82.02.020. In addition I feel it would serve a greater public good to make the Arlington TDR sending area available to the entire county rather than just our area.

Respectfully

Vernon & Margaret Beach

360-435-6024
croleacanth@hotmail.com

This email is free from viruses and malware because avast! Antivirus protection is active.
I-063-001
The Comprehensive Plan Update and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) address development impacts at a programmatic level. Specific impacts and mitigation for development projects, such as access and street improvements, are addressed during the development permitting process. Development applications are available for public review and comment following submittal the County.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

I live @ 13106 30th Ave SE in south Everett, your future use zoning map shows the parcels between my single family property and 2 other single family properties being rezoned to MR. Both the MR area and our properties are accessed by a dead end private road opening to 132nd. If someone were to redevelop in front of us how would you rework the access to 132nd street for the back end of this road? Would you connect us to the road to the north of us, or have the developer provide access through his apartment complex? Thanks, Gary Purvis g.i_purvis@hotmail.com 13106 30th Ave SE Everett
The comment to request a rezone to the subject properties is noted on the "Public Input Maps" for consideration by the County Council.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Several of the issues raised would be addressed during the permit review for a site specific development application including drainage, wetland impacts and buffers. Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes regulations that address these issues and any project would have to demonstrate compliance with the development regulations. The permit application materials would be available for public review and comment.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the UGA expansion.

I-065-001

To Whome It May Concern,

Unfortunately, I did not receive my mailer regarding this subject, and therefore did not attend the open house, much to my chagrin. My property, which is outside Stanwood city limits, borders the proposed expansion area. My tax parcel number is 32041700401600.

I have multiple concerns about this, and would greatly appreciate some information:

1) What are the provisions for how a change in use would affect my property?

I share an agricultural ditch with the farm that will become UGA. Parts are on my property, parts are on the their property, and it drains into a wetland that is also inside the UGA (same neighbor's property). I absolutely require a working ditch for proper drainage, and this ditch and its drainage area have been in place for decades. What happens when the land-use classification changes?

2) The property to the west of me, which is proposed to become Stanwood's UGA, also contains a large wetland on its north end. It slopes downward onto my property. Is any provision made for the wetland, critically necessary to the health of our region?

Is any provision made for how a change in land-use (development) will create much more impermeable surface, thus draining even more water onto my property? (Water which will have NO avenue of escape once I lose my ag ditch!! )

3) Is it possible to request a buffer between my property and the proposed change? Changing the classification right smack up against my property impacts me greatly. I would be far less impacted with a small buffer between my property and the new UGA.

4) I have a horse property. (Six stall horse barn, paddocks, etc). This change will negatively affect my property values because no horse person wants to live next to a giant development. Does that matter? When I come voice my concerns in Tuesday, is that even worth mentioning?

5) I am greatly saddened by the plan to turn productive farming lands into urban sprawl. Is there any realistic provision for the loss of farmland?

Thank you.

I realize I've asked several questions at the last minute, and I greatly appreciate the time it will take to answer them. If it is easier, I can be reached on my cell phone at (631) 742-9811.
Reagrds,
Carol Frey
The comment in support for the rezoning of the subject property is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

To Snohomish County Planning,
I George Dalinger, owner of a house at 2624 128th St, agree to zoning change in status to multi-family zoning.

Thank you.

George Dalinger
55 Hawk Hill
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

949 770-5009
The comment in support of Alternative 3 and specifically for the proposed land use and zoning designation amendments at the subject properties is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The comments are also reflected on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map posted on the Snohomish County Website.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

To the Snohomish County Planning Commission. I am the property owner of 12604 Waltham Drive. I am strongly for the Alternative 3 which would change the plan designation to Urban High Density Residential from Urban Medium Density Residential (UMDR). The properties along Waltham Drive have been lacking progressive development for several years. With these new changes the Waltham Drive properties will see property values increase and a higher quality of development take place which is long overdue.

-Delores Nunley
I-068-001

The comment in opposition to proposed amendments to the land use and zoning designations at the subject property is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The input you provided has been noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by the County Council. Any road or utility improvements as part of specific development proposal will be addressed during permit review. All development projects must be in conformance with the requirements of the Unified Development Code located in Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC). Development permit applications, once submitted, are available for public review and comment.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

To Whom it may concern,

As an owner at 29125, 80th Ave N.W. Stanwood, my concern with zoning the UTGord property to Industrial Use without the county (Snohomish) contacting us is considerable. This could impact our property value greatly. What is the plan in the long term? Even if no immediate plans are present once the zoning has been changed it is out of our control. The rural and residential advantage is lost. Are road and utility improvements already planned? Information has not been questioned.

Gary & Kuta Pedersen
Dear Commissioners,

Please see the attached letter and e-mail below.

Thank you,

Devin Tokizawa
Administrative Assistant

Community Development
City of Stanwood
10220 270th St NW, Stanwood, WA 98292
360.629.1811 x114 | Fax 360.629.3009
www.ci.stanwood.wa.us

Devin

Please forward our email below to all planning commission members. It states our and our neighbors point of view and our zoning request. We all will have to voice our view at the county comprehensive meeting in October.

Thank you
Brad and Melissa Picken
Subject: FW: Resolution 2014-15 "Attachment "A"
Date: Mon, 11 Aug 2014 15:04:49 -0700

Ryan

Here is our mailing address:
P.O. Box 805
Stanwood, WA 98292

We do not receive mail at our physical.

Thank you for calling me today.

Brad Picken

From: bradmellissa@hotmail.com
To: ryan.jarsen@ci.stanwood.wa.us
Subject: FW: Resolution 2014-15 "Attachment "A"
Date: Mon, 11 Aug 2014 14:24:19 -0700

Ryan

Our neighbors and ourselves would like to be included in the 9600 s/f zoning, (comprehensive plan update).

Attached is a letter from one of our neighbors.

Thank you for handing us your business card. We appreciate it and look forward to talking to you.

Brad and Melissa Picken
29121 80th Ave NW
Stanwood WA 98292
360 629-2444

From: bradmellissa@hotmail.com
To: rob.johnson@ci.stanwood.wa.us; arne.wennerberg@ci.stanwood.wa.us; rick.randall@ci.stanwood.wa.us; m27.mccune@ci.stanwood.wa.us; larry.sather@ci.stanwood.wa.us; conrad.ryer@ci.stanwood.wa.us; gottlie.borsuch@ci.stanwood.wa.us; mayor@ci.stanwood.wa.us; cityclerk@ci.stanwood.wa.us
To Stanwood City Mayor, Council and Planning:

We live at 29121 80th Ave NW, Stanwood. We are located in the County.

It has come to our attention just in the past week, (not thru any written notice by the City) that Linda Utgard has proposed that her mothers property, West of our property on 80th Ave NW, be zoned from R-9600, (per the County's Comprehensive plan) to industrial. Our neighbors and ourselves strongly object and would like to know why we were not notified, (we have lived here for 30 years), so we could make comment.

If this is approved it will have a serious downward and negative impact on our property values. Even if the City does not annex Utgards land, but it is put forth, that if the City does, it will be zoned General Industrial.

Per your City Council agenda staff report dated July 17, 2014, Attachment "A":

"Whereas, also on April 29, 2014 a notice of availability and public hearing was published in the local newspaper of general circulation and affected landowners were directly notified of potential changes to their property's Comprehensive Plan and designation and zoning classification; and"

As an affected landowner why were we and ours neighbors not notified? It is your intention to change the zoning on our South property line and on our West side both from R-9600. The west property to General Industrial and the southern property to R-7000.

It seems we have no recourse since your resolution 2014-15 "Attachment "A" is ready for the Mayor's signature.

Resolution 2014-15 "Attachment "A" should not be signed by the Mayor! We should first be given time to discuss this as neighbors, since this is new news to all of us and allowed to have our point of view be heard.

Regards,
Brad and Melissa Picken
The comment regarding opposition to the Sultan UGA proposal is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Please see Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment and Appendix B regarding growth capacity.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending the UGA retraction but not the UGA expansion request by Sultan as part of the preferred alternative.
Attached is letter from Mike and Leslie Foley regarding impacts on our neighborhood from development.

You can contact us at 425.481.3134 if you have questions or need additional information.

Have a happy day,

Mike Foley
The commenter raises concerns about increasing congestion on the 35th Avenue SE and 43rd Avenue SE corridors. Through the course of the Comprehensive Plan update and Draft EIS analysis, the County has identified needed improvements along those corridors. These improvements include:

Project W-2: Widen 35th Avenue SE, from 180th Street SE to Seattle Hill Road, to urban three-lane standards with bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Project W-3: Widen 35th Avenue SE/39th Avenue SE/York Road, from SR 524 (Maltby Road) to 180th Street SE, to urban three-lane standards with bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Project W-4: Widen 39th Avenue SE, from 207th Street SE to 228th Street SE, to urban three lane standards with bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Project N-4: Construct a new road/extension (urban two-lane standards with pedestrian facilities) to connect Sunset Road and 43rd Avenue SE between the end of Sunset Road (County Road #21755) and 43rd Avenue SE at 184th Street SE.

Project N-5: Construct a new road/extension of 43rd Avenue SE between 196th and 200th Street SE to rural two-lane standards.

The first three projects are included in the County’s adopted 2015-2020 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
I-071-001

zoning, (that parcel is served by an easement with no road frontage). We are caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place.

I-071-002

One option would be to call an immediate moratorium on new development in the 35th Ave SE corridor, all the way north to Seattle Hill Rd, until the capacity of 35th is improved or an alternative north/south connection to Maltby Rd is built. A fair question to ask is where the county has applied road mitigation funds collected from the 1,000's of homes already built or now under construction? We haven't seen any capacity improvements, only a few turn lanes for specific developments, but no new thru lanes; 35th is the same two lane road it was 50 years ago.

The bottom line for us is the fact that what was once rural has become urban with high density lots (many in the low 3,000 square feet) and now a high school adjacent to 2.5 and 5 acre zoning with no buffer. We strongly urge the county to modify the UGA to include our neighborhood, moving the line to the Olympic Pipeline/PSP&L Transmission Line. Development that would follow should provide funding for the infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of growth in this corridor, including our road.

Yours truly,

Michael D. Foley

Leslie S. Green Foley

I-071-002

Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes regulations for concurrency and road mitigation (chapter 30.66B SCC) that must be satisfied during project level permitting. Traffic studies are required for projects where traffic impacts are anticipated, which must be mitigated in compliance with SCC 30.66B. Adding additional lanes on a major arterial is only one mechanism to increase road capacity and other measures may have been implemented to increase capacity as part of mitigation for development projects.
I-072-001
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

I-072-001
My name is Brad Picken, we reside at 29121 80th Ave NW, Stanwood, WA. We are located directly East of the Utgard property, that the City of Stanwood Planning Commission, (chaired by Linda Utgard, the property owners daughter) and the City Council have proposed to be changed from the County’s R9600 to Industrial upon annexation. My neighbors and I were given no notice of this proposal even though it has a huge impact on our neighborhood quality and property values, if it is allowed.

We have no representation with the City as we live in the County. We are hoping you will represent us in this as county citizens, (what would you want if you were in our place, R9600 or Industrial zoning in your neighborhood)?

We want the county’s R9600 original Urban Growth designation to stay as is. We have expected since it was adopted, that was what would happen upon Stanwood’s Annexation.

We requested originally with the county and are requesting again that we be included in the R9600 designation. Our South and West property line’s are currently proposed at R9600 by the County. We have 2.5 acres and it is certainly not agricultural as now zoned.

When I short platted 30 years ago, 10 acres to 4-2.5 acre pieces, we brought Stanwood City water to the properties, with our expectation and the City’s we would be annexed eventually. Now we are excluded by the City even thought I put in the City water line that would serve the Utgard Property.

This whole thing is not right and feels like conflict of interest with Linda Utgard being on the City Planning Commission. We have been Mrs. Ugtards neighbors for 30 years. I wonder if Mrs. Utgard even knows what her daughter is proposing?

See attached letter to the City of Stanwood.

We appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Brad and Melissa Picken
29121 80th Ave NW
POB 805
From: Strandberg, Terri [mailto:terri.strandberg@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 2:18 PM
To: 'melissa Picken'
Cc: Evans, Sally
Subject: RE: Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

You can send them to Sally Evans or to me. Sally has been cc'd so you will have her email contact info. We will distribute your comments to the Planning.

If we get through all of the testimony tomorrow evening, it is expected that the public comment period will be closed at the end of the hearing. My suggestion is that you send your comments before 5:00pm on October 7th because they need to be submitted before the Planning Commission closes the public testimony. However, if you are commenting on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, you have until 5:00pm on October 8th.

If you are unable to meet the deadline you can still submit comments. The Planning Commission won't see them but we will forward them on to the County Council.

Terri Strandberg

From: melissa Picken [mailto:bradmellisa@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 12:47 PM
To: Strandberg, Terri
Subject: Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Terri

Who do we e-mail our written comments to, for the sno Co Comp Meeting?

We will not be able to make the meeting but have comments.

Thank you

Brad and Melissa Picken
Stanwood WA
Please see Response to Comment C-002-001.

I-073-001

Egbert land has been in this area since the early 1930's - it's been peaceful, country, relatively quiet. We don't live here to be invaded by noise and ultra-traffic. Please let Wellington be more like what it's been for decades - beautiful and spacious, a place to relax, dream, take a deep breath. Please let country stay country. We like it here.

Shirley from the Egbert family
The classification of on-site trails as passive facilities is the continuation of existing County Parks policy; the County’s 2007 Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan followed the same convention. Including in-park trails in the Passive recreation category is not intended to imply that such facilities are less important or less desired than Active recreation facilities. Active recreation facilities, such as athletic fields, have different development and infrastructure needs than passive facilities or trails. On-site trails can be used for a variety of purposes by people of wide-ranging fitness and skill levels, and the new Level of Service (LOS) methodology would not exclude any category of user. In addition, the proposed LOS methodology tracks Regional Trails separately from parks. Regional trails, because they are often larger than trails within local parks and cover greater distances, are ideal for active recreational uses. The proposed LOS methodology does not focus or give preference to active recreation amenities over what are classified as passive recreation amenities and proposed LOS standards for each would be maintained.

The updated LOS methodology is intended to provide flexibility in parks programming and allow the County to plan park improvements based on public priorities. The Draft Parks and Recreation Element includes documentation of recent public surveys, and trails consistently ranked high on the list of desired facilities. As population grows and new passive facilities are necessary to meet demand, the County will use this public input to determine what types of facilities are constructed.
The full Draft Parks Level of Service Analysis White Paper was included in Appendix E of the Draft EIS allowing all options to be reviewed during the comment period. The White Paper studied the same growth alternatives as the Draft EIS. The Draft EIS focused on the Capacity Level of Service (LOS) and No Action LOS as these represented a range of LOS options that resulted in different types and numbers of parks facilities for investment. The White Paper did not recommend a particular method but weighed the advantages and disadvantages of each. The Draft EIS identified the potential physical increase in facilities needed as a result of growth under both the No Action and Capacity LOS methods. The Per Capita method, while having the advantages and disadvantages listed in the White Paper, does not indicate what type or location of facilities would be needed, just the investment level. Therefore, for purposes of the EIS analysis, the Capacity method provides a reasonable estimate of type and location of facilities suited to projection of environmental impacts. The County may consider the Per Capita method or other methods of determining fees for new development.
However, a Capacity/Current LOS only Approach is not supported:

- There is no mention in the entire report where Berk identifies any County, City or Municipality in the State of Washington using Capacity LOS as their only LOS. He mentions Pierce County and Renton used Capacity to identify one particular need, but specifically states it is not their primary LOS methodology. (pg 21-22)
  - Berk does identify Bellevue - RCO, Renton - a version of Per Capita. Issaquah and Bellingham - Per Capita (pgs 27, 45-46).
  - Berk also notes SC received high marks for their current LOS in SC’s recent public survey. Pg 29
- Berk also warns that Snohomish County doesn’t have the statistics to support a Capacity only LOS. (pg 22)
- Capacity LOS doesn’t take into account other methods to provide identified service needs. For example needed soccer fields could be provided by other counties, cities, schools, private companies, etc with a Per Capita methodology
- The Berk White Paper appears to lean more towards the Per Capita not Capacity LOS (pg 53)
- Washington State adopted a new SCORP (State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning) in June 2008. Within that document, RCO proposed that all State agencies and local governments shift away from levels of service calculated by acres per thousand residents to a system based upon statistically valid local public opinion and park and trail service area (or accessibility) standards...
- Snohomish County just applied for Washington State RCO Grant funds based on a RCO LOS approach. If SC moves to a Capacity LOS only this violates RCO grant requirements. (pg 27)
- Violates GMA - public opinion would no longer be utilized to make decisions on Parks LOS (pg 7)

In Summary clearly Parks has chosen a Methodology that will yield the biggest budget and the least accountability. The County is headed towards selecting the LOS method which concludes the highest level of need without giving consideration to cost or public input. No cost estimates are even discussed using the Capacity LOS approach. The Capacity LOS approach is the only one which concludes that the current level of service is deficient, contrary to Parks’ own surveys which conclude that the public is satisfied with current park facilities.

Proposal - Reject the current PRP and DEIS and require Parks revise with inclusion of all 4 LOS before Planning can make a recommendation for consideration by County Council as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update process.

Linda Gray, 22629-78th Ave SE. Woodinville, WA 98072
October 6, 2014

I-076-001

It is hard to envision the cabal Snohomish County is immersed in regarding this project. The stubborn indifference for community input by local residences that will be adversely affected by this project is flagrant. Three hundred fifty locals have signed a petition stressing their concerns for the project. The adverse effects of noise, traffic, safety, and reduced property values are very real.

There is a rumor that the county may seek one thousand signatures in support of having a sports field in the area. Then perhaps the local people can raise ten thousand signatures from people who prefer grass and trees to pavement. None of this makes any sense nor is it germane to the core issues that affect the community.

It is our fervent hope that the Planning Commission takes into account the welfare of this neighborhood and makes the moral/ethical decision to support the people touched by this development.

LeRoy & Jeannene Mock
Windsor Park Homeowners

I-076-001
Please see Response to Comment C-002-001.
Good Evening.

Thank you for your due diligence thus far for examining Snohomish County’s proposed Tournament-Level Sports Complex design plan for Wellington Hills Park.

I realize that several departments within Snohomish County are anxious to move this project along and they want no obstructions to their plans prior to the Snohomish County Council’s vote on the matter.

Nevertheless, I encourage you to continue your own independent and thorough consideration in evaluating the County’s plan and its impact upon Woodinville.

As concerned citizens have expressed during previous meetings with the Snohomish County Councilmen and the Woodinville City Councilmen, the excessive noise, lights, and traffic congestion produced by a Tournament-Level Sports Complex will radically impact the quality of life in the greater Woodinville area.

I submit that there are serious consequences inherent in Parks and Recreation Department (P & R Department) proposed plan and altering the plan alone here and there cannot negate its impact.

Attempting to merely mitigate numerous issues is an exercise in futility that will not resolve this ill-conceived plan’s basic core problem: Namely, this type of development is not suited for this location. It is not only incongruous with the lay of the land, but, also, with its scope within this one-half-mile rural residential setting.

Furthermore, this venture of the P & Department to accommodate private sports associations at the expense and quality of life of Woodinville residents is not in the best interest of the City of Woodinville or our community.

There’s no evidence that there is even a need for such a sports complex, so why are we having this unwanted development thrust upon us?

If Snohomish County wants the P & R Department to sponsor private sports’ franchises for a hypothetical “revenue-generation operation,” then they need to put this before the voters, as well as find an appropriate piece of property that is suited
for this type of development. And, instead, use the Mitigation Fund to establish an actual local community park, as the Brightwater agreement had intended.

Considering the topography of the property and its limited access, the list of problems it generates includes:

1. An increase in emergency services deployed from Woodinville up 156th to address accidents, crimes, thefts, etc.

2. Failed levels of service at intersections along 156th due to too many cars crowding 156th trying to get ingress and egress out of the park. All intersections are evaluated based on how long a car has to wait in order to turn left or right to get on or off the roads. When there are too many failures, roads must be improved.

3. Water run-off from paved parking lots that will flow into Little Bear Creek and negatively impact salmon, wildlife corridors, and this unnecessary run-off will impact the ecosystem in the Wellington area.

4. Costs of road maintenance -- including paving, snow/ice removal, increased traffic.

5. Safety issues for bicyclists who use 156th. One death already in the past year--how many more will result (not to mention the increase in number of accidents) when traffic is 10 times or 20 times higher than today?

Therefore, I would ask that your recommendation be that the Snohomish County vote against this plan and ask the P & R Department to formulate a new more appropriate rather than try to tweak the plan that is inappropriate for this location.

\[\text{Plan}\]

I ask, 'why should the City of Woodinville agree to Snoco’s flawed proposal for the development of this property?’
In closing

I propose that you recommend that Snohomish County Councilmen reject this current proposal and resist the pressure to sign-off on the P & R’s plan that holds the city hostage with future expensive obligations from the consequences of such a flawed plan to build a sports complex in this setting.

Instead, I would have you suggest that the Snohomish County Council engage the P & R Department in planning the development of this property with a completely new plan that is better suited for this property’s location; specifically, take in consideration (1) the lands steep terrain and rolling hills, etc., (2) its limited access, and (3) its proximity within a rural residential neighborhood and to the City of Woodinville’s main arteries subject to gridlock from increased traffic congestion.

Again, I am appreciative your for their attention to and due consideration of this project. I am grateful for your ongoing support on behalf of the best interests of the Woodinville community as well as Snohomish County residents. And thank you for continuing to be an advocate for responsible planned development.

Thank you,

Vicki Marshall
I-078-001
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Please note the Stanwood UGA request is for residential purposes.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the UGA modifications.
Fifth: I am not convinced that the cost of bringing sewer to the area proposed for INCLUSION in the Stanwood UGA is more expensive and difficult than taking it to the area of proposed EXCLUSION from the UGA.

Thank you for your consideration-

John Poole
26020 64th Ave NW
I-079-001
The comment in opposition to the land use and zoning designation amendments in the subject area is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Your comments have been included in the "Planning Commission Inputs" map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by the County Council and detailed maps are also provided in Chapter 4, Comments and Responses, of the Final EIS.

The Comprehensive Plan update and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) address impacts at a programmatic level. Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes regulations that must be met as part of project level development review. Regulations regarding concurrency and road mitigation impacts (chapter 30.66B SCC) must be satisfied before any development is approved. Permit application materials, once submitted, are available for public review and comment.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
The commenter raises concerns about increasing traffic congestion on Damson Road and collisions at the intersection of Filbert Road and Damson Road. The Draft EIS includes planning-level analysis of Damson Road (Arterial Unit 216). Both the existing and future year analyses for each of the three alternatives found that Arterial Unit 216 would likely meet the County’s level of service (LOS) standard. Also, as noted in the Draft EIS, the County monitors LOS on county arterial units through its Concurrency Management System (CMS) and there were no Arterial Units in Arrears as of the publication of the most recent CMS report, the 2014 Concurrency Report. Intersection operations and collision rates were not analyzed for this programmatic, planning-level Draft EIS. This location could be reviewed as part of the County’s project prioritization and programming process, which includes the Transportation Needs Report, Transportation Improvement Program, and Annual Construction Program. This process includes the prioritization and programming of intersection and road safety improvements.

Specific concerns about the development referenced by the commenter are not part of the scope of this Draft EIS. Those questions should be addressed as part of the design review process for that development.

I-080-001
The commenter raises concerns about increasing traffic congestion on Damson Road and collisions at the intersection of Filbert Road and Damson Road. The Draft EIS includes planning-level analysis of Damson Road (Arterial Unit 216). Both the existing and future year analyses for each of the three alternatives found that Arterial Unit 216 would likely meet the County’s level of service (LOS) standard. Also, as noted in the Draft EIS, the County monitors LOS on county arterial units through its Concurrency Management System (CMS) and there were no Arterial Units in Arrears as of the publication of the most recent CMS report, the 2014 Concurrency Report. Intersection operations and collision rates were not analyzed for this programmatic, planning-level Draft EIS. This location could be reviewed as part of the County’s project prioritization and programming process, which includes the Transportation Needs Report, Transportation Improvement Program, and Annual Construction Program. This process includes the prioritization and programming of intersection and road safety improvements.

Specific concerns about the development referenced by the commenter are not part of the scope of this Draft EIS. Those questions should be addressed as part of the design review process for that development.
I-081-001

Please see response to comment I-080-001.

---

I am writing to you to oppose the alternative 3 plan proposed by Snohomish county.

I currently reside at 420 191st St Sw in Lynnwood, WA 98036. The property directly south of our property on Damson road is being proposed to be changed from residential to neighborhood business. The fact of the matter is that Damson road cannot simply handle this traffic. The amount of traffic is already overwhelming Damson Road, and the amount of traffic accidents that occur on Filbert and Damson seem to be increasing. There is a major accident at that intersection every other week.

Our major concern is the traffic increase on Damson Road will not only increase the likelihood of more traffic accidents, but will also decrease the quality of life by increasing traffic noise on that road to our neighbors.

In addition, the proposed property is too close to the traffic light to allow proper traffic flow between the traffic light and intersection at damson and 5th place west. The street is not wide enough to allow a left turn lane. During rush hour traffic this is going to cause backups and addition accidents at filbert and damson.

Please take these items into consideration when deciding on the zoning changes. Thank you for your time.

Chris Pearson
420 191st Street Sw
Lynnwood, WA 98036
I-082-001

Please see response to C-003-001 and C-013-001.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of zoning map amendments in this area to LDMR.

We agree with the concerns of the Lake Serene Association and the Fire District One on the adverse impacts from the proposed expanded LDMR zoning on lake drainage, fire fighting, inadequate on-site/off-site parking resulting in illegal parking, and lack of planning for additional public open space. We also have other concerns.

It appears the county is looking at increasing the density of the zoning without considering or providing for any impacts. When developers subdivide land, they have to provide for local drainage, local traffic, and submit funding to the county for various mitigation measures, such as regional traffic, public areas, and schools. If the proposed zoning is approved without planning for parking, regional drainage, utilities, public open space, and fire fighting and other public services, accommodation of these concerns will have to be "purchased" after-the-fact, which will undoubtedly cost more and necessarily displace current residents.

To expand on the drainage concerns, the Lake Association concern addressed primarily the drainage of Lake Serene. In addition is the concern of how the drainage gets to the lake. Supposedly, LDMR development will provide water retention or other mitigation for any increased impervious surface for the individual developments, but failures of and/or overflows to those mitigations will create "gushers" downstream, e.g., before the water gets to the lake, that will adversely impact the downstream facilities that were designed on the zoning current at that time. In other words, rather than having the current surface flow across the width of my property on its way to the lake, I will probably get localized quantities of water that will create miniature grand canyons across my property.

There are a number of other essential utilities that will be adversely impacted, such as electricity. One of the current methods of keeping up with electrical demand in the Puget Sound area is conservation to avoid the high cost of providing additional infrastructure to produce more electricity. Doubling the population without first providing additional capacity will undoubtedly lead to brownouts for everyone until the electrical production is increased.

In addition to increased illegal local parking, parking at various businesses seems to be at capacity so doubling the local population without increasing the available parking will probably lead to illegal parking everywhere. This includes employee parking as well as customer parking.

Related to parking is the current state of mass transit in the area. We hear about the uproar from communities in Seattle in which the new "minimal" housing has been approved without providing adequate parking, at least partially based on the availability of mass transportation. Not only is the local transit coverage much less than that provided in Seattle, all the local transit providers are cutting back on service based on costs, not rider ship so the increased population won't be able to use transit that isn't there so they will need to provide their own cars, thus increasing the parking problems as well as pollution from the extra time for everyone driving around trying to find a parking spot, legal or illegal.

Somewhat related to parking and mass transit in the Lake Serene area are lack of alternate routes for access and egress into, out of, and within the area. In addition to the natural physical obstruction of the lake, there is the limited crossing of SR 99, the very limited crossing of SR 525 and I-5, and the numerous dead ends created by housing developments over the years. It is difficult to provide new access routes as evidenced by the denial of access to Serene Way from the new developments at the former site of the pony farm. In this case, the county apparently agreed that the increased traffic would overload the existing street. In many cases, existing buildings, e.g., houses, would need to be removed to provide the through access. All of these cases would be exacerbated by doubling the number of housing lots by going from the current R-7200 to the equivalent of R-3600 provided in the LDMR.
Another essential service that will adversely impacted is police service. Snohomish county currently has very few officers to patrol a very large and often disconnected service area. Psychological studies for decades have shown the crowding from increased density leads to increased crime and violence. The police can't seem to keep up with parking and traffic violations now so increasing them as well as increasing violence due to increased density without mitigating provisions before the increased density seems to indicate a lack of consideration for the current residents.

Even though each existing lot could legally be subdivided into two lots, subdivision is not very practical because of the process of small subplots in Snohomish County. We attempted to subdivide our lot several years ago so that we could sell the lots that didn't include our house to help finance college for our children. When we were nearly done with the paperwork part of the subplat, which seemed to apply primarily to developers rather than land owners that wanted to sell the "excess" land, the physical improvements cost nearly as much as the potential "profit" from selling the land so we gave up and stopped the process. It only seemed to make sense to continue if we were developers and improved the lots, e.g., built houses, before selling the lots.

Some of the comments could seemingly be "answered" by the Transportation and Park studies noted as associated with the Comprehensive Plan. However, as near as I could tell from the various websites, both studies were completed in 2006 and there have been quite a few changes in the county, including developments and other building, since then. The park study didn't make any specific recommendations other than a nebulous one additional lake access between Lake Serene and Lake Stickney and three additional area parks within about a 10 mile diameter circle centered near the Lake Serene area. In addition the transportation study recommended an arterial improvement that has since been completed on SW 35/36 from 156th St SW to 164th St SW that completely ignored the section of SW 36th between 164th SW and Maple Road which is a major direct access to Alderwood Mall and is currently nearly as rough as a Forest Service mountain road.

Ken Bircher
Judy Bircher
Jenna Birchler
I-083-001

The comment requesting to expand the Urban Growth Area (UGA) to include the subject property is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The request has also been noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by County decision makers and detailed maps are also provided in Chapter 4, Comments and Responses, of the Final EIS. Public hearings have been posted on the County's website.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.
in 1978 the county first made adjustments to the maps. At that time the building was being used for commercial purposes but the county staff did not include it in the Light Industrial zoning, likely because of owner resistance. As time progressed the site remained in rural zoning area. This zoning has remained the same until today even though the properties to the south and east changed and adjusted to the current use.

Summary
I'm requesting the Snohomish County Council to add my property to the Malby Urban Growth Area, a closer match our current and past use. We can't enlarge or change the footprint of the current buildings. With an adjustment there will be no population or employment growth to this property. This change will not have any impact on our neighbors. In fact our neighbors consist of an empty unusable lot to the north, Brightwater to the east, Got to Go Espresso to the south and Waste management to the west. This change will correct an error made years ago and will make little change to the Malby Urban Growth Area. I'm asking for your support and quick action.

See attached tax maps for dates of adjustments
I-084-001
Thank you for your comment. All of the properties in the Cathcart “L” share the same “Other” land use designation, although – as the commenter notes – this is the only area in Snohomish County remaining with that designation. The proposal evaluated in the Draft EIS would remove that designation and replace it with the “Rural Residential” designation that applied to this area prior to 2006. This designation also applies to properties across SR9 from the “L” while “Riverway Commercial Farmland” applies to the lands immediately north of the “L” across Lowell-Larimer Road. Other lands adjoining the “L” to the east within the urban growth area are designated for urban low density residential (to the north) and urban industrial (to the south). The nearest commercially zoned land is on the south side of Cathcart Way at SR9, while the nearest multi-family zoned land is over a half-mile to the east – in both instances, undeveloped county property. For a number of reasons explained in the August 2014 staff report to Council, Option E, which involves adding the Cathcart “L” to the urban growth area, is not feasible at this time. Because County growth has slowed considerably over the past 7 years, additional urban land is not needed to accommodate current population or employment growth forecasts. Expanding the UGA without adequate justification is contrary to established countywide planning policy and to the GMA. Considerably more analysis of environmental impacts than could be performed in time for this EIS would also have been required to even consider this option. Please see the cited staff report for a complete explanation.

The Ehrlichman memo was included with your letter to Council from May 14, 2014 – but by that time, the environmental review process was already too far along to add a major element as requested. Regarding notice to property owners mentioned in the Ehrlichman memo, SEPA does not require individual property notices at the time of scoping. General notice of scoping was provided via the County website and published notice in the newspaper, as required. Furthermore, the
Cathcart “L” area had not yet been identified for possible change at that time (October 2013).

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
I-085-001

Please see Response to Comment C-002-001.

---

**Effects of Proposed Regional Sports Complex on rurally zoned Wellington Hills neighborhood**

**Judy Johnson <jimbelfair@yahoo.com>**

To: Alex Johnson <talexj@gmail.com>  

Tue, Oct 7, 2014 at 1:58 PM

Dear Planning Commission,

As a property owner of Five acres in rurally zoned South Snohomish County since 1970, my husband and I have attended several of the community meetings and submitted several letters of comment about the proposed regional sports complex on what has been the Wellington Hills golf course property. The neighborhoods' legitimate concerns that have been repeatedly voiced to the Parks Department seem to be received on the surface, yet continually ignored on the operational level. This is most disturbing since the golf course property was bought with mitigation funds from King County for building their Brightwater complex on Snohomish county land, over one of the only natural water aquifers in our area and over land vulnerable to earthquakes to supposedly be a benefit to those of us affected by Brightwater. Instead, it appears we are mere pawns in the hands of paid county employees and our elected representatives.

Why is it the County can ignore the zoning laws for our area, but we, the property owners are held to them? This area is zoned rural, with old two lane roads with no sidewalks and very little, if any, side shoulders. The roads leading to the golf course property are inadequate both from the west and the east, and any additional traffic brought by a proposed regional sports complex will severely affect the local property owners. Even if the county makes changes at the Highway 9 and 240th S.E Intersection, traffic will be backed up at the intersection of 522 and highway 9, as well as on 75th Ave. S.E./158th N.E. & Woodinville Duvall Road in King County.

Then there is the subject of night lights in a rural neighborhood and residual noise from the proposed 7 soccer fields, 720 parking places, and all that goes with this proposal.

Furthermore, this is a magnificent 120 acres of rolling hills, trees, and wildlife. And this proposal involves leveling, massive amount of dirt moving, tree removal and disturbing another natural habitat for wildlife. What about water runoff? What about the full environmental impact?

All these concerns seemed to be brushed aside since the receiving of a "monetary landfill" for the county and the parks department agenda to create a supposed financial source from renting "tournament" fields on the backs of a rural neighborhood in an unincorporated area in the southern most corner of the county. We would welcome a local community green space for everyone's use, without destroying the natural beauty of the land as it is. But our concerns seem to fall on deaf ears of our county representatives. We hope we are wrong.

Sincerely,

Judy and Tim Johnson

Sent from my iPad
The comments in support of the Stanwood UGA request are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of the UGA modifications.

I-086-001

I am Terry Robertson, CEO of Josephine Sunset Home ("Josephine") at 9901 272nd Ave NW, Stanwood WA 98292.

Josephine is a social ministry organization caring for 160 nursing home residents, 61 assisted living residents and 250 children in daycare, ECEAP preschool and Montessori preschool and kindergarten. About 105 of our residents in the nursing home and 20 residents in the assisted living have no money to pay for their care. They are enrolled in the Medicaid program for their care. Josephine provides over $1,000,000 of uncompensated care annually, is the city's second largest employer with 300 employees and payroll of $11,000,000 annually.

Twice in the seven years I have been here we have been forced to move 215 elderly infirmed nursing home and assisted living residents up to the Stanwood high school gym to sleep on cots because of the threat of flood from the Stillaguamish River. The Skagit river to the north is also a concern as flood water could breach the dike and spill into the valley and Stanwood. In the last 25 years we have had to evacuate five times. It is a matter of when, not if, we will have to evacuate again.

(Continued on reverse side)

See reverse side for mailing instructions or if more space is needed.
Josephine supports the STAN5 proposal for change in the UGA boundary. The STAN5 proposal would allow us to move our nursing home and assisted living from our current location in the flood plain up to high ground at the corner of SR532 and 64th avenue. With a joint development agreement to provide for water, sewer and traffic mitigation between the City of Stanwood and Josephine we could move out of the flood plain. We could relocate to parcels 32042900101000 and 3204290010900 currently in the UGA but unserved with city water and sewer and adjacent parcels 32042900101800 and 32042900101200 which are proposed to be included in the UGA with the STAN5 proposal. The STAN5 proposal does allow for Josephine to bring city utilities to these four parcels.

If the STAN5 proposal is not approved then our ability to move out of the flood plain would be pushed back years as we searched for property in the city limits of Stanwood and out of the flood plain. Or it could force us to move away from Stanwood removing our care for this communities elderly and 300 jobs with $11,000,000 in annual payroll.

If a flood were to come quickly and we were not able to evacuate our residents, the possibility of harm and death is real for our nursing home and assisted living residents.

Please approve the STAN5 proposal.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Mail written comments to the Planning Commission via:
Attention: Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Written comments can also be emailed to: sally.evans@snoco.org
The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

MY NAME IS LEO FIORINI AND I LIVE IN MILL CREEK 3021 163rd ST SE.
I WANT TO SAY A FEW WORDS REGARDING THE UPCOMING COUNTY DECISION FOR THE
ZONING OF THE CATHCART 1 AREA.

THE MAIN THING IS THAT ALL RESIDENT IN THE CATHCART 1 AREA HAVE BEEN EXPECTING THE COUNTY
TO FOLLOW ITS OWN RULE REGARDING ZONING BY FOLLOWING IT OWN GUIDELINES.
SO FAR, THIS HAS NOT HAPPENED AND THE CURRENT SITUATION IS THAT ALL AREA SURROUNDING THE
CATHCART 1 AREA ARE NOW MULTIRESIDENCIAL OR COMMERCIAL, OR ARE PROJECTED TO BE.
THE SAME HAS NOT HAPPENED FOR THE CATHCART 1 AREA ..., BUT WHY IS THAT?
IT SEEMS THAT THE ACCESS TO THE CATHCART AREA IS LIMITED FROM HWY 9.

THAT IS ENTIRELY DUE TO THE COUNTY DECISION TO BUILD THE BIG COMMERCIAL MAINTENANCE
FACILITY AT THE CORNER OF CATHCART 1 ROAD, ALONG WITH THE DECISION TO CLOSE THE ROAD THAT
WAS GIVING ACCESS TO THE RESIDENT TO THE SAME ROAD, NOW THE ONLY ACCESS IS FROM HWY 9.
THE COUNTY HAS DAMAGED ITS OWN CITIZEN BY DOING THAT, AND SHOULD FIND A WAY TO FIX IT.

IN ANY CASE AS A PARTIAL OWNER OF A 5 ACRE LOT IN THE CATHCART 1 AREA, I ASK FOR THE EPA OPTION
TO BE APPLIED, AND THAT IS MULTIRESIDENCIAL AND COMMERCIAL (MIXED URBAN).

BEST REGARDS

LEO FIORINI

Oct 7 2014
The comment in support of Alternative 3 and the upzoning of properties to allow for increased residential density is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The comment is also noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map for consideration by County decision makers. The map is available on the Snohomish County Website.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.

I-088-001

Regarding the above-mentioned properties, I write today in support of "Alternative 3" to change the comprehensive plan designation from UMDR to UHDR with a companion rezone from LDMR to MR. I am working with an apartment builder that is seeking to develop an apartment site on this property, along with the existing MR parcels between the subject properties and 21st Dr. SE.

Allowing higher density would foster a more-coherent development pattern along an intensely developed segment of the 128th/132nd St. SE corridor. Future homes would have pedestrian access to a significant commercial center at the intersection of 132nd and SR-527, and excellent vehicular access to Everett, Mill Creek, and Interstate-5. Further, allowing connection of these parcels to 21st Dr. SE which has an existing traffic signal to 132nd, would eliminate the need for these properties to take uncontrolled, direct access to 132nd.

Considering the existing development intensity in this area, and the ability to direct traffic to 132nd via existing traffic signal, permitting this reclassification to move forward is a responsible course and should be carried forward.

Thanks very much for your time and consideration,

S. Michael Smith
CP+H Consultants
733 7th Avenue, Suite 100 | Kirkland, WA 98033
(425) 285-2390 x115 | mobile: (206) 755-2660
www.cpplusconsultants.com
The comment objecting to the land use and zoning designation amendments in the subject area is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The Comprehensive Plan Update and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) address impacts at the programmatic level. Specific impacts associated with development projects are addressed during the permitting process. Development application materials are available for public review and comment. All development projects must comply with the Unified Development Code located in Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC). The Unified Development Code includes regulations that address concurrency and road impact mitigation (SCC 30.66B) that must be met prior to project approval.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
Adjourn

PLANNING COMMISSION'S RANGE OF POSSIBLE ACTIONS:
At the conclusion of its public hearing, the County Planning Commission will consider transmitting a formal recommendation to County Council concerning adoption of the ordinance. The Commission may make a recommendation to adopt or to not adopt the ordinance. The Commission's recommendation may also propose amendments to the ordinance. The Planning Commission is an advisory body and the final decision rests with County Council.

PARTY OF RECORD / PUBLIC TESTIMONY:
You may become a party of record for any specific topic that comes before the Planning Commission by submitting a written request or testimony to Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk, PDS, M/S 504, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201 or via email at Sally.Evans@ snooco.org.

Please check http://www.snooco.org for additional information or the Snohomish County Department of Planning and Development Services, Reception Desk, 2nd Floor, County Administration Building-East, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett. For more information, call Sally Evans, Planning Commission Clerk, at 425-388-3285.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT NOTICE:
Snohomish County facilities are accessible. The county strives to provide access and services to all members of the public. Sign language interpreters and communication materials in alternate form will be provided upon advance request of one calendar week. Contact Anne Kruger at 425-388-3311, Ext. 7119 Voice, or 425-388-3700 TDD.

Snohomish County Planning Commissioners:
Merle Ash, District 1
Ed Tai, District 1
Douglas Hannam, District 2
Tom Norcott, District 2
Simon Farretta, District 3
Darrel McLaughlin, District 3
Cheryl Stanford, District 4
Daniel Strandy, District 4
Ben Kaufman, District 5
Guy Palumbo, District 5
Angeline Fowler, Executive Appointee

Commission Staff (from Planning and Development Services (PDS) Department):
Sarb Mook, Acting Commission Secretary
Sally Evans, Commission Clerk
I-090-001
The comment in opposition to land use and zoning designation amendments in the Lake Ruggs is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
I-091-001

Please see Response to: C-003-001 Lake Serene Community Association.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are recommending approval of zoning map amendments in this area to LDMR.

John Prestek
4204 Serene Way
Lynnwood, WA 98087

October 6, 2014

Ryan Countryman, Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning
M/S Stop 604 3000 Rockefeller Ave.
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Countryman and Planning Personnel,

Lake Serene in South Snohomish County has a flooding problem. Dense zoning will exacerbate that problem. Since 2012 I have communicated this fact to various representatives of Snohomish County government at least annually. As water levels spiked after the construction of the Lake Serene Ridge development on Lincoln Way, I warned them of probable flooding due to continual building upland of the lake.

Since the development of the new Azi Lee Estates, also on Lincoln Way, our family and neighbors suffered through 2013 flooding unprecedented in the modern history of Lake Serene. I personally experienced water levels over twenty-four inches higher than normal winter water heights. Water in crawl spaces and within some homes was catastrophic. While Snohomish County Surface Water Management is looking at the problem, no permanent, long-range solution has been constructed.

Dense zoning and further development of the land around this environmentally sensitive site will only make the flooding and its attendant problems worse. Please declare a moratorium on dense zoning and further build-out in the Lake Serene drainage basin.

Sincerely,

John Prestek
I-092-001
Please see Response to Comment C-002-001.

Hello Sally,

Please include the following and attached as my comment to the 2015 update.

I am requesting the Planning Commission direct the SC Parks department develop a new Master Plan for Wellington Hills Park that complies with SC Laws (SCCP, CFP, Zoning, etc.), doesn't start with non-negotiable items (synthetic fields/lights/PA system), complies with GMA/SEPA and includes everyone not just the special interests of sports organizations.

- SC failed (in violation of the Brightwater Settlement Agreement) to include the community/neighbors in the Wellington Hills Parks Design.
  - See slide #3-4 of the attached.
  - Additional Proof - Snohomish County simultaneously announces purchase of Wellington Park and the release of their Sports Complex RFQ in Jan 2012. The scope for that RFQ reflected sports stakeholders only and is today's design - 4 synthetic fields, 3-4 natural, lights, PA, 700 parking spaces, mountain bike facility, community center, etc.
    - Notice of Request for Qualifications RFQ-01-12 Architectural/engineering Services for Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex, pg 3, Scope.
  - Listen to the 6/24/14 SC Operations Mtg video at 1:16:30 where Tom Teigen admits that I am correct in that some design decisions were made early on in 2004-5 but that funds accepted on park being "active" recreation based..."

- **My response would be to ask exactly what design decisions were not made then?** Again SC's RFQ dated 1/2012 has a scope that matches today's design and that was also the same date SC announced the park's purchase. One has to ask who exactly did they consult with in 2004-5? It certainly wasn't the neighbors who have to live by Brightwater and now an industrial Regional Sports Complex.
  - SC can also amend the BW Settlement agreement - KC doesn't care whether Wellington is "active" or not.
    - Proof the settlement agreement can be changed - the expiration date has been changed from 12/2015 to 6/2020. as of Spring 2014.

Please see attached for detail and substantiating documentation. Thank you.
Linda Gray
22629-78th Ave SE
Woodinville, WA 98072

Dear Sirs - this is my second email just now for the second comment I sent in to Sally Eveans on the 7th. She was listed as the contact for the 2015 comp update on your Website. I am sending again to you Terri and to the other general address.

Please confirm receipt. To date I received nothing from Sally. Thank you - Linda Gray
Wellington Hills Park

The Wrong Place for a Regional Sports Complex
Wellington Hills Park

- Golf course for nearly 100 years and it still could be.

- A beautiful jewel (outside the SW UGA) buffering rural residential homes Zoned R5, from urban industrial activities and blight.

- Per GMA/1982 WAC 365-105-340(2)(a)(ii) (1982 WAC 365-106-10). This Park is to be mitigation, (NOT a regional sports complex) for the surrounding community who have to live by an Essential Public Facility - The Brightwater Sewage Plant

- Though purchased 2 years ago, no progress has been made. To date, all SC's Park Plans and corresponding Legal Actions represent multiple violations of SC code, SEPA, GMA, Concurrency, etc, wasting tax payer time/money
Failure to Include Surrounding Community & Park Neighbors in Design As Required

SC Plan Reflects Sports Stake Holders & Tournament needs only

- Since before the Brightwater Settlement in 2005, nearly 10 years ago, Snohomish County has excluded the local community/surrounding neighbors from the Wellington Parks design in violation of the BW Mitigation Agreement, GMA, SEPA, etc.
  - Per Everett Herald 1/24/12: "Discussions from likely park users before the Brightwater settlement suggested that active recreation, including fields for team sports, were what the community most wanted to see. "That was loud and clear in that process," Teigen said. Having enough ball fields at the park to host large sports tournaments should raise money to cover ongoing maintenance and operations, he said."
  - Per Tom Teigen's History of Wellington Hills Update: "...Citizens in the "active use" sports community expected to see 6-12 soccer/lacrosse fields plus 5 baseball/softball fields, trails, playgrounds, concession areas, parking, off-leash area, indoor spaces, mountain biking area, etc. We've consolidated the high use sports fields into only 4 synthetic turf lighted fields with overlay marking to accommodate soccer, lacrosse, football, and baseball"
  - Per Tom Teigen's History of Wellington Hills Update: "The Park Design included only "...Snohomish County Parks and our "active use" stakeholder groups decided early in the process to strive for a more balanced approach in creating a truly amazing community park asset that better integrates the natural and built assets."
Failure to Include Surrounding Community & Park Neighbors in Design As Required (cont)

- Design now cast in STONE - Note scope in Snohomish County's RFQ for the park plan designer
  - SC WH Regional Sports Complex RFQ dated January 2012, page 12. Scope of work, #10: Note Name of Project: "Provide construction management and Prepare final as-buils for the following infrastructure - 8 fields: 4 synthetic (lit fields) and 4 grass (potentially synthetic), parking, trails, extreme courses, climbing wall"

- First three Ad Hoc Meetings ALSO excluded park neighbors
  - April 27, 2012 Ad Hoc minutes - note no neighbors and name of the project, for example - Alan MacDonald, Northshore Youth Lacrosse; Tom Tegan, Snohomish County Parks; Dave Shipway, Northshore Youth Soccer; James Yap, Snohomish County Parks; Joey Wyrick, Northshore Youth Soccer; Russ Bawerts, Snohomish County Parks; Tom Campbell, Northshore Soccer FC Alliance; Hal Gourman, Snohomish County Parks; Paula Townsend, Northshore School District; Steve Dixon, Snohomish County Public Works; Rich Leathy, City of Woodinville; Tammy Dunn, Snohomish County Sports Commission; Consultants Bruce Dees, Bruce Dees & Associates; Brian Pethick, Bruce Dees & Associates; Derrick Eberle, Bruce Dees & Associates
  - May 4, 2012 Ad Hoc minutes - note no neighbors, also revisions to messaging they plan to give those neighbors when they finally get to meet
  - 5/11/12 Ad Hoc Meeting Minutes - no neighbors from NSWP

- First public meeting for community/park neighbors -- Don't bother IT'S A DONE DEAL
  - SC Parks Dept. held the first public meeting about their "plans" for Wellington Hills Regional Sports Complex on May 8, 2012. At that meeting, the Parks Director said, "It's a done deal ... and you're going to love it." He also stated the Parks Master Plan will be presented to the SC Council for approval on July 10, 2012 and the County plans to break ground by September 2012.
Snohomish County’s Current Plan is still A Regional Sports Complex

Note: On 6/1/12 SC changed the name to Wellington Hills County Park, but failed to address any neighbor/community requested plan changes. 9/2013 Tom Teigen told me the synthetic fields were never negotiable.
There's Been a Dramatic Increase in Sports Fields Since 2005

- In the past 10 years, there's been a dramatic increase in the number of fields County-wide. Yet SC's focus for this park doesn't reflect those increases.
- Tournament facility needed in Marysville not Woodinville per SC Parks & Recreation Element of Capital Facilities Plan
- Contrary to Tom Teigen's comments - There aren't any Community Parks/Sports Complexes in our state that are adjacent to residential areas with lighted, multi-use fields, and constrained access like Wellington is with Route 9 and 75th streets.
- This Park is for the broader community as mitigation, it must be appropriate and is not just for Northshore Youth Soccer & other commercial ventures
Plans Not Supported by Snohomish County’s
2014 Parks & Recreation Visioning Plan

Per 2014 Snohomish County Parks and Recreation Visioning Plan

- "Survey Results - Respondents rated these categories as follows (1 being the highest ranking, 6 being the lowest): Trails 2.25, Leisure - 2.87, Water access 2.99, Conservation and wildlife areas 3.15, Sports facilities 4.25, Special use facilities 4.69
- Out of the 5 public meetings only one identified any need for sports fields, in the central and northern county area NOT Woodinville "... Five public meetings were held to ascertain what the public valued about parks and get specific comments about areas of focus... Snohomish County Administration Building Interest expressed in more soccer fields in central and northern county...
- "Summary of Public Input - Generally speaking, the public is very supportive of parks and appreciates access to park facilities and the benefits parks provide to individual users and also the community. Snohomish County residents who participated in development of this Plan reflected state-wide prioritization of trails and walking/hiking opportunities as their top priority for facilities, followed by 'leisure' (picnic areas, camping and viewpoints) and water access as their next highest priorities."
# Snohomish County Sports Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Seattle</th>
<th>Arlington</th>
<th>Bothell</th>
<th>Burien</th>
<th>Darrington</th>
<th>Edmonds</th>
<th>Everett</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Lynnwood</th>
<th>Marysville</th>
<th>Mill Creek</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Mountlake Terrace</th>
<th>Mukilteo</th>
<th>North Bend</th>
<th>Stanwood</th>
<th>Sultan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Snohomish County Sports Commission is here to make sure you have a great time! We will be there to help you with any questions you may have. We are located in the beautiful city of Seattle and offer a variety of sports facilities.

---


There will be no plant supply for the event. Please bring your own equipment.

Announcements in Snohomish County are not intended to replace downtown Seattle providing affordable housing. There is something for everyone and every budget.
SC Claims Only 25% will be developed. But what does that mean?

Take a drive through the park on 240th. Look around and note: All that you see will be flattened, paved over, and lit from 7am – 10pm 7 days per week!!

Essentially – The Footprint & Impacts of Safeco Field plus parking like that of Costco in a rural residential zone.
Fatal Flaws

- Plan is out of character with surrounding rural residential area — violates SC Code, Concurrency, SEPA, GMA, etc.
- For Woodinville's attorney:斯基, Peterz. FormResponse re File Number 13-11537-LG4 (Wellington Hills Park) 6816 200th St. SE Woodinville, WA 98072. Legal Comments on behalf of the City of Woodinville in Response to January 15, 2014 Released Notice of Application. To Toni Bennett, 2/20/14, pages 1-4
  - 1. Defective Notice and SEPA Checklist
  - 2. Lack of Authority to Submit Application and Incorrect Route to SEP A Review
  - 3. Incorrect Use Type: "...However, the Parks Department proposal for Wellington is not simply for a public park. The Wellington complex is more accurately categorized as a "Recreational Facility Not Otherwise Listed" which requires Conditional Use approval. In the alternative, the proposed use reflects characteristics in common with a Motocross Race track, which also requires Conditional Use approval.
  - 4. Failure to Address Unmitigated Impacts
  - 5. Failure to Address GMA Issues Related to the Non-Project Proposal
- Outside UGA, no sewer allowed. SC Septic studies in question. Hundreds of Porta Potties won't suffice. Leota & Wellington Schools septic tanks must be pumped daily.
- Proforma - No formal business plan identifying enough money to build or maintain
  - No money left to finish plans - $16,900,000 KC mitigation funds, yet ~10M already spent to purchase, $600K Traffic Mitigation, $1M Bruce Doos, $10-12M to build Fairfield fields (yet nothing presented for Wellington's cost to build their fields)
  - $250K annual maintenance required yet inadequate proof there will be the revenue to support or what it will cost to replace the artificial fields in the future.
Fatal Flaws (cont)

- Traffic – Under-reported volumes. Didn’t account for tournaments, Rt 9 commerce, problems associated w/steepest hill, Primus employee traffic, etc. Due to road narrowness, congestion & collisions are inevitable. Traffic revisions from SC study cited as potential for head on collisions.
  - For example: Traffic through the Park before Costco was approx. 600/day. After Costco opened (6+ yrs ago) it rose to over 1,500/day.
  - SC 2014 traffic studies have the volume of 2,000 additional cars per day. Rough more accurate estimate would be 2,800 additional per day without considering the impact of tournament events.

- Of specific interest, the current analysis of the traffic flow patterns suggests that 65% of the anticipated park users will originate from King County and only 35% will originate from Snohomish County.

- Noise/Lighting – Failures include comparable sites, expected volumes/attendance, time-frames and the impact of full tournament events. No mention of PA system noise effects.
  - For example: Comparable timeframes/sites/tournament volumes, etc were not used
    - Woodinville (2 fields) studied for 15 minutes of game time on a Saturday from 4-4:15: No average hourly Leq
    - Kenmore (6 fields) only 3 in use for the study, for less than 2 hrs from 8-10pm on a Sunday evening: No average Leq
    - Wellington Hills (7 fields) studied for 5 days, 24 hours a day. Average hourly Leq computed – did they pick the noisiest days?

- Safety – Emergency response & access is in question. No provisions for pedestrians outside of park, no side walks along 75th or Rt. 9. Wellington Hills Business Campus retaining wall failure – What’s next?
Traffic/Safety (cont) Rt. 9 & 75th

street entrances to Park

Costco/Rt. 9 Entrance – no room for additional lanes, Costco traffic, Railroad Tracks, Cement Recycling center, Retaining Wall failure at Wellington Hills Business Campus

75th Street entrance – no shoulders, 2 lane, high speed no sidewalks
Hi, Attached is a short list of comments on the 2015 SnoCo Comp Plan EIS. Overall I think you did a good job and I only have a few questions and comments.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and keep up the good work!

Bill Blake
12506 Smokes Road
Arlington, WA 98223
northforkstilly@frontier.com
360-435-3684
The County has a documented trend of growth largely going to urban areas. The 2013 - 2014 Growth Monitoring Report indicates that "Rural cluster subdivision activity decreased dramatically after 2007. In fact, there was only one new rural cluster subdivision application submitted from 2010 to 2013. Recordings also declined after the 2007 peak, and dropped off almost completely in 2010 and 2011, with a slight uptick in 2012 that continued in 2013."

Water resources are addressed in numerous places in the County’s Comprehensive Plan and development regulations. For example, critical aquifer recharge areas are regulated, consistent with the GMA, in chapter 30.62C SCC. Chapters 36.63A SCC (Drainage) and 36.63B SCC (Land Disturbing Activity) regulate certain development activities to, in part, protect water resources. These regulations would apply equally to development proposals under any of the alternatives.

The estimated date of complete consumption of instream flow rule reserve water rights is beyond the scope and level of planning that was applied to this EIS, which provides a broad analysis of the County’s proposed long-term vision for land use and growth management. As described in Section 3.2.10.2 of the Draft EIS, each of the three alternatives restricts allowable growth in unincorporated rural areas. Under Alternative 1, only about 8 percent of new population growth would go into rural areas. Under Alternatives 2 and 3, only 10 percent of new population growth would go into rural areas. This is consistent with GPP LU Policy 6.A.1, which limits rural growth to no more than 10 percent of the county population growth forecast. This restriction on rural growth mitigates potential impacts on rural water resources. The actual location of growth in rural areas will be driven, in large part, by adequate
water supplies. Ecology promulgates instream flow rules for each WRIA, and new development may occur only consistent with those rules.

I-093-004
The provisions in Snohomish County’s critical area regulations (SCC 30.62A) that address the protection of fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, including stream buffers, apply to agricultural and forest resource lands. These provisions would not be applied differently under any of the alternatives, so any differences between buffers for development versus buffers for other land uses are not pertinent to this analysis of growth allocation.

I-093-005
We have expanded the discussion of the regulatory environment for Fish and Wildlife, to include information about the Instream Flow Rule and the National Flood Insurance Program biological opinion.

The regulatory weight carried by planning documents is not pertinent to this analysis. The alternatives under review in this EIS concern the allocation of population and employment growth in UGAs in Snohomish County. Under any of the alternatives, the effects of individual development proposals would be addressed through project-specific reviews; information found in planning documents—whether interpreted as regulation or guidance—would be used to inform analyses and decisions for such reviews.

The County has utilized and implements Best Available Science (BAS) in the development of critical area regulations and natural environment policies. There are various recovery plans addressing endangered and threatened species that could apply to the County. Recovery plans and watershed management plans are often updated in response to new science and changing conditions. The County maintains its flexibility and ability to be adaptive to different approaches to recovery and
watershed management by adopting policies that require the consideration of the recommendations contained in these plans. Rather than adopt actual documents, the County maintains the flexibility to utilize all sources of recovery recommendations, not this from one approved plan. The following policies are examples of this approach:

Policy NE 1.C.2 (b) -- The County shall continue to protect and enhance wetlands and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas through the use of a variety of strategies, such as: (a) including best available science in plans and programs; (b) supporting the development and implementation of watershed management plans and identifying areas where voluntary restoration and enhancement should be used to improve water quality, water quantity, fish habitat and overall hydrologic function.

Policy NE 3.A.8 -- The County shall consider the recommendations contained in watershed management plans and salmon recovery plans in drafting development regulations.

Policy NE 5.A.7 -- The County should consider the recommendations contained in the watershed management plans and salmon recovery plans as the basis for prioritizing restoration and enhancement projects.

Policy NE 7.A.4 -- The County should consider the recommendations contained in watershed management plans, salmon recovery plans, NPDES requirements, NRCS standards or other relevant science-based plans as guidelines for developing the monitoring program. Data from approved land use applications should also be considered.

I-093-006
The comment requesting the County consider adding more detail to the Table 3.2-3 regarding flood inundation prior to publishing the Final EIS is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.
I-093-007
Conservation of wildlife resources (including upland wildlife habitat) in Snohomish County is accomplished through the County’s critical areas rules in Chapter 30.62A of the Snohomish County Code. These rules would continue to apply to development proposals under any of the alternatives. As discussed on page 3.1.4 of the Draft EIS, species receiving protection through those rules include not only ESA-listed species but also state-listed species, species of local importance, and several other species.
I-094-001
The comment in support for Alternative 3 and in particular for the land use and zoning designation amendments in the subject area is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.

The County Executive is recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments. The Planning Commission is not recommending approval of the future land use and zoning map amendments.
As part of its 2005 10-year update, Snohomish County expanded the Southwest UGA to include the County property at Cathcart, out to SR 9. This action removed the "other" designation from the County’s ownership, but left it in place for certain adjoining properties, known as the “L,” triggering eight long years of uncertainty about the future of the property, with explicit promises that the County would continue and finish planning the ultimate designation for the “L.”

Eight landowners within the “L” now are asking the County Council to support completion of this planning at the most economical andlogistically-sound time: during the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Fairness, and the explicit County promises, support this request. Understandably, the County Council has directed that no new UGA expansions be considered at this time. This case is distinguishable from all other UGA expansion requests based on the long history of adopted resolutions and ordinances committing the County to resolve and to lift the “Other” designation from the “L” properties. The County has a duty to:

- Complete the planning for the “L” properties as mandated by the comprehensive plan at Policy LU 5.B.6, adopted in Ord. No. 10-042,
- Resolve the internal inconsistency between the urban “Other” designation and the underlying Review-5 zoning; and
- Cure the notice defect to the “L” owners, by considering this request on the scope of EIS review for the 2015 Update.

We appreciate your consideration of the following points:

1. Affidavits from the 8 “L” owners will show they did not receive notice of the EIS scoping process. PDS acknowledged problems with its notice in October 2013, but did not reissue notice to these owners.
2. The County’s “Other” designation is applied to their properties, along with Rural 5-Acre zoning. This is an internal inconsistency between the plan and its implementing regulations.
3. The General Policy Plan text explaining the “Other” designation makes clear “Other” is a designation for areas “within UGAs.”
4. The key to the Future Land Use Map states that lands designated “Other” are "pending completion of master planning "

P.O. Box 1241, Everett, WA 98206
5. Immediately after removing the “Other” designation from County-owned properties in its 2005 comprehensive plan update, the County Council explicitly acknowledged the relationship between the urban County property and the adjoining “L” properties and promised further consideration and evaluation of those properties, as part of the Cathcart master planning:

Resolution 06-006:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Snohomish County Council intends to consider and evaluate the relationship between the county-owned Cathcart property and adjoining properties, including those located north of Cathcart Way and West of State Route 9, as the master plan for the county-owned Cathcart property is prepared . . .

- The County thereafter hired a master planning consultant but abruptly ended the contract in 2008 during the height of the recession.

6. Subsequently, the County Council and Planning Department further strengthened the planning relationship between the County Cathcart property and the “L” properties, in the following official actions:

- Feb. 2009: Adoption of Addendum No. 12 to the FEIS for the 2005 comprehensive plan update (Dec. 13, 2005); describing a new proposed policy for planning the “L” properties.

- July 7, 2010: Ordinance No. 10-042, adopting findings of fact and a new GPP Policy LU 5.6.6(a) requiring consideration of the “L” properties during County planning of the Cathcart property.

7. Finding “F” of Ordinance No. 10-042 described this future consideration of the “L” properties as a “commitment” to evaluate alternative map designations for the “L”:

F. The new policy language of LU 5.6.6(a) commits the county to evaluate alternative FLU map designations for the adjacent lands immediately northeast of the Cathcart site, which maintain the “Other” designation applied to these lands in 2005, consistent with the council direction of Motion 06-006.

8. PDS’ range of alternatives for the draft EIS review for the 2015 Update already includes consideration of land use changes within the Cathcart UGA area, thus triggering EIS transportation review. Alternative 3.

9. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report does not analyze the new population and employment targets set by the Office of Financial Management. During that analysis, the County will need to determine ways to curb the employment
Briefing on Cathcart "L"
December 18, 2013
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deficit for the "Silver Firs Gap," the area that includes the Cathcart portion of the SW UGA. Including the "L" properties within the draft EIS process will allow consideration of whether the over-projection of employment for the Cathcart transit hub should be shifted to adjoining properties to meet new employment targets.

Thus, while they are arriving later than desired to make their request of the Council, these "L" property owners now ask the County to honor its promises to complete the planning on their property, by including their properties within the range of alternatives for consideration in the draft EIS for the 2015 comprehensive plan update. Time is of the essence in making this decision to ensure timely review in the draft EIS.

Request:

We respectfully request these alternatives be incorporated into the scope of draft EIS review for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update. Once included in that process, we can describe a range of possible outcomes, including possible comprehensive plan designations and implementing zoning, as well as provide detailed computations supporting the need for this change, under the County’s employment projections for 2035 targets.
Evans, Sally

From: Scott Honaker <scotthon@pilchuckvet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2014 7:16 PM
To: 2015Update
Cc: JeanAnn Honaker
Subject: Options for addressing the comprehensive plan inconsistency
Attachments: CathcartL.docx; Cathcart L Justification.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Snohomish County
Planning Commission
5000 Rockefeller Ave
Everett, WA 98203

October 7, 2014

To whom it may concern;

I live in an area known as the Cathcart L. My wife and I moved there in 2000 next to the closed, capped landfill. It was zoned rural conservation with a conditional use permit to operate the landfill. It was just a big grassy field behind our home with some pipes on it. It was a nice quiet neighbor.

A few years later the county constructed a LARGE facility and managed to get the zoning changed to light industrial. We fought against this as it was clearly inconsistent with our rural parcels and nowhere near the Rural Conservation land we previously had as a neighbor. Ultimately, little we said had any effect.

We attended several community meetings where the residents to the south were promised an urban village similar to Mill Creek Town Center and our land use designation was changed to OTHER until the area could be considered. I was appointed to the Cathcart Advisory Council created by Aaron Reardon as the representative of the impacted homeowners and we held several meetings to discuss the future of the area. More promises were made and two council resolutions were passed to include us in future land use considerations.

After waiting 8 years to resolve our OTHER designation, it appears the planning commission is seriously considering simply dumping us back to rural residential with no additional consideration. This seems like the easy way out, not the considered option we were promised in person and council resolution.

In no way does this address that our RURAL property is now adjacent to LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, BUSINESS PARK, and PLANNED COMMUNITY BUSINESS to our south and west sides. We have attempted to be good neighbors and citizens by participating in this process to insure consistent, appropriate use. Of the options presented for addressing the comprehensive plan inconsistency, only option E (Mixed Urban) meets the criteria to be compatible with the planning we have participated in.

It has been made clear to us that this is a new administration who seems to have little regard for past obligations and promises. We are here yet again to make sure that the administration recognizes were are still here waiting for the opportunity to correct this issue.
One of the neighbors, Troy McGuire, has enlisted the assistance of attorney Tom Ehrlichman to clarify the legal justifications which I cannot effectively address. We have been very patient and tried to work with the system for the last 8 years with no results to this point. It is getting more difficult for us to continue to wait patiently to resolve this issue.

Please recommend option E (Mixed Urban) and let us move on.

Sincerely,

Scott Honaker
14014 89th Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
425 330-5439
n7ts@arrl.net
To whom it may concern;

I live in an area known as the Cathcart L. My wife and I moved there in 2000 next to the closed, capped landfill. It was zoned rural conservation with a conditional use permit to operate the landfill. It was just a big grassy field behind our home with some pipes on it. It was a nice quiet neighbor.

A few years later the county constructed a LARGE facility and managed to get the zoning changed to light industrial. We fought against this as it was clearly inconsistent with our rural parcels and nowhere near the Rural Conservation land we previously had as a neighbor. Ultimately, little we said had any effect.

We attended several community meetings where the residents to the south were promised an urban village similar to Mill Creek Town Center and our land use designation was changed to OTHER until the area could be considered. I was appointed to the Cathcart Advisory Council created by Aaron Reardon as the representative of the impacted homeowners and we held several meetings to discuss the future of the area. More promises were made and two council resolutions were passed to include us in future land use considerations.

After waiting 8 years to resolve our OTHER designation, it appears the planning commission is seriously considering simply dumping us back to rural residential with no additional consideration. This seems like the easy way out, not the considered option we were promised in person and council resolution.

In no way does this address that our RURAL property is now adjacent to LIGHT INDUSTRIAL, BUSINESS PARK, and PLANNED COMMUNITY BUSINESS to our south and west sides. We have attempted to be good neighbors and citizens by participating in this process to insure consistent, appropriate use. Of the options presented for addressing the comprehensive plan inconsistency, only option E (Mixed Urban) meets the criteria to be compatible with the planning we have participated in.

It has been made clear to us that this is a new administration who seems to have little regard for past obligations and promises. We are here yet again to make sure that the administration recognizes were are still here waiting for the opportunity to correct this issue.

One of the neighbors, Troy McGuire, has enlisted the assistance of attorney Tom Ehrlichman to clarify the legal justifications which I cannot effectively address. We have been very patient and tried to work with the system for the last 8 years with no results to this point. It is getting more difficult for us to continue to wait patiently to resolve this issue.

Please recommend option E (Mixed Urban) and let us move on.

Sincerely,
Scott Honaker
14014 99th Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
425 330-5439
n7ss@arrl.net
The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA reduction.

Comments to the Planning Commission for the 2015 Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Update Project

My Name is Vernon Beach. I, along with my wife Margaret, live at 9111 Tveit Rd., Arlington, WA 98223

I-097-001
This is in reference to Alternative 3, City of Arlington Docket Item.
My tax ID # is 31051200100500 and I have 26.5 acres of the 300+ acres in what is referred to as the Brekhus/Beach annexation to the city of Arlington TDR Receiving area. The Docket as proposed would include the de-annexation and removal of my property from the Arlington UGA. I am opposed to this and would consider such an action as a 'takings' under state and federal law.
I would like to see a revision to the 2005 Comp Plan that would in effect remove the required use of TDR's for any development. I believe that the TDR requirement may be in violation of RCW 82.02.020.

Respectfully,

Vernon & Margaret Beach

360-435-6024
coolacanth@hotmail.com
I-098-001
The commenter suggests adjusting the UGA boundary in the vicinity of 43rd Avenue SE to shift traffic onto alternate roadways. However, changing the UGA boundary would not shift traffic patterns in and of itself.
The comment in support of expansion of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The proposed UGA amendment is also noted on the “Planning Commission Inputs” map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by County decision makers.

The Unified Development Code located within Title 30 of the Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes regulations requiring buffers between zoning districts (SCC 30.23A.030). Compliance with the buffer requirements are addressed during permit review for development project applications. The permit process allows for public review of application materials and public comment.

The County Executive and Planning Commission are not recommending approval of the UGA expansion.

The County Buildable Lands analysis excludes public land from calculations of residential capacity. See the report here: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7662.

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. Alternatives all focus growth inside UGAs (no net change in UGA boundary) with some alternatives having a greater emphasis in city limits. (Alternatives/ and others more in line with permit trends and growth capacity in cities and UGA). Focusing growth in UGAs is intended to result in a more compact growth pattern.

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The
Comprehensive Plan Update is designed to provide growth capacity over the 20-year planning period to provide for housing at all affordability levels. The County is also updating its Housing Element as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

I-098-006
The comment in support of expansion of the Urban Growth Area (UGA) is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The proposed UGA amendment is also noted on the "Planning Commission Inputs" map located on the Snohomish County Website for consideration by the Planning Commission.

I-098-007
The comments are noted and forwarded to the County decision makers. Fiscal considerations are part of the legislative process. They are not a topic required in an EIS.
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming. [need more here depending on what Tim writes up for that part of our comment letter].

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Will Brandt
19715 Bing Rd
Lynnwood, WA 98036
Snahomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming. [need more here depending on what Tim writes up for that part of our comment letter].

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Will Brandt
19715 Bing Rd
Lynnwood, WA 98036
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water—while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming. [need more here depending on what Tim writes up for that part of our comment letter].

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Michael Dahlstrom
11018 33rd Dr SE
Everett, WA 98208
Hey! No more pandering to developers pocket books. Get serious and do your job... Or destroy this place for future generations otherwise.

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming. [need more here depending on what Tim writes up for that part of our comment letter].

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Jesse jarosz
2912 21st st
Everett, WA 98201
Evans, Sally

From: Kathleen Gamble <kathleen@tbirdmining.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 8:13 AM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1 (my rural farm has already been ruined)

My rural farm has already been ruined by the approval of rural cluster subdivisions next to it and surrounding my property and I can no longer run my farm. Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kathleen Gamble
21424 157th Ave SE
Monroe, WA 98272
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Roger Nystrom
6510 141st St SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Laurie Cooper
1010 Carol way
Edmonds, WA 98020
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Laurel Hughes
8814 236th St SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Sharon Roberts
3707-231st Street SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Sally Abbey
5208 211th Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98290
We are at another choice point regarding growth.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Karen Guzak
230 Avenue B
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Warren Bare
13320 Highway 99 #78
78
Everett, WA 98204
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water – while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Jon Brown
6815 157th pl sw
edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Joan Poor
1002 10th Ave. N.
Edmonds, WA 98020
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Tammy Kennedy Rice
10811 Vernon Rd
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Ricky Taylor
4221 114th ST SE
Everett, WA 98208
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Laura Goldberg
9225 N Cedarvale
Arlington, WA 98223
I recently attended the 14-073 hearing opposing its adoption by the County Commission. Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Marvin Dawson
@3319 19th Place West
Un-incorp-Sno
Bothell (unc Sno Co), WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Dan Stearns
3628 147th PI SE
Mill Creek, WA 98012
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Nancy Sosnove
3816 Railway Avenue
Everett, WA 98201
Ms. Evans and fellow Commissioners:

Provided parks, urban forest and green spaces are sustained in urban areas, I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Cliff Sanderlin
10522 235th P1 SW
Edmonds, WA 98020
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Rebecca Loveless
50 Cedar Ave
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Richard Rosen
23508 32nd Ave. West
Brier, WA 98036
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Chris Stay
540 Seamont Lane
Edmonds, WA 98020
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Judy Heydrick
P.O. Box 352
Sultan, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Victoria Stratton
805 Mill Ave
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Greg Onsel
122 178th PL NE
Arlington, WA 98223
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

carol mcdonald
7709 28th st se
lake stevens, WA 98258
From: Bruce Barnbaum <barnbaum@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 9:58 AM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

A report heard on NPR two days ago noted that 50% of all wildlife worldwide (terrestrial and aquatic) has disappeared in the past 50 years. This is a catastrophe...a true catastrophe. The key culprits identified in the study were #1. agricultural fertilizers and run-off, #2. logging, and #3. global warming. Here in Snohomish County we must do the utmost to curb all three, not just for Snohomish County, but for the world.

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan. Yet it is an alternative that should be further strengthened. While we ALWAYS talk about planning for future generations, we ALWAYS make decisions based on today’s perceived needs, with no real thought about future generations. (After all, future generations don't vote today!)

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Bruce Barnbaum
31417 Mountain Loop Highway
Granite Falls, WA 98252
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Lael Bradshaw
21511 4 Ave. W
Apt A62
Bothell, WA 98021
Snhoimish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Julie Langabeer
1409 Grand Ave.
Everett, WA 98201
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Dayna Yalowicki
23426 53rd Ave SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Evans, Sally

From: Bronwen Bradshaw-Balmos <brondo7@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 10:54 AM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Bronwen Bradshaw-Balmos
21511 4th Ave. W, #A62
Bothell, WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

These issues are important to me. Thank you for your attention to this important policy.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Megan Dunn
2216 Main Street
Everett, WA 98203
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Cynthia Selby
6211 97th DR NE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Linda Swan
P O Box 224
Snohomish, WA 98291
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land within our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Allison Hays
18930 Bothell Everett Hwy
G104
Bothell, WA 98012
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Thom Peters
7725 Riverview Road
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report shows there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for many years of growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only promote growth in our rural areas.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Ronald Ramey
4630 Mermont Drive
Everett, WA 98203
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

bea wilson
1033 9th south
8107 225th Pl SW
edmonds, WA 98020
Evans, Sally

From: Lynn Lichtenberg <mimlichtenberg@frontier.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future to reduce the potentially catastrophic effects of climate change and ocean acidification. Our communities must become increasingly walkable, and transit oriented. It has never been more imperative to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent, or less. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth and resulting congestion in our rural areas. Therefore, I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks. Accessible parks are positively linked by many studies to quality of life.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Lynn Lichtenberg
501 Colby Ave.
Everett, WA 98201
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water—while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Dorothy Hall
23210-57th Ave. W., #452
Mountlake Terrace, WA 98043
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Karen Byrd
5631 151st St SE
Everett, WA 98208
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Jeffrey Tinius
6132 195th Ave SE
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water – while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Laurel Cheap
314 Rhodora hts rd
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Rowena Miller
8711-182 pl. s.w.
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Mara Price
10509 76th Dr NE
Marysville, WA 98270
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Ed Williams
34117 140th Street SE
Sultan, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Robert Haverlock
8204 320th ST SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn’t stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

David Clay
9307 45th Pl. SE
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Penny Shively
13512 106th Dr. SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

My wife and I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

We are opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

We support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore we do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

We support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

We support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of our recommendations.

David Gladstone
P. O. Box 803
Snohomish, WA 98291
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Jack Stansfield
16314 62nd Ave. NW
Stanwood, WA 98292
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

James Reeder
23456 78th Ave. W.
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water – while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Beverly Hawkins
7918 236th St SW #209
Edmonds, WA 98026
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

janet chalupnik
540 dayton
# 201
edmonds, WA 98020
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Bob Krigbaum
14115 80th St SE
Snohomish, WA 98290
I've lived in Snohomish County since 1984 and have watched its population grow quickly. The inevitable growth this area will see needs to be managed properly to maintain our quality of life. It makes sense to channel the growth to the cities where the infrastructure and service can be offered more efficiently. Please choose wisely and adopt Land Use Plan Alternative 1. Save our farmlands, shorelines, and rural areas.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Julia Winchell
22920 19th AVE NE
Arlington, WA 98223
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Lee Bennett
13501 Kenwanda Drive
Snohomish, WA 98296
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

brad mcneil
1413 3rd st
snohomish, WA 98290
Evans, Sally

From: Douglas Cavit <dscavit@cavit.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 9:21 PM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Alternative 1 is Crucial

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I have seen sprawl first hard destroy valuable farmland and impact my quality of life here in northern Snohomish county.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Douglas Cavit
PO Box 427
Silvana, WA 98287
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

stan Heydrick
PO Box 352
Sultan, WA 98294
Evans, Sally

From: richard wertz <wertzwhitman@frontier.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 9:36 PM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

richard wertz
p.o. box 441
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water—while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional, and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Patricia Reeve
7035 Morgan Road
Everett, WA 98203
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Terrill W Hendrickson
21625 45th Ave SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Julia Briggs
6528 60th St SE
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Julie O'Donald
3404 Russet Rd.
Brier, WA 98036
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Reg Reisenbichler
2918 227th Street SW
Brier, WA 98036
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Karl Keener
7612 30th St. SE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
We must plan wisely to ensure that Snohomish County remains a desirable place to live, work, and play.

I support Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. Consideration must be given to keeping traffic on rural roads manageable to support families, commuters, and emergency services.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

m dulin
1216 W Mukilteo Blvd
Everett, WA 98203
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Mary Lowry
PO Box 886
SULTAN, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

It is critical that a process of coordination with the cities be conducted concurrently and in particular in the Southwest Urban Growth Area(SWUGA), this area is a patchwork of jurisdictions that have been penalized by powerful special interests that have prevented (fair elections) normal city growth by annexation of dense urban areas that surround Bothell, Mill Creek, Lynnwood, Mukilteo and Everett. The SWUGA must have a special attention as to how our planning will fit together regardless of differences. I do not see how we will ever have a vision for our coordinated growth in this area. In the final adopted plan , I will see an entanglement of Snohomish County Planning that is isolated and not a true coordinated document where citizens of cities and unincorporated Snohomish County have the necessary information or a vision for our growth. I see continued conflicts for our revenue in the unincorporated areas of the SWUGA.. Fire Districts/County/Sheriff will continue to fight to maintain power in this region for the foreseeable future.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Gene Grieve
3712 220th St SE
Bothell (unincorporated Sno. Co., WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities' ability to create livable, walkable, and transit-oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water—while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kathy Johnson
927 Quinn Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Jenny Clark
1516 243RD PL SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

mark lucianna
703 316 st. n.e.
stanwood, WA 98292
As the mother of two growing teens, the health of our community is my top priority. Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kylie Loynd
725 Mill Ave
Snohomish, WA 98290
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Steve Hanson
16429 67th Ave W
Lynnwood, WA 98037
Evans, Sally

From: Leslie Strickland <stricklt76@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 04, 2014 9:44 AM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Leslie Strickland
2932 151st Pl SW #103
Lynnwood, WA 98087
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Terry Nightingale
602 N 46th St
Seattle, WA 98103
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn’t stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Brooks Bennett
21110 46th Ave SE
Bothell, WA 98021
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kathy Russ
Po Box 1053
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Nick Barcott
1318 N. Lake Stickney Dr.
Lynnwood, WA 98087
I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am strongly opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn’t stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Steve Moore
P.o. Box 1233
Snohomish, WA 98291
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn’t stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kamol lohavanichbutr
26710 2nd Ave NE
Arlington, WA 98223
Evans, Sally

From: Kathleen Snyder <ksnyder75@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 06, 2014 8:10 AM
To: Evans, Sally
Subject: Adopt Alternative 1

Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Kathleen Snyder
2406 81st PI SE
Everett, WA 98203
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Bryan Ashbaugh
12719 Sultan Basin road
Sultan, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

As a forty-five year resident in rural Snohomish County I have seen substantial and grave changes in my neighborhood: massive increase in traffic, wanton destruction of wildlife habitat, and systematic purging of agricultural lands. Don't you think it is time, perhaps, that we further utilize our existing urban communities to create and increase safe, healthy living environments so that our open spaces can be preserved? We moved to our rural home to experience a rural lifestyle which is fast disappearing.

Thank you for considering the recommendations of Futurewise which I fully support.

Joan Pryor
4525 91st Avenue N.E.
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development. Alternative's 2 and 3, which I do not support, would bring us one step closer to a Los Angeles-like vision of continuous urban sprawl from the ocean to the mountains, with associated environmental degradation and decreased quality of life for the County's inhabitants.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Mark Bothwell
32814 120th St. SE
Sultan, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County’s 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn’t stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Julianne Williams
34117 140th st se
sultan, WA 98294
Snohomish County needs to plan wisely for our future. Decisions made now will have a long-lasting effect on the county and cities ability to create livable, walkable, and transit oriented development. It has never been more imperative than to plan for growth in a way that lessens our impact on our air, land, and water -- while also reducing costs for taxpayers.

I support the recommendations of Futurewise to adopt the Land Use Plan Alternative 1, the Regional Growth Strategy Plan.

I am opposed to unnecessary Urban Growth Area expansions. The County's 2012 Buildable Lands Report clearly demonstrates that there is plenty of buildable land in our current cities and urban growth areas for the next 20 years for new growth and development.

I support keeping the rural development population to 8 percent. The amount of traffic on our rural roads from the intensity of rural development over the last 25 years will just increase if the County doesn't stop allowing so much growth in the rural areas. The County is suggesting our rural roads with congestion have an urban level of service. This will only create more opportunities for growth in our rural areas. Therefore I do not want the LOS of any rural arterials be less than LOS C.

I support strong policies to the Natural Environment Chapter of the General Policy Plan for dealing with ways our county can reduce the impacts of global warming.

I support the Parks Plan that will help achieve more neighborhood parks, as well as community, regional and trail parks.

Thank you for consideration of my recommendations.

Robert Stafford
10240 42nd Ave NE
Unit B
Marysville, WA 98271
A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Chairman Palumbo called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Ten (10) of the currently appointed commissioners (11) were in attendance (both a quorum and a majority being six (6) members).

Merle Ash          Darrel McLaughlin
Simon Farretta     Tom Norcott
Angeline Fowler    Guy Palumbo
Doug Hannam        Cheryl Stanford
Ben Kaufman        Dan Strandy

Commissioner Taft had an excused absence.

Jacqueline Reid, PDS PAT Division Supervisor, served as Commission Secretary for this meeting.

B. NEW BUSINESS

Public Hearing on the 2015 Update of the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

Chairman Palumbo opened the hearing to public testimony at 5:36 p.m., with testimony being received as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paula Crandall</td>
<td>Requested boundary line adjustment; concerned about traffic and new homes; children are walking to school in dangerous areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig VanLewderen</td>
<td>85% of his neighbors agree with above statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Bird</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3; wants a zoning change in the Greenleaf area (current zoning is RC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Greeley</td>
<td>Opposed to Alternative 3; wants to retain 40 acres of forestry as per FTA; LDMR out of character with surrounding area; rezone to R9600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Putt</td>
<td>Concerned about Alternative 3 and brought petition from Highlands East; 10 year moratorium should last until rezoned; wants rezone to R9600; streets can’t accommodate more traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri Moore</td>
<td>Wants safe places for walking and biking in order to improve health and decrease disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Brekhus</td>
<td>Does not support de-annexing in City of Arlington. His property is already in the city with access to utilities. Proposes reducing urban sprawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Brekhus</td>
<td>Delay consideration of de-annexing from Arlington; wants to develop the property; TDR is not workable as the cost is prohibitive and the program will not be successful as now structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Roberts</td>
<td>Opposed to both Sultan docket proposals; the city should build within their boundaries; proposed UGAs are rural and agricultural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Thurman</td>
<td>Prefers option E for the Cathcart L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Poole</td>
<td>Taxes will go up if city (Stanwood) develops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula Andrews</td>
<td>Do not expand Stanwood UGA; Church Creek is protected; 64th is not good for traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kelly</td>
<td>Futurewise recommends Alternative 1; less cost; opposed to docket requests; eliminate RUTAs; need density in urban areas to bring in transit; listed what is included in her letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley McGuire</td>
<td>Has no access to Cathcart Way; PAWS has blocked them; Cathcart L should be in UGA right now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Larsen</td>
<td>Represented City of Stanwood and spoke for their docket proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lavers</td>
<td>40 acres north of Glacier Peak; Highlands Association does not want to be rezoned; keep low density residential; traffic very serious; width of roads cannot handle more traffic; don’t change the zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Erdozain</td>
<td>Traffic concerns in Highlands East; don’t change the zoning as it would make the neighborhood a cut-through; dangerous to build on a slope, against additional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruybal</td>
<td>In favor of zoning change, go a step further; want LDMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope Prethero</td>
<td>Lots of wetland on the church property in Granite Falls, oppose building; expanded park area for community as there are homeless people and trash that doesn’t get cleaned up; if park area can’t be clean, don’t expand it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lowry</td>
<td>Sultan does not need more room to build houses – already have areas to build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Ashbaugh</td>
<td>Sultan doesn’t need more land to develop – has plenty; whole process has not been very open; don’t expand the UGA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Winde</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3; proposed road in Cathcart L will alleviate additional traffic; allows for growth for current and future residents and provides strong economic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Heydrick</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan proposals 1 and 2; no notice to property owners; city consulted special interests; want to remain in the county; growth can be accommodated within city limits; inconsistent with GMA planning goals; approve a hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Malinowsky</td>
<td>Don’t rezone property in Granite Falls; promised to maintain in natural condition in the past; opposed to access road in swap; wants to know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Malinowsky</td>
<td>Opposed to Granite Falls UGA; already beautiful land that needs to be taken care of by owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gamache</td>
<td>Questioning church in Granite Falls; middle of property has no access to any roads; lots of wetlands and wildlife; questioning motive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stankus</td>
<td>Objects to “inappropriate development” of Wellington Hills park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gray</td>
<td>Flawed parks LOS; capacity not a good plan; Parks misrepresented white paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Marshall</td>
<td>Opposed to sports complex in Wellington Hills park; excessive noise, lights, and traffic – negatively impact the quality of life; ill-conceived plan not suited for the location; not in the best interest of either the city or the county – put this before the votes and find an appropriate piece of property suited to this type of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Littlefield</td>
<td>Opposed to proposed plan of Wellington Hills park; community had no input to park design; park located outside the UGA and zoned as rural; proposed plan is wholly inappropriate; unnecessary commercial endeavor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Willett</td>
<td>Spoke in opposition to Wellington Hills Park; no public input; inappropriate place for sports complex; no road lights, and county has no plans to make improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Stewart</td>
<td>Concerned with all alternatives; gave definitions of active and passive recreation; doesn't like passive definition of trails; make PRE definitions more general and inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Ondrasik</td>
<td>Over 300 people opposed to the Wellington Hills park; no input from neighborhood; access limited and steep slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Gibson</td>
<td>Does not support Sultan UGA expansion; population allocation to the city by the county was reduced; now no need for expansion; no public input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Winde</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike O’Grady</td>
<td>Opposes Wellington Park proposal; master plan developed without citizen input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bacon</td>
<td>Opposes Wellington Park proposal; no commercial sports park in rural area and without consulting the neighborhood; no collaboration; back door deals; traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hanson</td>
<td>Supports the Union Slough restoration project; consistent with CPP MPP and meets requirements of RCW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Schriver</td>
<td>Has Woodinville property he wants added to Maltby UGA; rezone – only a minor change; make property more in line with actual use; across from Brightwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Wanichek</td>
<td>Opposes making the Lake Serene area LDMR; need a moratorium on rezoning and/or variances; someone needs to take accountability; in the Mukilteo MUGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fussell</td>
<td>Need moratorium on LDMR in the Lake Serene area where there is flooding and lack of drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hockenson</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan annexation area; cannot be developed because of power lines and gas pipeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Wheeler</td>
<td>Opposed to Arlington docket land swap to de-annex on east side and add on west side; bought because the area was R5; City of Marysville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Golston, Mayor</td>
<td>Explained the Granite Falls proposal; disputed arguments against it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Sturtz</td>
<td>Further explained Granite Falls proposal; disputed arguments against it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mumaw</td>
<td>Objects to rezone on 25th Ave. S.E.; only one access to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Renz</td>
<td>Highlands East cut-through is unsafe; rolled curbs and narrow streets; teen drivers unsafe; renew the development plan and renew access through the other side; make MC Town Center type of area to keep quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Scullywest</td>
<td>Has property on North Creek; house across the street drains to north creek; has Artesian well; development uphill will destroy or degrade the springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Thomas</td>
<td>Snohomish Co. sheriffs not doing their job in Granite Falls; need to fix sidewalks and make the city nice; keep its natural habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Savage</td>
<td>Opposes rezoning to higher density in Lake Serene area; overflow and flooding; surface water drains into lake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gardner</td>
<td>Owns property in Cathcart L; zone back to R5 is inappropriate – mixed use urban more appropriate in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Frey</td>
<td>In RUTA but borders new UGA (Stanwood docket); when land is developed will drain onto her property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrzad Khatibi</td>
<td>Part property owner in Cathcart L; wants option E mixed urban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Fiorini</td>
<td>County needs to follow own guideline (with respect to Cathcart L); surrounded by commercial area; only place in other designation; only access from Hwy. 9; wants option E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Nordell</td>
<td>Supports alternative 1; opposed to unnecessary expansion; keep rural growth slow; concerned with habitat and wildlife loss; spoke regarding displaced wildlife; wants strong Natural Environment chapter and good parks; request new park goal to establish wildlife network across parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Dolan</td>
<td>Opposed to Arlington de-annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Laico</td>
<td>Explained plan for PAWS facility in Cathcart L; purchased as a result of R5 zoning designation; PAWS doesn’t plan to densely populate – want peaceful environment for recuperating animals; not actively opposing any zoning change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Yoshihara</td>
<td>Ruggs Lake belongs to the landowners; lots of wildlife; any development between there and the City of Everett should not be allowed, the water comes from Silver Lake; too much congestion around Bothell-Everett Highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Wells</td>
<td>Has equestrian property on Lake Serene; – 1 acre; peaceful 2 lane road with no sidewalks; don’t rezone to 10-12 homes per acre --will not be consistent with the neighborhood (Shelby Road); drainage a problem too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Renshaw</td>
<td>Cathcart L property diminished by county facility; not happy about PAWS facility as it will bring more traffic; rezone area to mixed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Johnson</td>
<td>Way too much traffic in Wellington Hills park area; do not put a regional sports complex in a rural area; park needs to fit the neighborhood it was designed for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Duell</td>
<td>Dense housing is not appropriate in the Lake Serene area; do not use Lake Serene as a holding pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Bercher</td>
<td>Agrees with previous speakers about Lake Serene; additional concerns: essential facilities adversely impacted includes electricity – need to provide additional capacity; illegal parking on Shelby road; parking a problem – need a moratorium until all concerns are addressed; need mass transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ruckman</td>
<td>Favors Alternative 3 rezoning; owns property in Cathcart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Beach</td>
<td>All property owners are opposed to Arlington Docket item; Arlington TDR area restricted to receiving area; posting of this meeting not done until September 27; no response to written comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanann Honaker</td>
<td>Cathcart L should be rezoned as urban mixed use – only 5 minutes walking from future transit area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Pearson</td>
<td>Want urban low density zoning, rather than R5 (Granite Falls docket).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Robertson</td>
<td>Supports the STAN5 Docket proposal; wants to move the Josephine facility to an area that does not flood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Bergenheim</td>
<td>Wellington Hills park should not be developed as there is lots of wildlife in park; Maltby wants more facilities; could be county destination park with a few improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Powell</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan docket; west of Trout Farm Road is in a flood zone and dam holds back Spada Lake - not a good idea to put houses there; keep UGA; roads inadequate for added traffic; infrastructure inadequate; crime rate up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady Helseth</td>
<td>RUTA ridiculous; signage needs to go back up – notification signs instead of postcards and mail outs; no LDMR by Tom Thumb – get rid of it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There being no other persons wanting to speak, Chairman Palumbo closed the hearing to public testimony at 9:10 p.m.

Commission Request for Additional Information

Commissioners requested the following additional information be provided or arrangements made prior to their October 14, 2014, deliberations:

- Parks Department staff should attend the deliberations.
- More information regarding the City of Arlington request to delay its docket proposal.
- Clarify decision points regarding Wellington Hills, such as, what impact would the decision points have.
- Surface Water Management staff should attend the deliberations and provide clarification regarding the issues brought up about Lake Serene.
- Information regarding the 10-year Greenleaf moratorium.
- Implications to comp plan and DEIS process (as well as cost) of the individual parcel rezones not proposed.
- Explanation of the plan for a new road through the Cathcart site that was talked about.
- What are the sports franchises talked about for Wellington – the commercial plan
- Explanation of why the City of Sultan is making its docket proposal.
- Definition of mitigation for Brightwater.
• Explanation of the discrepancies the Mayor of Granite Falls said speakers were describing.
• Explanation of the implications option E would have on development in Cathcart L.
• More information on a road to County facilities in the Cathcart area. Why was a road denied in the past?
• Need clarification regarding the church area in the Granite Falls docket proposal. Is part being used for a stormwater system?
• Need more information regarding rezoning to light industrial across from Brightwater
• Need more information regarding the Crystal Springs neighborhood.
• Need more information regarding a wildlife corridor plan mentioned by one of the speakers. What might be a viable plan for the county?
• What implication does the RUTA designation have on the utilization or development of property?
• Need more information regarding the proposed LOS service methodology for Parks, including an explanation of option 2.

This public hearing, including all testimony and discussion, is on file (via recording) in PDS.

C. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paula Crandall</td>
<td>Requested boundary line adjustment; concerned about traffic and new homes; children are walking to school in dangerous areas.</td>
<td>Please see responsesl-098-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig VanLewderen</td>
<td>85% of his neighbors agree with above statements.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-098-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Bird</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3; wants a zoning change in the Greenleaf area (current zoning is RC).</td>
<td>Please see response to C-005-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Greeley</td>
<td>Opposed to Alternative 3; wants to retain 40 acres of forestry as per FTA; LDMR out of character with surrounding area; rezone to R9600 for consistency; doesn’t want connecting roads to cut through to Cathcart (from the Greenleaf Area).</td>
<td>Please see response to I-031-001 and C-005-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Putt</td>
<td>Concerned about Alternative 3 and brought petition from Highlands East; 10 year moratorium should last until rezoned; wants rezone to R9600; streets can’t accommodate more traffic.</td>
<td>Please see response C-007-001 and C-005-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri Moore</td>
<td>Wants safe places for walking and biking in order to improve health and decrease disease.</td>
<td>The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The updated Transportation Element addresses all modes of travel including non-motorized modes. See Volume II of the Draft and Final EIS for an analysis of alternative growth and transportation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Brekhus</td>
<td>Does not support de-annexing in City of Arlington. His property is already in the city with access to utilities. Proposes reducing urban sprawl.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-062-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Brekhus</td>
<td>Delay consideration of de-annexing from Arlington; wants to develop the property; TDR is not workable as the cost is prohibitive and the program will not be successful as now structured</td>
<td>Please see response to I-062-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Roberts</td>
<td>Opposed to both Sultan docket proposals; the city should build within their boundaries; proposed UGAs are rural and agricultural.</td>
<td>Please see response I-034-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Thurman</td>
<td>Prefers option E for the Cathcart L.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-087-001 (last paragraph).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Poole</td>
<td>Taxes will go up if city (Stanwood) develops.</td>
<td>Please see responsesl-078-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula Andrews</td>
<td>Do not expand Stanwood UGA; Church Creek is protected; 64th is not good for traffic.</td>
<td>Please see response I-007-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Kelly</td>
<td>Futurewise recommends Alternative 1; less cost; opposed to docket requests; eliminate RUTAs; need density in urban areas to bring in transit; listed what is included in her letter.</td>
<td>Please see response C-004-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley McGuire</td>
<td>Has no access to Cathcart Way; PAWS has blocked them; Cathcart L should be in UGA right now</td>
<td>Please see response to I-084-001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ryan Larsen         | Represented City of Stanwood and spoke for their docket proposal.                                                                                                                                             | The comments are noted and forwarded to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Lavers</td>
<td>40 acres north of Glacier Peak; Highlands Association does not want to be rezone; keep low density residential; traffic very serious; width of roads cannot handle more traffic; don’t change the zoning.</td>
<td>Please response to C-007-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Erdozain</td>
<td>Traffic concerns in Highlands East; don’t change the zoning as it would make the neighborhood a cut-through; dangerous to build on a slope, against additional growth.</td>
<td>Please response C-007-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ruybal</td>
<td>In favor of zoning change, go a step further; want LDMR</td>
<td>The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelope Prethero</td>
<td>Lots of wetland on the church property in Granite Falls, oppose building; expanded park area for community as there are homeless people and trash that doesn’t get cleaned up; if park area can’t be clean, don’t expand it.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lowry</td>
<td>Sultan does not need more room to build houses – already have areas to build.</td>
<td>The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The process by which the County considers docket requests is addressed in SCC Chapter 30.74 Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Ashbaugh</td>
<td>Sultan doesn’t need more land to develop – has plenty; whole process has not been very open; don’t expand the UGA.</td>
<td>Please see response I-042-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Winde</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3; proposed road in Cathcart L will alleviate additional traffic; allows for growth for current and future residents and provides strong economic support</td>
<td>Please see response I-028-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan Heydrick</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan proposals 1 and 2; no notice to property owners; city consulted special interests; want to remain in the county; growth can be accommodated within city limits; inconsistent with GMA planning goals; approve a hybrid</td>
<td>The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The process by which the County considers docket requests is addressed in SCC Chapter 30.74 Growth Management Act Public Participation Program Docketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Malinowsky</td>
<td>Don’t rezone property in Granite Falls; promised to maintain in natural condition in the past; opposed to access road in swap; wants to know if ulterior motive.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Malinowsky</td>
<td>Opposed to Granite Falls UGA; already beautiful land that needs to be taken care of by owners.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gamache</td>
<td>Questioning church in Granite Falls; middle of property has no access to any roads; lots of wetlands and wildlife; questioning motive.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responses to Public Hearing Testimony (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Stankus</td>
<td>Objects to “inappropriate development” of Wellington Hills park.</td>
<td>Please see response C-010-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gray</td>
<td>Flawed parks LOS; capacity not a good plan; Parks misrepresented white paper.</td>
<td>Please see response I-075-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki Marshall</td>
<td>Opposed to sports complex in Wellington Hills park; excessive noise, lights, and traffic – negatively impact the quality of life; ill-conceived plan not suited for the location; not in the best interest of either the city or the county – put this before the votes and find an appropriate piece of property suited to this type of development.</td>
<td>Please see response I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Littlefield</td>
<td>Opposed to proposed plan of Wellington Hills park; community had no input to park design; park located outside the UGA and zoned as rural; proposed plan is wholly inappropriate; unnecessary commercial endeavor.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Willett</td>
<td>Spoke in opposition to Wellington Hills Park; no public input; inappropriate place for sports complex; no road lights, and county has no plans to make improvements.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Stewart</td>
<td>Concerned with all alternatives; gave definitions of active and passive recreation; doesn’t like passive definition of trails; make PRE definitions more general and inclusive.</td>
<td>Please see response I-076-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Ondrasik</td>
<td>Over 300 people opposed to the Wellington Hills park; no input from neighborhood; access limited and steep slope.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Gibson</td>
<td>Does not support Sultan UGA expansion; population allocation to the city by the county was reduced; now no need for expansion; no public input.</td>
<td>Please see responses I-004-001 and I-050-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Smith</td>
<td>Supports Alternative 3.</td>
<td>Please see responses I-061-001and I-088-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike O’Grady</td>
<td>Opposes Wellington Park proposal; master plan developed without citizen input.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bacon</td>
<td>Opposes Wellington Park proposal; no commercial sports park in rural area and without consulting the neighborhood; no collaboration; back door deals; traffic.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hanson</td>
<td>Supports the Union Slough restoration project; consistent with CPP MPP and meets requirements of RCW.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-077-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Shriver</td>
<td>Has Woodinville property he wants added to Maltby UGA; rezone – only a minor change; make property more in line with actual use; across from Brightwater.</td>
<td>Please see responses I-033-001 and I-083-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Wanichek Voice</td>
<td>Opposes making the Lake Serene area LDMR ; need a moratorium on rezoning and/or variances; someone needs to take accountability; in the Mukilteo MUGA</td>
<td>Please see response C-003-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Fussell</td>
<td>Need moratorium on LDMR in the Lake Serene area where there is flooding and lack of drainage.</td>
<td>Please see responses to C-003-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hockenson</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan annexation area; cannot be developed because of power lines and gas pipeline.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-29-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Wheeler</td>
<td>Opposed to Arlington docket land swap to de-annex on east side and add on west side; bought because the area was RS; City of Marysville cannot manage growth.</td>
<td>Please see response to C-004-005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Golston, Mayor</td>
<td>Explained the Granite Falls proposal; disputed arguments against it.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Sturtz</td>
<td>Further explained Granite Falls proposal; disputed arguments against it.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mumaw</td>
<td>Objects to rezone on 25th Ave. S.E.; only one access to the south.</td>
<td>The comment is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Renz</td>
<td>Highlands East cut-through is unsafe; rolled curbs and narrow streets; teen drivers unsafe; renew the development plan and renew access through the other side; make MC Town Center type pf area to keep quality of life.</td>
<td>Please see response C-007-001 and C-005-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Scullywest</td>
<td>Has property on North Creek; house across the street drains to north creek; has Artesian well; development uphill will destroy or degrade the springs.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-093-002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Thomas</td>
<td>Snohomish Co. sheriffs not doing their job in Granite Falls; need to fix sidewalks and make the city nice; keep its natural habitat.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Savage</td>
<td>Opposes rezoning to higher density in Lake Serene area; overflow and flooding; surface water drains into lake.</td>
<td>Please see responses to C-003-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gardner</td>
<td>Owns property in Cathcart L; zone back to R5 is inappropriate – mixed use urban more appropriate in area</td>
<td>Please see response I-065-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Frey</td>
<td>In RUTA but borders new UGA (Stanwood docket); when land is developed will drain onto her property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrzad Khatibi</td>
<td>Part property owner in Cathcart L; wants option E mixed urban.</td>
<td>Please see response I-065-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Fiorini</td>
<td>County needs to follow own guideline (with respect to Cathcart L); surrounded by commercial area; only place in other designation; only access from Hwy. 9; wants option E</td>
<td>Please see response I-087-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Nordell</td>
<td>Supports alternative 1; opposed to unnecessary expansion; keep rural growth slow; concerned with habitat and wildlife loss; spoke regarding displaced wildlife; wants strong Natural Environment chapter and good parks; request new park goal to establish wildlife network across parks.</td>
<td>The preference for Alternative 1 is noted and forwarded to County decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Dolan</td>
<td>Opposed to Arlington de-annexation</td>
<td>Please see response I-062-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette Laico</td>
<td>Explained plan for PAWS facility in Cathcart L; purchased as a result of R5 zoning designation; PAWS doesn’t plan to densely populate – want peaceful environment for recuperating animals; not actively opposing any zoning change.</td>
<td>Please see response to C-009-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Yoshihara</td>
<td>Rugs Lake belongs to the landowners; lots of wildlife; any development between there and the City of Everett should not be allowed, the water comes from Silver Lake; too much congestion around Bothell-Everett Highway.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-090-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Wells</td>
<td>Has equestrian property on Lake Serene; – 1 acre; peaceful 2 lane road with no sidewalks; don’t rezone to 10-12 homes per acre – will not be consistent with the neighborhood (Shelby Road); drainage a problem too.</td>
<td>Please see response to C-003-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Renshaw</td>
<td>Cathcart L property diminished by county facility; not happy about PAWS facility as it will bring more traffic; rezone area to mixed use.</td>
<td>Please see responses to 084-001 and C-011-001.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Responses to Public Hearing Testimony (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Johnson</td>
<td>Way too much traffic in Wellington Hills park area; do not put a regional sports complex in a rural area; park needs to fit the neighborhood it was designed for.</td>
<td>Please see response I-011-001 or I-085-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Duell</td>
<td>Dense housing is not appropriate in the Lake Serene area; do not use Lake Serene as a holding pond.</td>
<td>Please see response to C-003-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Birch</td>
<td>Agrees with previous speakers about Lake Serene; additional concerns: essential facilities adversely impacted includes electricity – need to provide additional capacity; illegal parking on Shelby road; parking a problem – need a moratorium until all concerns are addressed; need mass transportation.</td>
<td>Please see responses C-003-001 and C-011-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ruckman</td>
<td>Favors Alternative 3 rezoning; owns property in Cathcart.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-094-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Beach</td>
<td>All property owners are opposed to Arlington Docket item; Arlington TDR area restricted to receiving area; posting of this meeting not done until September 27; no response to written comment.</td>
<td>Please see responses to I-18-001, I-062-001, and I-097-001. Response to written comment is included in the Final EIS and proper meeting notice was provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanann Honaker</td>
<td>Cathcart L should be rezoned as urban mixed use – only 5 minutes walking from future transit area.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-096-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Pearson</td>
<td>Want urban low density zoning, rather than RS (Granite Falls docket).</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Robertson</td>
<td>Supports the STANS Docket proposal; wants to move the Josephine facility to an area that does not flood.</td>
<td>Please see response I-086-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Bergenheim</td>
<td>Wellington Hills park should not be developed as there is lots of wildlife in park; Maltby wants more facilities; could be county destination park with a few improvements.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-073-001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Powell</td>
<td>Opposed to Sultan docket; west of Trout Road is in a flood zone and dam holds back Spada Lake - not a good idea to put houses there; keep UGA; roads inadequate for added traffic; infrastructure inadequate; crime rate up.</td>
<td>Please see response to I-042-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady Helseth</td>
<td>RUTA ridiculous; signage needs to go back up – notification signs instead of postcards and mail outs; no LDMR by Tom Thumb – get rid of it.</td>
<td>Please see response following this table.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to comment from Penelope Prethero:**

This EIS addresses impacts at the planning level. Impacts from specific development proposals, including impacts to individual wetlands, will be addressed during permit reviews for those proposals. Many of the requirements in the Snohomish County Code provide protection for critical areas such as wetlands. As discussed in the Draft EIS (e.g., pages 3-39 and 3-56), potential adverse effects on these resources can be avoided or minimized through compliance with critical areas rules (SCC 30.62A) and elements of the Snohomish County Code that address land-disturbing activities (SCC 30.63B). These rules would apply equally to development proposals under any of the alternatives. Regarding your other comments unrelated to wetlands, these comments have been forwarded to County decision makers.

**Response to comments from Shannon Malinowsky, Michael Malinowsky, Robert Gamache, Joshua Golston, Ray Sturtz, and Stanley Thomas regarding City of Granite Falls docket GF2:**

Thank you for your comments. Your comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision makers. The GF2 – City of Granite Falls proposal site is located along the west boundary of the Granite
Falls UGA. The site is undeveloped and contains three parcels, two of which are owned by the City. The City intends to annex the three parcels and develop the City-owned parcels as a passive recreation park that will connect to existing municipal passive recreation park land within City limits. The City has stated that public access to the two City-owned parcels will occur from the adjacent City-owned parkland. The third parcel is owned by the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church. Access to the church parcel is to the east through an access easement across the City’s sewage treatment plant facility property, which is within the City limits, and connects to Wallace Street. In its docket application, the City indicated the church-owned property is likely to be developed as either a church or a retreat facility following its annexation into the City of Granite Falls. The GF2 docket proposal is being evaluated in the EIS as a non-project legislative action by the County. Any site-specific development that may be proposed on these sites would be subject to project-level environmental review.

The GF2 – City of Granite Falls docket proposal was analyzed for consistency with the locational requirements of urban growth in RCW 36.70A.110(3). The GF2 proposal is consistent with these locational requirements. The proposal site is surrounded on three sides by lands within the Granite Falls’ city limits and public facilities and services, including fire and law enforcement protection, and sewer and water services, which can be extended to serve this proposed UGA expansion.

**Response to comment from Grady Helseth:**

The comments are noted and forwarded to County decision makers. The RUTA is meant to indicate the potential future area that could be added to the Urban Growth Area so that it develops at rural densities in a manner that does not preclude future rational urban development if that land should be needed. The County is not proposing to provide net increases in the Urban Growth Area with the present Comprehensive Plan Update.

Regarding noticing, with an areawide land use and zoning proposal, the County’s public participation methods involved thousands of postcards to those potentially affected within and adjacent to the potential areas of change. Signage for such areawide proposals is not as feasible or reliable to notify persons potentially affected by areawide proposals.

Please see the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update website. That website identifies the disposition of different land use and zoning requests as reviewed by the Planning Commission and Executive. These proposals and recommendations are being reviewed by the County Council.