Appendix A

Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update Scoping Comments Summary
PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

Snohomish County is updating its Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Growth Management Act. Snohomish County’s Comprehensive Plan consists of the General Policy Plan, Future Land Use Map, Transportation Element, Capital Facilities Plan, and Park and Recreation Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is designed to help the County meet its long term vision for land use and growth management in unincorporated areas outside of cities and towns. Three land use and growth alternatives are currently under consideration and discuss a range of growth patterns:

**Alternative 1, Vision 2040 County Council Initial Growth Targets:**
- About 92% of new growth would be in the UGA and 8% in the rural areas. Would allocate much lower growth in the unincorporated urban growth areas and rural/ resource areas, and direct this growth into the cities. Within the UGA, 29 percent of the growth would go to the unincorporated UGA and 71 percent into cities.

**Alternative 2, Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Recommended Growth Targets, No Action Alternative:**
- Includes the initial population growth targets recommended by SCT and assumes no changes to the land uses as shown on the County’s Future Land Use Map. About 90% of new growth would be in the UGA and 10% in the rural areas. Within the UGAs, about 32% of the growth would go to the unincorporated UGAs and 68% to cities.

**Alternative 3, Snohomish County Tomorrow (SCT) Recommended Growth Targets with Infill and Docket Proposals:**
- Includes the initial population growth targets recommended by SCT similar to Alternative 2. Considers some land use and regulatory changes, and some proposed Docket Amendment Requests that would amend land use classifications and in some cases UGA boundaries.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL

Snohomish County has determined that a non-project environment impact statement (EIS) should be prepared to provide the County, public and other agencies with environmental information to be considered in the decision process. The EIS is anticipated to address the following topics: Soil/Erosion, Air Quality/Climate, Water Resources, Plants/Wetlands/Wildlife/Threatened and Endangered Species, Land and Shoreline Use, Plans and Policies, Population, Housing, Employment, Cultural Resources, Transportation, Police, Fire, Emergency Medical Services, Parks, Schools, Water Systems, Sanitary Sewer Systems, Drainage Systems, Telecommunications and Solid Waste.
Agencies, affected tribes and members of the public were invited to comment on the scope of the EIS including the alternatives and the EIS topics. The comment period extended from September 24, 2013 to October 22, 2013.

A public meeting was held on October 8, 2013 from 6:00pm to 8:00pm at the Northwest Stream Center. At the meeting, County staff made a presentation about the Comprehensive Plan Update proposal, alternatives, and EIS topics, and facilitated a question-and-answer session. Before and after the presentation there was an open house where interested persons, County staff, and consultants could discuss transportation, parks, land use alternatives, and EIS topics. There was a group exercise where interested persons could provide scoping comments by placing “Post-it” notes with comments on posters listing the alternatives and EIS topics. Alternatively, persons could provide comments on a comment form/brochure or send in an email or letter.

Commenters could provide their comments by mail or email. Persons who attended the meetings could provide their comments on a comment form/brochure or on posters. Copies of the public notice, meeting materials, and original comment letters are available at the project website: http://2015update-snoco.org/.

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING SCOPING

Exhibit 1 lists the tribes, agencies, and individuals who provided scoping comments during the comment period. Tribes and state agencies are listed first, followed by local and regional government agencies, community groups, and individuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Krongthip Sangkapreecha, Ph.D., Planning Supervisor</td>
<td>Tulalip Tribes Community Development Department</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gretchen Kaehler, Assistant State Archaeologist</td>
<td>Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kate Tourtellot, Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td>Community Transit</td>
<td>October 22, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Allan Giffen, Director</td>
<td>City of Everett Planning and Community Development</td>
<td>October 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Thomas Matlack, Planning Commissioner</td>
<td>City of Lake Stevens</td>
<td>October 20, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Carla Nichols, Mayor</td>
<td>Town of Woodway</td>
<td>October 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Tom Rogers, AICP Director of Community Development</td>
<td>City of Mill Creek</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kristin Kelly, Futurewise and Pilchuck Audubon Society</td>
<td>Futurewise, Snohomish/Skagit Program Director Pilchuck Audubon Society, Smart Growth Director</td>
<td>October 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Anonymous 1</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Anonymous 2</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Anonymous 3</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Anonymous 4</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kellie Cooper</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Lauren Countryman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Lauren and Helen Countryman</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Elizabeth Healy</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Liz and Don Healy</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 11, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Grady Helseth</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 18, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Judy Heydrick</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 20, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Stan Heydrick</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 20, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Connie King</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Letter with no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Connie King</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Brad Stoll</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Sean Martin</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 8, 2013 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Edwin F Moats</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Sharon Peterson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Tina Stewart</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Michael E. Waggoner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>October 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

This document presents a summary of the comments received during scoping. It is not intended to fully repeat each comment but to give a snapshot of a range of comments. For the full set of comments, please refer to Attachments B and C.

Alternatives

Alternative 1: Initial Growth Targets

- Some commenters desired the first option as it preserved the most rural lands, and focused on housing and development in urban areas. Commenters felt that compact, higher-density urban areas bring significant benefits.
- Commenters expressed support for Alternative 1 because it is the one most compatible with the Growth Management Act.
- Comment stated that Alternative 1 is the only alternative that is consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA), Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRCs) VISION 2040, and the multi-county planning policies. The recent Buildable Lands Report also shows that Snohomish County’s existing cities and Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) can accommodate the projected growth without expanding UGAs.
- Commenters stated that the population density for Alternative 1 is more realistic.
- Commenters stated that it seems the best plan to consider for the future.
- One commenter stated that Alternative 1 is not realistic because Everett cannot accommodate the amount of growth assigned to it, and the market will not support that growth.
- One commenter asked, “Great idea, but what if big city does not come through?”

Alternative 2: No Action

- A comment stated that this was the most likely scenario.
- A comment stated that Alternative 2 would create more family residences, which would create a more comfortable lifestyle.
- A comment stated that Alternative 2 was unlikely to meet future needs.

Alternative 3: Infill and UGA Revision

- The commenter indicated the potential for additional impacts to the already overburdened transportation system in the vicinity of Mill Creek and its Municipal UGA (MUGA), especially with the increased densities proposed in Alternative 3.
- Commenters expressed concerns that the proposed Urban Village land use designation in Alternative 3 may be built out entirely as residential. If the intent is to have commercial uses in the areas shown as Village Center, there should be some tool to require commercial use.
- The increased residential densities would seem to discourage the attainment of the 2035 growth targets adopted by the County Council for the Metropolitan and Core Cities.
- A comment stated that Alternative 3 is the best option for providing market rate and affordable housing.
- A comment stated that Alternative 3 would increase greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions because it allows more growth than is necessary into the unincorporated urban growth areas. This would create more pressure for urban growth area expansion, and also increase the need to drive cars, which would add to GHG emissions.
• When towns/cities are annexing land, they should be required to take areas that have relatively smooth boundaries and maintain relatively smooth boundaries with the City. “Fingers” and gerrymandering should be discouraged.

Natural Environment

Air Quality/Climate
• A comment requested that the greenhouse gas emissions associated with each of the three alternatives should be analyzed. Assessment tools for this analysis are available through the Washington State Department of Commerce.

Erosion
No comments were received specifically related to this section.

Fisheries/Plant and Animal Habitat
• A comment stated that Little Bear Creek is not yet completely cleaned up and that much attention is needed to maintain and restore this creek for ongoing salmon habitation. One of the salmon species found in the creek is close to being added to the Endangered Species List, and Little Bear Creek is one of the few salmon-bearing streams left in this area.
• A comment asserted that engineered approaches to mitigation of surface water runoff have not prevented fish abundance and species composition from being severely compromised.
• A request was made for less development so that plants, animals and humans can all use the property.
• Commenters expressed concern about the gradual development of green spaces and diminished habitat for native plants and animals. Also concerned about the lack of attention to restoring streams and wetlands.
• A request was made to create, maintain, and protect contiguous wildlife corridors and green belts connecting natural areas to allow for wildlife movement and habitat.
• A comment stated that the County should not keep filling and relocating wetlands to site development without adequate consideration of the damage to wetlands and the watershed.
• The ability to maintain a reliable clean water supply to the Tulalip Tribe’s Bernie “Kai-Kai” Gobin Salmon Hatchery may be threatened by development pressures/growth north of the Reservation.
• Wagley’s Creek runs through an ESA fish bearing tributary of the Skykomish River, which has already suffered from sedimentation loads created by previous development and should not be put at further risk.
• A request was made for analysis of the impact of the three alternatives on the existing Woodway Reserve and the natural resources of Woodway’s extensive forest cover.

Groundwater Water (quality, supply for streams & wetlands)
• A commenter stated that development occurs without adequate evaluation of its total effect on groundwater. The effect on area beyond the immediate site is important. Preserving water quality while increasing population density is critical.
• More than one person discussed the potential for impacts on Little Bear Creek. Some stated that the current proposal produces unacceptable adverse impacts to groundwater recharge and Little Bear Creek habitat, which is home to Endangered Chinook Salmon.
• A commenter stated that water flow to Little Bear Creek is currently imbalanced, and the amount of water that recharges is dramatically reduced. Any development of the hillside areas introduces impervious surface, which introduces additional pollution. Soil that has been paved has lost its ability to infiltrate and filter water, which increases water run-off. Concentrating storm water infiltration on a hillside creates landslide hazards.

• The Tulalip Tribe is in opposition to increasing development in rural/ resource areas in the north of the Reservation where groundwater recharge is located. Allowing more development in rural/ resources areas will have significantly adverse impacts on the water source and environment on the Tulalip Indian Reservation, the Seven-Lake area, and south of Stillaguamish River. The water resources of the Reservation are fundamentally important to the Tulalip Tribes, who depend on their water and fisheries for many things.

• There is an interconnection between groundwater and surface water. Impacting one can negatively impact the other. See The Tulalip Tribes letter for more information on steps to protect water resources.

• Rural residential development and agriculture are also polluting the County’s limited ground water supplies. Nitrate pollution of surface and ground water is a known problem in Snohomish County.

• A request was made to address the impacts of development in upland areas to agricultural lands and floodplains.

• A commenter stated that more development of sewer districts is needed to eliminate septic systems and save ground water quality.

Natural Resources
• The EIS should analyze the impacts of development on critical areas and identify measures to mitigate these impacts.

• Forest cover in rural and urban areas has many beneficial effects, including reducing storm water peak flows, reducing the effects of high temperatures and increasing property values.

• A comment stated that, “we are surrounded by streams and Lakes – they’re slowly disappearing.”

• A commenter stated that Snohomish County’s natural attractions are the source of much of the county’s appeal, but they are given significantly lower priority than development.

• A comment stated that it is important to preserve the hills and wild areas, particularly in unincorporated areas. Preserving native giant trees is very important.

Surface Water Management (Including runoff, drainage systems)
• Commenters stated that Surface Water Management needs to be a priority in planning because as development increases, runoff and drainage become an even bigger problem. Surface water should be managed using a large-area approach, rather than on a per-development basis.

• Development on the upper bluff of the Woodway MUGA could cause bluff erosion and impact the BNSF railroad tracks and waterfront development. What are the likely impacts and mitigation measures?

• A resident wanted to make sure that Martha Lake is protected from pollution and unwanted water drainage. There is a desire to make sure homes downhill from the proposed residential development are protected from water damage and erosion.

• A commenter stated that multi-housing apartments have increased the number of cars on the road, putting additional pollution into storm drains.

• It is important to promote rain gardens, water retention landscaping, water permeable drive ways, and parking lots in new developments.
• A comment stated, “Do we really need a mosquito basin on every corner? There must be better solutions.”
  Another comment agreed with this question and statement.
• An additional request was received for research on the alternatives’ effects on surface water fee/ tax on resource industries, and inventory and qualification of land paying surface water fee/ tax yet having no surface water runoff.

Built Environment

Energy
• A comment stated that there should be credits for energy efficient housing.
• A comment discussed the problem with the City of Sultan’s, “sky high utility rates.”

Fire and Emergency Medical Services
• Police, Fire, Emergency Medical Services should be increased to keep up with good quality housing for all incomes.

Historic and Cultural Resources
• Snohomish County is known to contain hundreds of precontact and historic period archaeological sites, and there is a high probability for many additional archaeological sites to be present. Damage to archaeological sites can lead to project work stoppages and cost overruns along with criminal and civil penalties.
• It is important to consider the management of identified resources, but also of unidentified cultural resources as well. The comment recommended that the EIS focus on probabilities for unidentified cultural resources in different areas of the County.
• There was concern about negative impacts on the cultural component of agriculture and other resource industries.

Land Use
• A comment stated that over-development occurs without due consideration for other, more appropriate and popular uses.
• A comment stated that Snohomish County needs livable communities with affordable housing, sidewalks, bike trails and mass transit. Another comment stated that there should be a mix of land use around major transit centers.
• A comment stated that the County should carefully balance dense housing with rural areas, saying “we do NOT need 100% dense housing with a little border of green.” Another comment requested less development of open space because of a need for natural park land.
• A commenter expressed concern about permitting of development in excess of what can be effectively served by the roadway system. Concern about school overcrowding from population growth was also expressed.
• The Tulalip Tribes commented that having two separate plans by Snohomish County and The Tulalip Tribes has undermined comprehensive planning on The Tulalip Tribes reservation to the detriment of all. The Tulalip Tribe urges the County to update the County Comprehensive Plan in a way that recognizes the unique status and purpose of the Tulalip Reservation as a permanent homeland for the Tribe. A comment requested that the County use the Aligned Tulalip Reservation Comprehensive Plan workgroup as a foundation for incorporating the Memorandum of Understanding Land Use Planning goals into the County’s General Policy Plan (GPP) and increasing Tribal inclusion and engagement in planning throughout the EIS and Update Process. The Salmon Recovery and Sustainable Land Strategy should be included in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update.
• The comment stated that the commenter opposes rezoning. The added traffic, poor access problems and incompatibility with the surrounding area would make this proposed multi-family a poor choice for the area. The (South Lake Stevens Road) area has been traditionally single-family and should stay that way.

• A comment stated opposition to the proposed comp plan designation in the Lake Stevens area on property fronting on South Lake Stevens Road. The commenter does not want a multi-family development in this area and indicated that the City of Lake Stevens is opposed to this proposal, and their opinion should be given strong consideration as they will be annexing the area in the future.

• A commenter noted that, while the Town of Woodway’s future land use designations are similar to the County’s land use designations, the growth targets drastically differ. Another comment requested additional information about the land use related impacts on the Woodway community with the build-out of the three alternatives in the Woodway MUGA.

• Commenters expressed concern regarding the City of Sultan’s request to “swap” UGAs. There was opposition to both the UGA 1 and 2 proposals because the City has an adequate land supply within its current borders to accommodate future population growth until 2035. Unnecessary urban growth would result in the destruction of rural lands. Infrastructure is also inadequate. Habitat, forests, and pasture land would be developed increasing traffic and flooding.

• A commenter expressed concern that the Southwest Urban Growth Area (SWUGA) did not get any special attention, and reflects the limited budget of the update process. The SWUGA is uniquely complex, and half of the unincorporated population is in the SWUGA. The commenter would like an integrated plan for the SWUGA that involves law enforcement, fire and EMS, parks, schools, water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, energy, telecommunications, and some consistency of land use between the complex interface of nine communities and unincorporated areas.

• Comments requested information regarding the effects on agriculture and the other resource industries from the County’s policy of conversion of resource land to fish habitat. Comments also requested analysis of the effects on the private sector tax burden and the environmental impacts associated with removal of land from tax rolls under this policy.

• A commenter noted that land use patterns and infrastructure can have significant effects on human health.

**Parks and Recreational Facilities**

• A commenter noted that park funding has been a key problem.

• A commenter requested that a complete inventory of all land owned by the County be presented, including the total quantity of acreage. Also, the impact on tax revenue of all the above county-owned land and the environmental impacts of the increased private sector tax burden should be included.

• A commenter stated that, as population density increases, bike paths, biking trails, playgrounds, ball fields and passive spaces to enjoy nature would be needed.

• A commenter noted that the government agencies need to be aggressively acquiring land for a future park/development of bicycle/walking trails. Sufficient trail land should be acquired for connection of trails.

• A commenter stated that it is important to have more space for young people and teens, especially teen boys.

• Commenters expressed concern regarding the location, creation and budget of new facilities.

• A commenter requested impact analysis on the potential future of other park facilities within Snohomish County.

• Another resident stated that specifically Martha Lake is very crowded in the summer.

*See “Other Comments” section for a discussion of Wellington Hills.*
Police Service
There we no comments for this specific section.

Population and Housing
- The cities are planning separately from the County and there will be a reconciliation period. A comment stated that there is no attempt to review the three alternatives for the SEPA or to review the population goals.
- A commenter noted that the capacity of the unincorporated UGA greatly exceeds the initial population growth target adopted by the County Council.
- Multiple Cities in Snohomish Counties show either a deficit in capacity, or a near match between growth target and existing plan capacity.
- Snohomish County has excess capacity, and it is unlikely that any expansion of the UGA will occur. It is likely that Master Builders will lobby to expand the UGA and get land costs down.
- The task of including the requested housing analysis in the DEIS will enable us to understand where current land capacity is likely to more readily encourage growth, and if adjustments to land use plans are necessary to discourage growth far in excess of initial targets in specific geographic areas.
- The SWUGA will likely undermine the ability of cities to accommodate the housing required to meet their 2035 initial growth targets. Another comment stated that there was a request for the EIS to evaluate the impact that the residential capacity in the unincorporated areas, especially in the SWUGA, will have on the cities’ ability to realize their initial population growth targets.
- A comment requested clarity on how many new family homes are being added at the present moment. A drive down Greenwood Avenue, Seattle is not in the future.
- A commenter stated that it is important to have housing for all income levels, but it is necessary to not build future slum areas.
- Affordable housing is a significant problem in Snohomish County as it is in many parts of Central Puget Sound. One effective way of increasing affordable housing is inclusionary zoning.
- A comment stated that, “apartment housing brings in a transient lifestyle. It shows. We need houses not apartments and crime.”
- A commenter stated that, based on weak population growth trends over the previous 10 years, the City of Sultan cannot justify a need for additional land capacity, nor can it afford it.
- Comments expressed concern over how the County was developing. A resident stated, “It appears that you are after numbers not families. It’s sad and frustrating. I’m referring to the area of 164th.”

Schools
- Comments noted that school funding continues to be a problem.
- A commenter noted that schools are showing a high level of low-income families due to the presence of apartments.
- A commenter stated that safe routes to schools are important.

Sewer/ Solid Water Systems
- Comments stated that it is necessary to increase sewers and eliminate septic systems in dense areas.

Shoreline Management
- Comments stated that it is necessary to preserve natural shorelines and the health of its inhabitants.
Telecommunications
There are no specific comments related to this section.

Transportation

- Many comments were received regarding transportation planning. A comment stated that when new commercial or high density residential housing is constructed, transportation access is often not well planned. Another comment stated that there was inadequate transportation planning. Development is planned and transportation consequences are brushed aside. Another comment asked that the County better plan for mass transit that suits the needs of residents, and provide roads that anticipate the actual requirements of residents. Another requested, “more housing within walking distance to major transit centers...”

- Multiple comments requested better public transportation. One comment stated that there is a need for rapid transportation from Snohomish County to Seattle and north to Marysville. Another comment discussed that light rail is the missing critical element. Another resident stated that it takes two hours to bus from Everett to downtown Seattle and there was a need for effective regional transportation.

- One comment stated that the number one issue is that roads are clogged; mass transit is overcrowded or not available. The rush hour gridlock is a big problem.

- Comments requested that transit and transit infrastructure to be evaluated as part of the transportation analysis. During the next twenty year timeline, major transit projects will be completed or be in the planning stages.

- A comment stated, “Statistics show that apartment residents prefer cars to public transportation.”

- A comment requested mitigation costs of transportation projects and impacts on rural development.

- Comments stated that certain infrastructure improvements are needed. These include high occupancy vehicle (HOV) or Business and Transit (BAT) lanes, signal priority, and intersection improvements. Community Transit has identified 16 transit emphasis corridors in the Long Range Transit Development Plan. Community Transit has identified four (4) future Swift bus rapid transit (BRT) corridors, included in the Transportation 2040 project list that could be in service by 2035. Another comment stated that would like to see better County-State cooperation to fix Highway 527 issues.

- Comments stated that land use assumptions that rely on Swift BRT [Bus Rapid Transit] service as part of the transportation system need to include the associated BRT infrastructure.

- A comment requested knowing the impact to the Town of Woodway’s transportation LOS with the build out of the three alternatives projects for the Woodway MUGA.

- Commenters expressed concern about insufficient accounting for the safety of pedestrians or bicyclists on 240th Street SE and on surrounding roads. The increased traffic volumes will increase the probability for accidents and injuries.

- A comment described some local transportation problems, including unsafe speeds on a road that is a quick cut through for the apartment on 6th Avenue going to North Road. Traffic speeds can reach up to 55mph on a 25mph road. The resident states that her car was broken into and her husband’s new truck tires were stolen from her backyard. She states that she has seen drug deals going on beside the apartment building, mattresses and other garbage tossed in the wooded buffer, and campers with people living in them parked in front of her house.

- Numerous comments discussed local traffic problems, including the following:
  - Current traffic on 164th is congested and will get worse.
Multiple comments requested a cut-through from Larch way to 148th to Meadow, which would eliminate a large amount of traffic. The right-of-way already exists.

Another comment stated that traffic on 240th will increase. 156th will be clogged with cars coming in and out of a Regional Sports Facility all day long.

**Water Supply System**
- A comment requested discussion of the effects on water law and the administrative rules of the state and Snohomish County, and the County policies of the October 3, 2013 Washington Supreme Court decision in Swinomish Tribe v. DOE and the consequential environmental impacts.
- A comment requested that the impacts of the alternatives on rural area drinking water supplies, and irrigation water for agricultural lands, and stream and river flows and wetlands be addressed in the EIS.
- Comments expressed concern that rural residential development would acquire agricultural water rights and the loss of water for irrigation and stock watering would adversely affect the agriculture industry.

**Other Comments**
While some comments were marked under the category of “other,” where the topics appeared to fit among the above built and natural environment categories, they were included there.

**Aesthetics**
- One comment asked, “What noise and aesthetic impacts will be generated by the alternatives in the Woodway MUGA and how will such impacts be mitigated?”
- A comment stated that Comprehensive Plan updates must take into consideration the well-established character of adjacent neighborhoods.

**Process**
- A resident stated that he/she was impressed by the effort to develop/use the website to have interface with citizens as an interactive planning program.
- Comments were received regarding the length of the comment period for scoping:
  - Limited opportunity to review an extremely lengthy document in this short period.
  - Upset that there is less than 2 weeks for comments.

[Note: The scoping comment period was longer than two weeks. It was approximately 4 weeks, extending from September 24, 2013 to October 22, 2013.]

- Received the notice for the presentation of the comprehensive land-use plan ten days after the meeting.

[Note: The County apologizes if the notice was received after the meeting. A legal ad and newspaper ad, in addition to mailings, were employed to ensure that the meeting was advertised. In addition, the written comment period extended over approximately 4 weeks to provide an opportunity to comment outside of the meeting.]
- A commenter stated that Snohomish County does not follow its own due process.
- A request was made that the EIS review the Sustainable Development Study from the City of Woodinville.
- Another resident stated that, “our opinions have been ignored. We wanted to maintain our facilities not build expensive new ones.”
• A commenter stated that the County should seriously solicit and actually listen to input from its residents and businesses in all areas instead of restricting the number and times of public meetings and then ignoring comments.

• General concerns were expressed about the County’s interest in protecting the rural lifestyle in unincorporated areas.

• A comment stated that the City of Sultan failed to inform and involve impacted property owners or the community of its docket amendment plans.

Wellington Hills

• Comments were made regarding built (land use, rural character, noise, traffic, light and glare, etc.) and natural environment (fish and wildlife, surface water, etc.) impacts of developing the Wellington Hills property for a sports complex, and concerns that the facility was inadequately analyzed in prior County SEPA documents.

• The original park development proposal (for Wellington Hills Park) does not serve the surrounding community, which was stipulated in the Brightwater Settlement Agreement.