



Snohomish County
Planning and Development Services

Dave Somers
County Executive

Mike McCrary, Planning Director
3000 Rockefeller Avenue M/S #604
Everett, WA 98201-4046
(425) 388-3311 FAX (425) 388-3832

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Local File Number: 22 102230 CUP

Project File Name: Residential Treatment Facility North

Applicant: Tulalip Tribes

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL: The proposal would construct a secure civil behavioral health services facility (Level II Health and Social Services Facility under SCC 30.91H.095) to be located within two buildings, each with 16 beds and constructed in two phases on a 4.81 acre parcel; the southern building is proposed for construction in Phase 1 along with all associated infrastructure. Each 16-bed facility will be a single-story approximately 15,000 square foot building. The facility will have an average length of stay for patients of 90-180 days. The proposal includes associated parking facilities, off-site septic system and reserve area to be located on the parcel immediately to the west of the project site, stormwater detention and dispersion system, associated perimeter and site landscaping, secured outdoor recreation spaces, and adjacent right-of-way improvements. The proposal will be served by the City of Stanwood's municipal water system through a water line extension to the site. The extension will be constructed entirely within existing right-of-way. Grading quantities for phase one include 8,500 cubic yards of cut and 10,000 cubic yards of fill.

Location of Proposal: 29901 and 29919 80th Ave NW Stanwood. A boundary line adjustment (22-104576 BLA) has been approved for these parcels. The CUP proposal will be located on the eastern parcel once the BLA is recorded.

Tax Account Number: 320418-001-001-00 and 320418-001-014-00

Lead Agency: Snohomish County Planning and Development Services

THRESHOLD DETERMINATION:

The lead agency for this proposal has determined the proposal does not have a probable, significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is NOT required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review by Snohomish County of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with this agency and such information is adopted herein by reference. This information is available for public review upon request.

The lead agency has determined that the requirements for environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation are adequately addressed in the development regulations and comprehensive plan adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, and in other applicable local, state, or federal laws or rules, as provided by RCW 43.21C.240 and WAC 197-11-158. No additional mitigation measures under SEPA are required.

COMPLIANCE WITH DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (RCW 43.21C.240): In making the foregoing SEPA threshold determination the lead agency has determined in the course of review of the proposal that the requirements for environmental analysis, protection and mitigation in Snohomish County's development regulations and comprehensive plan adopted under chapter 36.70A RCW, and in other local, state, or federal laws

and rules provides adequate analysis and mitigation for specific environmental impacts as provided by RCW 43.21C.240 and WAC 197-11-158. Our agency will not require any additional mitigation measures under SEPA relating to said impacts. Approval of the proposal shall be subject to and conditioned upon, among other things, compliance with the requirements of mitigation measures set forth in the following development regulations:

1. Stormwater (SCC 30.61.122): The Director of PDS determines that compliance with the requirements of chapters 30.43C, 30.43D, 30.44, 30.62A, 30.62B, 30.62C, 30.63A, 30.63B, 30.65 and 30.67 SCC is adequate analysis and mitigation of any probable adverse environmental impacts of the proposal upon on-site and off-site changes to stormwater volume, release rate, erosion, sedimentation, stream channel stability and water quality.
2. Critical Areas (SCC 30.62A.030): The Director of PDS determines that compliance with the requirements of chapter 30.62A SCC is adequate analysis and mitigation of any probable adverse environmental impacts of the proposal on wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and their buffers.
3. Traffic/Road Impact Mitigation (SCC 30.66B.010(2)): The Director of PDS determines that compliance with the requirements of chapter 30.66B SCC, including payment of any road impact mitigation fees, is adequate analysis and mitigation of any probable adverse environmental impacts of the proposal on the road system (including traffic).
4. On-Site Sewage: The Director of PDS determines that compliance with the requirements of Title 5 (Wastewater) of the Snohomish Health District Code or Washington State Department of Health regulations found at Chapter 246-272B WAC is adequate analysis and mitigation of any probable adverse environmental impacts of the proposal associated with on-site sewage disposal.

This Determination of Nonsignificance is issued under WAC 197-11-340 (2) and is subject to a 14-day comment period. Written comments may be submitted to the lead agency at the address below or emailed directly to the project manager. Comments must be received by **October 3, 2022**.

APPEALS:

This DNS may be appealed pursuant to the requirements of Section 30.61.300 SCC and Chapter 2.02 SCC. The fourteen (14) day appeal period commences on the date of publication of notice. Any appeal must be addressed to the County Hearing Examiner, accompanied by a filing fee of \$1,500.00, and be filed in writing at the Customer Support Center on the 2nd Floor, County Administration Building East, Everett, WA.

Appeals may also be accepted electronically by the Planning and Development Services Department and paid for by credit card over the phone as follows:

1. Scan the original manually signed (handwritten) copy of the appeal document;
2. Send your appeal as an email attachment to epermittech@snoco.org. Please include your phone number where you can be reliably reached.
3. Staff will call you to collect your credit card information and process your payment.
4. Mail the original to Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller M/S 604, Everett, WA 98201.

The appeal must be received by **October 3, 2022**. The appeal must contain the items set forth in 30.71.050(5) SCC as follows:

- (a) Facts demonstrating that the person is aggrieved by the decision;
- (b) A concise statement identifying each alleged inadequacy in the threshold determination;
- (c) The specific relief requested; and
- (d) Any other information reasonably necessary to make a decision on appeal.

Please note that failure to file a timely and complete appeal including all the above items shall constitute waiver of all rights to an administrative appeal under county code. In addition to the above requirements, SCC 30.61.305(1)

also requires that any person filing an appeal of a threshold determination made pursuant to this chapter shall file with the hearing examiner, within seven days of filing the appeal, a sworn affidavit or declaration demonstrating facts and evidence, that, if proven, would demonstrate that the issuance of the threshold determination was clearly erroneous.

Contact Person: Rebecca Samy, rebecca.samy@snoco.org

Responsible Official: Mike McCrary, Planning Director
Planning and Development Services

Address: County Administration Building East, 2nd Floor
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, Washington 98201

Signature:  _____

Date: September 14, 2022

Rebecca Samy Principal Planner, for Responsible Official

Date Issued: **September 18, 2022 – kjarnett/NRC**

DISCLAIMER:

The determination that an environmental impact statement does not have to be filed does not mean there will be no adverse environmental impacts. Snohomish County codes governing noise control, land use performance standards, construction and improvement of county roads, off site road improvement obligations, drainage control, fire protection and building practices will provide substantial mitigation of the aforementioned impacts.

The issuance of this Determination of Nonsignificance should not be interpreted as acceptance or approval of this proposal as presented. Snohomish County reserves the right to deny or approve said proposal subject to conditions if it is determined to be in the best interest of the county and/or necessary for the general health, safety and welfare of the public to do so.

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Snohomish County North County Regional Fire Authority (Seve Goforth)
Snohomish Health District (Lucas Larson/Antonia Weiss)
Snohomish County Public Works (Doug McCormick)
Snohomish County Sheriff's Office

Washington State Department of Ecology
Department of Transportation
Department of Fish and Wildlife

Utilities Public Utility District #1 of Snohomish County
City of Stanwood – Public Works (Kevin Hushagen)

Other Agencies Stanwood-Camano School District
City of Arlington (Amy Rusko)
City of Stanwood – Planning (Tansy Schroeder)
Snoqualmie Tribes (Anne House)
Snoqualmie Tribes (Kelsey Payne)
Tulalip Tribes (Gene Enick, Richard Young, Todd Gray)

**Adjacent Property
Owners**

Notice of the issuance of this Determination of Nonsignificance
Determination of Nonsignificance has been mailed to property owners of record
within 1,000 feet of the external boundaries of this project.

Parties of Record

Allen Saunders
Allen.saunders@comcast.net

Allie Perry
sheparda@hotmail.com

Amy Bergemier
abergemeier@yahoo.com

Anne Jones
anniewaynorth@yahoo.com

Brent Koos
brentkoos@gmail.com

Bruce Collins
bruceposu@frontier.com

Bruce & Peggy Kitting
peggypoooh321@yahoo.com

Candace Trautman
philandcandy@wavecable.com

Carol Korpi
korpej1@gmail.com

Catherine Carpenter
uryurhere@earthlink.net

Chris Davis
cdavisbusiness@yahoo.com

Chris Larson
Captlarski1@gmail.com

Christi Bell
Christimbell@yahoo.com

Christina Gravin
Cgarvin86@gmail.com

Claudia Davidson
claudia@mainstreetyarn.com

CM Nate Nehring
Nate.Nehring@snoco.org

Darren & Alyona Franz
izbushka.llc@gmail.com

David Fugate
mountbakermeadows@gmail.com

Deana Ottum
kezo@comcast.net

Dee Shishido
tangles39@hotmail.com

Dinah Aldrich
dinahaldrich@gmail.com

Donna Knight
errymor@gmail.com

Elizabeth Reed
elizabeth@interfacetechnw.com

Frederic Berg
fredericpberg@msn.com

Gay-Lynn Beighton
gay-lynnb@namisnohomishcounty.org

Garry Olson
stanwoodstumpy@hotmail.com

G.L. DeBortole
Geno6860@gmail.com

Gretchen Saari
gsaari@msn.com

Gwen Phillips
mcinlineq@gmail.com

Hank Tingler
brownshooo@earthlink.net

Harvey Stackhouse
hstackhouse1948@gmail.com

Jan Iverson
janiverson4950@gmail.com

Jim Bloss
jbloss132@gmail.com

Joan Andrews
andfre65@yahoo.com

Joseph Chartier
jac98270@comcast.net

Joseph Wilson
joeyw206@gmail.com

Janet Graafstra
graafstrajan@gmail.com

Jayson Russell
jaysonrussell@outlook.com

Jeremiah Bauman
jeremiah.r.bauman@gmail.com

Jessica Gilman
jessicamarie0125@aol.com

Jim Dolan
jbdolan@jbdolan.com

Joan Rave
fedheads@hotmail.com

Julie Melville
julielmelville@gmail.com

Kara Dineen
kara@ttns.org

Katie Farrey
kffarrey@gmail.com

Katie Mahoney
katie.a.mahoney@gmail.com

Karen Dickson
kranmom@hotmail.com

Kathy Richardson
kathymrichardson@yahoo.com

Kiley Casey
caseykiley@me.com

Kris Cimino
kriscimino@comcast.net

Leanna Partridge
leannapartridge@gmail.com

Lynn White
ldaviswhite@yahoo.com

Mary Gage
meliz50@hotmail.com

Meg McClure
megmcclure234@gmail.com

Michael James
mfj62@yahoo.com

Murphy Russell
jnmr0617@gmail.com

Pamela Thompson
dogday@myfrontiermail.com

Pat Wilder
fanta002@aol.com

Peggy Miller
pfmiller.49@gmail.com

Richard Moparman
richardmoparman@aol.com

Rob Gildan
robgilden@yahoo.com

Robin Carmichael
robinwood333@yahoo.com

Katie Weeks
klweeks@gmail.com

Karen Schilde
schildek@comcast.net

Kelsi Opland
KelsiOpland@hotmail.com

Kimberly Acuff
kimberly.acuff@gmail.com

Laura Oltman
horsenerd801@gmail.com

Liliana Uribe
lilianadelourdes@yahoo.com

Lynne Donovan
lynne51donovan@yahoo.com

MaryAnn Kridler
mi.cha.el9.mk@gmail.com

Melissa Walstad
braaten794@icloud.com

Michael Weeks
miweeks@gmail.com

North Stanwood Concerned Citizens
northstanwoodconcernedcitizens@gmail.com

Paul Miller
millerpaulcutler@gmail.com

Patricia Tingler
animalfancy@gmail.com

Rachelle Cummings
rachellecummings92@gmail.com

Richard Vaughan
windenrayn@yahoo.com

Robert and Gloria Drury
drurylane1@yahoo.com

Robyn Gibson
gibsonrobyn9@gmail.com

Kaitlinn Donham
kkaters20@aol.com

Kathleen McKee
mckee.kdm@gmail.com

Kevin & Jenell Jones
jordannursery@yahoo.com

Konni
katokon@aol.com

Lauren Simonds
LSimonds@namiwa.org

Linda Godwin
lgodwin5601@gmail.com

Marcy Imus
deterow@aol.com

Meagen Watne
meagen.watne@gmail.com

Micheal Carmichael
stokewood33@yahoo.com

Mike Buckland
bucklandmike@hotmail.com

Pam Reeves
preevesrq@gmail.com

Paula Segale
PaulaSegale@msn.com

Patrick & Heidi Wade
pjwade_454@yahoo.com

Ralph & Amy Esary
esary5@frontier.com

Rick Flores
rick.d.flores@gmail.com

Robert James
lovemychevytruck@gmail.com

Ron Howell
rhowell@wavecable.com

Roy Everett
royamy@wavecable.com

Sam Keller
sam_c_Keller@hotmail.com

Sarah Gibson
s.j.gibbs1@gmail.com

Saranne Moreschi
saranne.moreschi@gmail.com

Sean Gillespie
omalley1537@yahoo.com

Sonya Johnson
sjohnson409@gmail.com

Stacy Moore
stacyamoore@ymail.com

Stan Burwell
stanburwell78@gmail.com

Stephen Hendrickson
steve@hendricksonhomestead.com

Steve Snowden
steve.snowden@frontier.com

Stuart Heady
stuart.heady@gmail.com

Sue Keller
sjkeller61@gmail.com

Susann E Hendrickson
suehen@wavecable.com

Teresa Buckland
bucklandmike@hotmail.com

Tim Schmitt
lethalwit@hotmail.com

Tina Sharp
myemail2tina@yahoo.com

Toni Reading
toni.reading@gmail.com

Tracy Sellers
tracy271wa@yahoo.com

Trisha Pearce
tpearcern@yahoo.com

Vicki Russell
vmrranch@msn.com

Shirley O
sheharr@aol.com

Izzie Lund
ilund@scnews.com

Jacqueline Allison
jacqueline.allison@soundpublishing.com

Sheila Harrington
sheharr@aol.com

Applicant

Tulalip Tribes
Keith Banes – Wenaha Group
KeithB@wenahagroup.com

Owner

Tulalip Tribes
KeithB@wenahagroup.com

Contact Person(s)

Christine Phillips - BCRA
cphillips@bcradesign.com

ATTACHMENTS

1. Environmental Checklist
2. Vicinity Map
3. Ownership & Zoning Map
4. Site Plan/Plat Map (reduced to 8 1/2 x 11 or 14)

6/27/2022

Residential Treatment Facility North

22102230CUP

SEPA Environmental Checklist

Project:

Residential Treatment Facility North
22 102230 CUP

Prepared by:

BCRA

Christine Phillips, AICP
2106 Pacific Ave., Suite 300
Tacoma, WA 98402
(253) 627-4367

June 20, 2022

SEPA Environmental Checklist**A. BACKGROUND**

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
RTFN, Residential Treatment Facility North
2. Name of applicant – Name, phone number & address:
**Tulalip Tribes / Kelsey Edwardson
6406 Marine Drive
Tulalip WA 98271
Cell 509.554.8197
kelseye@wenahagroup.com**
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
**Applicant: Kelsey Edwardson
Cell 509.554.8197
kelseye@wenahagroup.com**

**Contact: Christine Phillips, BCRA Planner
CPhillips@BCRAdesign.com
2106 Pacific Ave, Suite 300
Tacoma, WA 98402
(253) 627-4367**
4. Date checklist prepared:
June 20, 2022
5. Agency requesting checklist:
Snohomish County
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
Construction of 32-bed Residential Treatment Facility to begin in Spring 2023. This facility will be built in two phases: Phase 1 will construct the proposed building located to the south of the Project Site along with all the site improvements, utilities, and parking for both structures, and Phase 2 will construct the north building. Phase 2 will commence when funding is in place and is intended to be permitted and constructed within the timelines of the County's CUP Expiration limits per 30.70.140.
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
No future plans are proposed at this time.
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
**Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazard, Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering, and Stormwater Infiltration Feasibility Report; Associate Earth Sciences, Inc.; December 9, 2021
Boundary and Topographic Survey; Semrau Engineering & Surveying, PLLC; 12/17/2021
Traffic Impact Analysis; Heath & Associates, Inc.; June 2022
Parking Analysis; Heath & Associates, Inc.; June 8, 2022
Septic Feasibility; Cascade Surveying & Engineering, Inc.; Jan 26, 2022**

Wetland & Fish & Wildlife Habitat Report; Soundview Consultants LLC; January 2022
Wetland Buffer Impacts & Mitigation Plan; Widener; June 10, 2022
Cultural Resources Assessment; Drayton Archaeology; December 27, 2021
Preliminary Stormwater Site Plan; BCRA; June 2022

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.
Boundary Line Adjustment through Snohomish County
Water Availability Detailed Analysis from City of Stanwood for public water main extension

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
Type 2, Conditional Use Permit, Snohomish County
Wetland Buffer Compensatory Mitigation, Snohomish County
Engineering Design and Development Deviation Request for Driveway Entrance, Snohomish County
Stormwater Modification Request for Flow Control, Snohomish County
Typical Site Development and Building Permits, Snohomish County
Right of Way permits, City of Stanwood & Snohomish County
Septic Design Approval, Snohomish Health Department

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.
This parcel will undergo a Boundary Line Adjustment which will reallocate the 30.22 acres into two lots of roughly 4.81 acres in the northeast, this project parcel, with the remaining 25.41 acres encompassing the rest of the property.

This checklist covers the construction of two (2) secure, 16-bed facilities for in-patient civil behavioral health treatment, and a maintenance building of approximately 500 SF and their associated site improvements. The area of construction is on an existing Tulalip Tribe-owned property with other facilities on the western portion of the site. The buildings will be 1 story of approximately 15,500 SF each, constructed in accordance with IBC standards for Type V-B construction, fully sprinklered.

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

Address: 29901 & 29919 80TH AVE NW, STANWOOD WA
Parcel(s): 32041800101400 & 32041800100100
Total Parcels Site Area: 30.22 acres
Project Area: 4.81 acres

Vicinity Map



B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**1. Earth**

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____.

The site is generally flat, sloping down from both sides to a drainage swale that runs north-south through the center of the site.

- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The topography of the site is gently sloping from the west and northeast with approximately 30 feet of vertical relief across the length of the property and maximum slope inclinations on the site are less than 15%. The steepest slope in the project work area is approximately 1:12 or 8%.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.
Review of the regional geologic map titled Geologic Map of the Utsalady and Conway 7.5-minute Quadrangles, Skagit, Snohomish, and Island Counties, Washington by J.D. Dragovich, et al., 2002 indicates that the area of the subject site is underlain by Vashon lodgement till, Vashon advance outwash deposits, and glaciomarine drift. The geotech interpretation of the sediments encountered at the subject site is generally consistent with the regional map in that was encountered Vashon lodgement till, Vashon advance outwash, and pre-Olympia glaciomarine drift.

A review of regional soils mapping (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] Web Soil Survey) indicates that the subject site is underlain by Tokul gravelly medial loam. Tokul soil is commonly derived from the weathering of glacial till, which is consistent with the lodgement till observed at shallow depths in the borings.

Native soils were capped by existing fill that extended in depths of 3 feet in one test pit and 6 feet in another. This is not inconsistent with the general area designation as local commercial farmland and with this site's current use for pasturing horses. During grading, onsite soils will be supplemented with approved structural fill as may be needed to support building foundations.

See Geotechnical Engineering Report.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

There are no known surface indications or history of unstable soils. Current seismic design criteria for this project are based on the 2018 IBC. Due to the potential for liquefaction of site soils, the site should be considered Site Class C, as defined in Table 20.3-1 of American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) 7-16 Minimum Design Loads and Associated Criteria for Buildings and Other Structures.

See Geotechnical Engineering Report.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling, excavation, and grading proposal. Indicate source of fill.
Approximate cut quantity of 8,500 cy and an approximate fill quantity of 10,000 cy. Fill will consist of both native soils and import structural fill. Imported fill will be provided from an approved source.
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
The site does not qualify as an erosion hazard area as defined by SCC 30.91E.158 as the erosion hazard in areas where construction or disturbance of soils will take place is classified as "slight" by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS).
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
Existing total site coverage for both parcels is approximately 7% prior to BLA. Site coverage for the proposed reconfigure of the west/south parcel will not change and is approximately 9%. Proposed total site impervious coverage for new northeast parcel is approximately 37%.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any.
A temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) plan will be prepared and implemented during the construction phase in accordance with Snohomish County Standards. TESC measures will include a temporary construction entrance, filter fabric fence, sediment pond, temporary drainage ditches, and catch basin inlet protection.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities, if known.
Emissions during construction are anticipated as a direct result of the construction workers use of personal, company and/or subcontractor vehicles to and from the site. Once the project is complete, automobile exhaust from staff, visitors, and other vehicles, will be the main source of emissions.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
Main off-site emissions are from traffic on local roads and odors and emissions from nearby agricultural activities that are typical of commercial farmland. Common local activities would include fertilizing fields and manning farm equipment. These emissions are typical of rural agricultural-based areas and are not anticipated to affect this proposal.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any.
Dust during construction activities will be managed by the contractor

with industry standard best practices.

3. Water

a. Surface:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, salt water, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
- There are two regulated wetlands on the north and east portions of the subject property. There is an off-site stream to the southeast of the site, Douglas Creek, which is considered a Type Np stream.**

Wetland A is classified as a Category III wetland with a moderate habitat score which has a standard buffer width of 110 feet. Wetland B is a Category III wetland with a low habitat score which has a standard buffer width of 60 feet.

See Wetland Buffer Mitigation Plan prepared by Widener & Associates.

See Wetland & Fish & Wildlife Habitat Report prepared by Soundview Consultants LLC

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.
- Yes, project work will occur within 200 feet of the wetlands and will impact wetland buffers with proposed buffer averaging and enhancements.**

A 25 percent reduction in the standard buffer width is allowed due to the installation of a permanent fence along the wetland buffer and the placement of the wetland into a separate tract/easement or other protected open space per SCC 30.62A.320(1)(f). Both of these minimization measures will occur for Wetland A. Wetland B will not be placed in an easement, but a fence shall be installed. This would allow for a 15 percent reduction in the buffer width for Wetland B.

In addition to the reductions, averaging of buffer width surrounding the wetlands, by reducing the width of a portion of the buffer and increasing the width of another portion of the same buffer, is allowed. No portion of the buffer may be less than 50 percent of the standard required width and the total buffer area on the property must be equal to the area required if averaging had not occurred. An area of 13,790 square feet on the east boundary of Wetlands A and B will be reduced and replaced with additional designated buffer on the west side of Wetland B. This area is currently grazed pasture equivalent to the area being averaged. This area will be fenced from access by horses following the project completion. No additional

planting is proposed.

See Wetland Buffer Mitigation Plan.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.
Wetlands will be avoided with no proposed fill or dredging.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.
The proposed project does not anticipate surface water withdrawals or diversions.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
The subject site is not within an identified 100-year floodplain.
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
The proposed project does not involve discharges of waste materials into surface waters.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
No well is proposed as the project is working with the City of Stanwood to extend the city water main down 300th Street NW to the property to obtain public water to the site.
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any. For example: domestic sewage, industrial, containing the following chemicals... agricultural, etc. Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, and the number of houses to be served, if applicable, or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.
The proposed buildings will be served by an on-site septic system designed to provide service to both buildings and conforming to Snohomish County Health Department requirements.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
The source of runoff will be storm water runoff from building roof tops, concrete walks and asphalt pavement areas. It is

intended that stormwater runoff will be directed to bioretention treatment cells or filter strips and with amended soils to remove pollutants. After treatment, runoff from portions of the site will be detained before all runoff is dispersed and discharged to wetlands to maintain natural site hydrology.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
It is anticipated that waste material will enter ground or surface waters.
- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.
Drainage patterns will be maintained in the vicinity of the site.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.
Impacts to wetlands will be avoided and wetland buffers will be enhanced to compensate for impacts to buffers.

During the construction phase, temporary erosion control measures, ongoing maintenance, soil stabilization and other best management practices will be implemented to help reduce and control impacts from the project. Permanent measures to reduce and control runoff from the completed project will include bioretention cells, vegetated filter strips, a detention vault, stormwater dispersion facilities, catch basins and underground conveyance pipe as determined necessary to meet Snohomish County Requirements.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:
- ☒ deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other:
 - ☒ evergreen tree: fir, spruce, cedar, pine, other,
 - ☒ shrubs
 - ☒ grass
 - ☒ pasture
 - ☐ crop or grain
 - ☐ orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops
 - ☒ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other: Reed Canary grass, Slough Sedge, Douglas' Meadowsweet
 - ☐ water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
 - ☒ other types of vegetation: Himalayan Blackberry

The site is vegetated with open grassy fields and actively grazed pastures, typical of agricultural areas, containing a few scattered trees and landscaping near the developed areas of the site.

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
Grasses and pasture land within the development area will be removed for this project work.

- c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
None known.
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any.
Landscaping within parking and drive areas will be designed and installed in accordance with applicable County requirements. Wetland buffers will be enhanced with appropriate native wetland vegetation.

Tree spacing has been decreased from the 30' spacing required by code for a Type B buffer, down to 20' on center to enhance the visual screening of the property from the road. Additionally, the shrubs in the Type B buffer along the road have been selected for their mature size of approximately 10' in height, to effectively form a sight-obscuring hedge in 3-5 years.

See Wetland Buffer Impacts & Mitigation Plan and Landscape Plans.

- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.
Himalayan Blackberry is known to be on the site.

5. Animals

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other (list): **birds typical of suburban environments such as jays, crows, sparrows etc. are likely to be seen on or near site.**

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other (list): **small mammals typical of suburban environments such as rodents/squirrels, raccoons are likely to be seen on or near the site.**

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other (list): **None**

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.
None known.
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
Snohomish County is within the Pacific Flyway for migratory birds. Migrating species of geese and ducks can be found in lakes, ponds, wetlands and waterways of the area.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any.
Existing wetlands will be maintained.
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.
None known.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be

used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Electricity will be the sole source of energy on this project. It will be used for heating and cooling, lighting, appliances and equipment, hot water, fire and life safety systems, including access control, and all operational and personal forms of technology and communication devices.

Two emergency generators are provided, one for each building. Each are diesel fueled and have above grade fuel storage tanks with secondary containment. The generators are roughly sized at 450KW each. Generators will be used in emergency power outages to support the building and associated on-site lighting, septic pumps, and other electrical systems for a minimum runtime of 96 hours of full rated generator load.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.
The proposed project will not adversely affect the potential use of solar energy by the adjacent properties as they are all one-story buildings and so will not create any shade or shadows on possible structures located on adjacent properties.
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any.
Washington State Energy Code requirements will be met when designing building shell, lighting, heating, and ventilation equipment.

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.
- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.
The development area has only been used for crop or pasture in its known history, so no contaminations are believed to exist.
 - 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.
None known.
 - 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.
New buildings will likely have various chemicals for on-going use such as maintenance and cleaning, and they would be expected to be present in quantities typical to the building activities. Overall, any chemicals should be used as necessary, and any un-used or waste materials properly recycled or disposed of.

- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
None anticipated.
 - 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:
None proposed.
- b. Noise:
- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
There may be low level traffic noise impact from adjacent roads, and noise from nearby farming operations, but this would not be expected to impact this project.
 - 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (i.e., traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.
Short-term noise would result from construction activities. Long term noises associated with the proposed project will include the coming and going of vehicles as well as indoor and outdoor use of the facility by staff and clients. During potential power outages the two emergency generators will operate which will add noise at those random times for the length of the power outage. Noise levels are roughly 72 dBA at 23ft from the generator. Generators will be used in emergency power outages to support the building and associated on-site lighting, septic pumps, and other electrical systems for a runtime of 96 hours of full rated generator load.
 - 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any.
None proposed.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.
The 30+ acre site has had an ongoing use of horses and associated pastureland. With the boundary line adjustment, these uses will be supported on the remaining 25+ acre parcel. There are residences and barn structures that are used to house a group home and the on-going horse facilities that will also continue to function on the larger revised parcel. Adjacent and nearby uses consist of agricultural farm and pasturelands and single-family residences.
- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or non-forest use?

The site has been in horse pastureland for the last 30 years or more.

- 1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:
There are small farms near to the property which may affect the proposal during application of pesticides, tilling and harvesting by producing increased noise, odor and dust in the vicinity during these activities. The project will not affect nearby working farms or forest lands business operations.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

The current configuration has a northern parcel containing an unoccupied, unfurnished, 3 bedroom, 1 ¾ bath home on the northern parcel. The residence is approx 1500 sq ft. This building is sometimes used by the facility caretakers on an irregular basis. There are also general purpose buildings per the following list from the Snohomish County Assessor's info:

Garage(s), Carport(s) and major outbuilding(s)	
Detached Garage SF	660
Loft or Flat Barn SF	4950
Carport SF	360
Pole Bldg SF	720
Pole Bldg SF	7200
Pole Bldg SF	4400
Pole Bldg SF	1140

The current configuration has a southern parcel containing a residence of approximately 6800 sq ft. and associated accessory buildings. There are also general purpose buildings per the following list from the Snohomish County Assessor's info:

Garage(s), Carport(s) and major outbuilding(s)	
Attached Garage SF	1539
Pole Bldg SF	720

With the proposed BLA, these structures will all be on the secondary parcel.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?
No structures will be demolished as a part of this project.
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
R-5, Rural-5 Acre
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
LCF, Local Commercial Farmland
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
Not applicable.
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

The site has a wetland designation but no other critical area classifications.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
It is anticipated that each of the two main buildings will be staffed with approximately 35 personnel and will house up to 16 patients at any given time, for a total of approximately 70 staff and a maximum of 32 patients.

Staff work in 3 shifts including a swing shift. The day shift will be the most staffed at from 12-15 employees per building. The time when most staff are in the facilities is at the shift change. Specialty staff and visitors are scheduled for times outside of shift changes.
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
None.
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any.
None proposed.
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
The buildings are single story and designed to have sloped roofs, materials and finishes, and other design aesthetics that are in keeping with typical residential structures. Landscape buffers are proposed to give both screening and additional aesthetics to the overall site appearance. Tree spacing has been decreased from the 30' spacing required by code for a Type B buffer, down to 20' on center to enhance the visual screening of the property from the road. Additionally, the shrubs in the Type B buffer along the road have been selected for their mature size of approximately 10' in height, to effectively form a sight-obscuring hedge in 3-5 years. See *landscape plans*. Project will be designed in excess of landscaping county standards.
- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:
None proposed.

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate high, middle, or low-income housing.
None.
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
No housing units will be removed with this proposal.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.
None proposed.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?
Maximum building height to the roof peak will vary from approximately 20-29 feet above grade, due to changes in grade around the building. Materials will be fiber cement siding, standing seam metal sloped roofs, aluminum windows, and metal storefront system.
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
No proprietary or significant views will be obstructed by the proposal.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any.
Buildings will be single-story, wood framed structures with low-sloping and angled roof lines, and varying materials and colors. Project will be designed in compliance with county standards. See *Elevation Drawings included with submittal.*

11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?
Typical parking lot lighting will be directed downward with full cut-off and away from adjacent properties. Building mounted security lighting will be provided around the perimeter building and will have a lighting level of 1 foot-candle at the building perimeter with motion sensing to increase light level on demand. Light from vehicle headlights as cars navigate the parking area could occur at any time during the day or night.
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?
It is not anticipated that the glare resulting from the proposed project will create a safety hazard or interfere with views, and the project will comply with all relevant standards.
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
Existing sources of light and glare will not affect the proposal.
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any.
Light standards will be installed in locations that minimize the amount of light encroachment on to adjacent properties.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Lake Ketchum is mile to the north. Stanwood schools with playfields are within 1.5 to 2 miles to the south. Stanwood also has a couple community parks. There is a private equestrian facility on the adjacent parcel (after the boundary line adjustment is completed).

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
No recreational opportunities will be displaced.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any.
Clients and staff at the facility will have access to outdoor areas attached to the buildings. The areas that clients have access to will have 12' tall anti-climb fencing surrounding the outdoor spaces.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.
There are no buildings located on the project site. Other buildings are located on the adjacent parcel that will result in the boundary line adjustment. The house in the northwest corner of the resulting secondary parcel was constructed in 1914. It is typical of its time and not likely to be eligible for listing. No 45+ year structures in the area show up on WISAARD.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.
A Cultural Resources Assessment was conducted by Drayton Archaeology in 2021. While background review suggests the project is located in an area of high risk for encountering cultural resources (DAHP WISAARD), field investigation yielded no evidence of pre-contact or historic archaeological deposits.

According to WISAARD, four cultural resource surveys were conducted within an approximate 1.25-mile radius of the current project area. All of these projects were limited in scope, surveying 1.33-acres in total. No cultural materials were identified by any of these reviews (Boyton and Fagan 2007; Munsell 2021; Osiensky 2018; Stipe 2008). The only recorded cultural resource located within the 1.25-mile search radius is the Cedar Home Cemetery (45SN510).

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.
Drayton's determination for the presence of cultural resources within the project area was based largely upon a review of past environmental and cultural contexts, previous cultural resources studies, and sites recorded within an approximately one-mile radius of the proposed corridor. Consulted sources include a review local geologic data to better understand the depositional environment; archaeological, historic, and ethnographic records on file on Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP) Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) database; and selected published local

historic records.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

Regardless of the high probability assessment outlined by background research, field investigation yielded no evidence of pre-contact or historic archaeological deposits. As proposed, the project does not appear to have the potential to effect cultural resources and no further oversight warranted. Archaeological Reports have been uploaded to the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) website and no additional on-site measures were determined to be required.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and State Routes serving the site and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
Public streets located adjacent to the site are 300th St NW/McKean Rd which runs east-west and has access to the east to I-5 and 80th Ave NW which runs north-south and connects to the south to Stanwood. Access to and from the property will be from 300th St NW/McKean Rd.

- b. Is site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

The site is not currently serviced by public transit. The nearest bus stop is at the corner of Pioneer Hwy and 300th St NW/McKean Rd., 1 mile to the west.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The proposed facility will have approximately 60 parking stalls distributed between the two main buildings.

Staff work in 3 shifts including a swing shift. The day shift will be the most staffed at from 12-15 employees per building. The time when most staff are in the facilities is at the shift change. Specialty staff and visitors are scheduled for times outside of shift changes. This proposal has 30 parking stalls for each building.

See *Parking Assessment* provided by Heath & Associates, Inc.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

Project will comply with the Snohomish County Transportation and Circulation Ordinance which requires half-street improvements to 300th St NW.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

The proposed project does not require the use of, nor will it occur in the immediate vicinity of water, rail or air transportation systems.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed

project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Based on the derived trip generation rates, the project can be expected to generate 284 new average daily trips, 29 new AM peak hour trips (13 inbound/16 outbound) and 21 new PM peak hour trips (9 inbound/15 outbound).

Trip generation is typically derived using the Institute of Transportation Engineering Manual, Trip Generation, however; no applicable Land Use Code (LUC) in the 11th Edition manual was identified as representative for a behavioral health facility. Therefore, local trip generation data collected at five similar behavioral health facilities have been applied for trip forecasts. See *Traffic Impact Analysis*.

- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
The project will not affect movement of agricultural or forest products in this area. No impacts are expected.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.
Based on limited intersection sight distance findings, the Traffic Impact Analysis recommends restricting the driveway's outbound movements to right-turns only. Other than half street improvements, no other transportation controls are proposed. Traffic Impact Fees will be calculated and assessed upon review of the traffic study.

15. Public Services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
The project area is going from undeveloped to including two buildings. This project might expect to result in a minor increase in need for public services such as fire, police and ambulance due to the addition of development as would be expected for any development when emergencies occur.
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.
Day to day transportation of clients will be via a contracted ambulance service. Staff are trained in de-escalation techniques to handle ongoing management of clients inhouse so as to not require additional police support. No additional measures proposed.

16. Utilities

- a. Underline utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the

6/27/2022

Residential Treatment Facility North

22102230CUP

service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Electricity – Snohomish County PUD

Refuse Service – Waste Management NW

Telephone/Communication – Wave Broadband

Water service – City of Stanwood, water main extension on 300th St NW

Septic – New On-Site Septic System to service both proposed buildings

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: 

Name of signee: Christine Phillips

Position and Agency/Organization: Planner with BCRA; Agent for Owner

Date: June 20, 2022





