Environmental Review. This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is being distributed to agencies, Tribes, public service providers, organizations, adjacent property owners, and individuals who have expressed an interest in the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development (PRD) in southwest Snohomish County, Washington. The Final EIS is produced as a companion document to the Draft EIS. It contains the Summary, comments received during the Draft EIS comment period, and the County's response to comments received. The two documents together constitute the environmental review document for the proposed action. The EIS analyzes the environmental impacts of residential development of 22.34 acres within and adjacent to the Harbour Pointe Master Planned community near Mukilteo.

The EIS will be used by Snohomish County (along with other information about the proposal) during the decision making process on the application. A Preliminary Plat hearing will be scheduled, during which there will be an additional opportunity for public comment on the proposed action. Between the date of issue of the Final EIS and the date when the hearing is scheduled, comments can still be submitted to:

Ryan Countryman, Principal Planner
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046
425.388.3311, Extension 2304
ryan.countryman@snoco.org

Availability of the Final EIS. Copies of the Final EIS in printed form and CD format are available from Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS). A limited number of printed copies of the Draft EIS, Final EIS, and Technical Appendices are available for review in the PDS Records Center on the second floor, and at three libraries: Everett Main, Evergreen Branch, and Mukilteo Library. CDs of electronic files of the Draft EIS and Technical Appendices are available to interested individuals at the Snohomish County PDS offices at no cost. The EIS is also available for review on the Snohomish County PDS website:

http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/Frognal-Estates

County Actions Required. County actions required to authorize the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD include: Preliminary Plat approval, construction plan approvals, a Land Disturbing Activity Permit, right-of-way use permits, Building Permits for structural walls and vaults, vacation of unopened rights-of-way, Final Plat approval and recordation, Building Permits for homes, and occupancy permits for homes. Permits will also be required from other agencies. These are listed in the Fact Sheet that follows the Cover Memo.
The Proposed Action and Alternatives. The Proposed Action (PRD proposal) would create 112 fee-simple lots for single-family detached homes, 28-ft wide residential streets, stormwater recharge using Low Impact Development (LID) techniques (e.g., bio-retention swales and rain gardens), and 9.4 acres of landscaped common areas. Approximately 8 acres of open space would be preserved within the development, and approximately 5.1 acres of forest would remain on the site. The Multi-Family Alternative would create 112 multi-family dwelling units in 4-plex condominiums, 25-ft wide private access drive aisles, stormwater recharge by injection wells, and 3.12 acres of landscaped common areas. Approximately 16.06 acres of open space would be preserved within the development, and approximately 13.7 acres of forest would remain on the site. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no development on the property at this time, and thus no change from existing conditions.

Key Environmental Issues. The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD application was submitted to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) on August 4, 2005, and was deemed complete on the date of submittal. A SEPA Checklist signed and dated August 4, 2005 accompanied the application. Upon reviewing the proposal and SEPA checklist, PDS determined that the grading proposal had the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. PDS determined that a limited scope Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required to address the Earth element of the environment; specifically to analyze the potential impacts of moving large amounts of earth (cuts and fills) on a site with steep slopes. Following receipt of comments during the EIS Scoping period, Snohomish County PDS expanded the scope of the EIS to include the Water element; specifically, to require a downstream analysis of the potential effects of Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates stormwater runoff on Picnic Point Creek, from the site to Puget Sound.

Your interest in this proposal is appreciated by Snohomish County. If you would like more information about the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD proposal and/or the environmental review that has been conducted, please contact Ryan Countryman, Principal Planner. Additional information regarding the environmental review process and public involvement opportunities is provided in Chapter 1, Section 1.2.

Ryan Countryman, Principal Planner and
Designated SEPA Responsible Official

Date: September 10, 2015
Fact Sheet
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Brief Description of the Proposal:
The proposal would provide 112 lots for single-family homes on an assemblage of parcels totaling 22.34 acres: undeveloped parcels within Sectors 22 and 23 of Harbour Pointe (7.46 acres total), and Lots 27 and 28 of the Hillman’s Meadowdale Addition (14.88 acres). A significant amount of grading would be required to recontour the site to develop grades suitable for housing, utilities, and road construction. The proposed action includes detailed mitigation measures as incorporated plan features for the grading proposal and for erosion control. The applicant will also comply with applicable local and State regulations and site-specific permit conditions.

Purpose and Objectives:
The purpose of the project is to provide single-family home sites in a livable and sustainable community on one of the last remaining large pieces of vacant land within Snohomish County’s Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA). The objectives of the proposal include:

- Compliance with Growth Management Act (GMA) policies and density requirements within the Snohomish County Southwest UGA.
- Compliance with the Snohomish County General Policy Plan (GPP), Snohomish County Code (SCC), and Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS).
- Constructability and economic viability.
- Compatibility within the site-specific environment.
- Compatibility within the neighborhood as a whole.
- Ability of the site development plan to create a “sense of community.”

Principal Alternatives:
The PRD Proposal. The Proposed Action would create 112 fee-simple lots for single-family detached homes, 28-ft wide residential streets, stormwater recharge using Low Impact Development (LID) techniques (e.g., bio-retention swales and rain gardens), and 9.4 acres of landscaped common areas. Approximately 8 acres of open space would be preserved within the development, and approximately 5.1 acres of forest would remain on the site.

The Multi-Family Alternative. The Multi-Family Alternative would create 112 multi-family dwelling
units in 4-plex condominiums, 25-ft wide private access drive aisles, stormwater recharge by injection wells, and 3.12 acres of landscaped common areas. Approximately 16.06 acres of open space would be preserved within the development, and approximately 13.7 acres of forest would remain on the site.

**The No Action Alternative.** Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no development on the property at this time, and thus no change from existing conditions.

**Project Proponent:**
Frognal Holdings, LLC
Grosvenor Pacific Holdings, Inc.,
Controlling Member of the LLC
Integral Northwest Corporation,
Manager of Frognal Holdings, LLC
8115 Broadway, Suite 204
Everett, WA 98203

**Schedule for Implementation:**
Site development would commence as soon as the land use approval process is complete. It is estimated that construction would begin in Spring 2016, and that occupancy of homes would occur between approximately 2017 and 2019.

**Lead Agency:**
Snohomish County Planning & Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Fifth Floor, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046

**Snohomish County File No.:** 05-123050 SD

**Designated SEPA Responsible Official:**
Ryan Countryman
Designated SEPA Responsible Official
425.388.3311, Extension 2304

**Project Information Contact Person:**
Ryan Countryman, Principal Planner
425.388.3311, Extension 2304

**Permits and Approvals Required:**

**Snohomish County**
- Preliminary PRD Subdivision Approval
- Construction Plan Approvals
- Land Disturbing Activity Permit
- Right-of-Way Vacations
- Right-of-Way Use Permits
- Building Permits for structural walls and vaults
- Final Plat Approval and recordation
- Building Permits for homes
- Occupancy Permits for homes

**Washington Dept of Natural Resources**
- Forest Practices Permit for tree removal
Washington Dept of Ecology  NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit
Alderwood Water and Wastewater District  Developer Extension Agreements

**EIS Authors and Principal Contributors:**

**Vicki Morris Consulting Services**

Vicki Morris, *EIS Primary Author and Editor*

**Anthony Burgess Consulting (ABC), Inc.**

Tony Burgess, PhD, PE, RPG

*Geotechnical and Surface Water Peer Reviewer.*

Author of the following Technical Appendices:

- *Targeted Drainage Report* (September 2013),
- *Geotechnical Conditions Report* (September 2013),
- *Off Site Analysis Report* (September 2013), and
- *Groundwater Conditions Report* (September 2013), and

Author of the Earth and Water Resources Sections of Draft EIS Chapter 3 (Sections 3.1 and 3.2).

**Merle Ash, Land Technologies**

Description of the Grading Proposal and Stormwater Management Proposal

**Jim Miller, Jim Miller Planning Services**

Land Use and Development History

**Draft EIS Date of Issue:**

July 23, 2014

**Draft EIS Comment Period:**

July 23, 2014 through September 8, 2014

**Final EIS Date of Issue:**

June 25, 2015

*Note: The Final EIS is a companion to the Draft EIS. The two documents together constitute the environmental review document for the application.*

**Availability of Copies of the EIS and Technical Reports to the Public:**

Everyone on the Final EIS Distribution List (Chapter 4) was sent a Notice of Availability. A limited number of printed copies of the Draft EIS, Final EIS and Technical Appendices are available for review in the Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) Records Center on the second floor (for which the address is provided above), and at three libraries: Everett Main, Evergreen Branch, and Mukilteo Library. CDs of electronic files of the Draft EIS, Final EIS and Technical Appendices are available to interested individuals at the Snohomish County PDS office at no cost. These documents are also available for review on the Snohomish County PDS website: [http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/HorsemansTrail](http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/HorsemansTrail)
**Next Steps:**

Following issuance of the Final EIS, the County will schedule the Preliminary Plat hearing for the application. Parties of Record will receive notice of the date, time and location of the hearing. There will be an opportunity during the hearing for public comment on the proposed action.
Reader’s Guide for this Final EIS

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) attempts to strike a balance between the technical information and format required by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and readability for persons interested in the project who may be unaccustomed to this manner of organizing the document. The Reader’s Guide summarizes the content of this Final EIS, and suggests locations where information of interest can most readily be found.

The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development (PRD) proposal has a long history and a complex framework of land use controls and regulations. In order to understand this application, readers are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the land use context specifically applicable to this site. Final EIS Chapter 1 summarizes the Land Use and Development History of the Site and Proposed Action in Section 1.3. Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4, provides a more detailed description.

The Table of Contents provides a complete list of the subjects covered in the document. Lists of figures and tables can also be used to locate topics of interest.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of SEPA procedures that have been followed during EIS preparation, and describes public involvement opportunities. It briefly summarizes the land use and development history of the site, the Proposed Action, and alternatives considered. Potential impacts of implementing the project, and measures to avoid or minimize these impacts (mitigation measures) are summarized in a table near the end of Chapter 1. Readers are encouraged to review more detailed information in Draft EIS Chapters 2 and 3 on any topic summarized in Chapter 1, to gain a more complete, “in-context” understanding of the issues, Proposed Action, and applicable regulations.

Chapter 2 contains the written comments submitted to Snohomish County PDS during the Draft EIS comment period, and the County's response to these comments.

Chapter 3 is an Errata Sheet that makes minor additions to the Draft EIS.

Final EIS Chapter 4 is the Distribution List, updated with the names of organizations and individuals who submitted comments on the Draft EIS who were not previously listed in the Draft EIS Distribution List.

There are two Attachments to the Final EIS: Attachment A is a Land Technologies memorandum (May 25, 2006) that responds to Snohomish County PDS review comments on the August 4, 2005 Horseman's Trail application. This memo clarifies the development potential of Lot 1 of Regatta Estates that is included within the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates project area. Attachment B contains letters from the applicant's geotechnical consultant and the EIS Team Peer Review consultant affirming review of their investigations, calculations, and recommendations for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site in light of the Oso landslide.
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1. Summary

1.1 Purpose and Objectives of the Proposed Action

The purpose of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development (PRD) project is to provide single-family home sites in a livable and sustainable community on one of the last remaining large pieces of vacant land within Snohomish County’s Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA). This area includes the established communities of Mukilteo, Edmonds and the Harbour Pointe Master Planned Community. The site is located at the terminus of 60th Ave W and 58th Place W, within the NE ¼ of Section 32 and the NW ¼ of Section 33, Township 28N, Range 04E, WM, Snohomish County, Washington (see Figure 1.1-1).

The criteria for developing the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD are primarily based on the following objectives:

- Compliance with Growth Management Act (GMA) policies and density requirements within the Snohomish County Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA)
- Compliance with the Snohomish County General Policy Plan (GPP), Snohomish County Code (SCC), and Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS)
- Constructability and economic viability
- Compatibility within the site-specific environment
- Compatibility within the neighborhood as a whole
- Ability of the site development plan to create a “sense of community.”

The first two objectives are regulatory compliance criteria placed on any development of land within the Snohomish County UGA and the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area. The last four are the applicant’s objectives for achieving the project purpose on the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site.

1.2 SEPA Procedures and Public Involvement

The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD application was submitted to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) in August 2005. A SEPA Checklist signed and dated August 4, 2005 accompanied the application. Upon reviewing the proposal and SEPA checklist, PDS determined that the grading proposal for the Proposed Action had the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts. PDS determined that a limited-scope Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required to address the Earth element of the environment; specifically, to analyze the potential impacts of moving large amounts of earth (cuts and fills) on a site with steep slopes:

EARTH – Grading in the amount of 285,000 cubic yards of cut and fills in a steeply sloped area adjacent to existing residences.
(excerpt from Determination of Significance and request for comments on scope of EIS)

PDS issued a combined Determination of Significance (DS) and request for comments on the scope of the EIS on April 27, 2007. On May 4, the DS and scoping notice were sent by U.S. postal mail to all parties of record and to all property owners within 500 feet of the proposed site. On May 9, 2007, the County published a combined DS and EIS Scoping Notice in the Everett Herald.
The DS and scoping notice was subject to a 21-day scoping comment period and concurrent appeal period that extended 7 days beyond the scoping comment period. The scoping comment period ended May 30, 2007, and the DS appeal period ended June 6, 2007. No appeal of the DS was filed.

Letters of comment and/or e-mail messages received by Snohomish County PDS during the EIS Scoping comment period included correspondence from the City of Mukilteo, the Edmonds-Mukilteo Action Committee, the Pilchuck Audubon Society, three homeowners associations (Regatta Estates, WindandTide and Woodsound), and 252 parties and individuals. Several of the written comments requested that a complete Environmental Impact Statement (to address all elements of the environment) be required. Representative concerns identified by the City of Mukilteo, Pilchuck Audubon Society, local home owners associations, and residents in the vicinity of the project included:

- Geotechnical hazards: critical area protection
- Zoning densities
- Stormwater runoff impacts to slope stability
- Downslope effects of land use, construction, and drainage activities
- Site design adaptation in response to slope conditions encountered during construction
- Loss of habitat for numerous animals and birds, including large raptors
- Public services (including school capacity), and utilities
- Aesthetic impact to neighbors of higher density development on the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site
- Site runoff to Picnic Point Creek, in consideration of protecting salmon habitat
- Native Growth Protection Areas, clear-cutting, and designated wetland areas
- Safe walking conditions for school children in an area that lacks sidewalks
- Traffic volumes near two elementary schools: Picnic Point and Serene Lake
- Traffic volumes during rush hours on streets designed for fewer vehicles (in public opinion)
- Limited bicycle lanes and no transit facilities nearby
- Sewer system utility, given a moratorium on additional connections.

Based on review of the comments received during the EIS Scoping comment period, Snohomish County PDS expanded the scope of the EIS to include the Water element in addition to analysis of the impacts of proposed grading in the Earth element. Specifically, the EIS scope was expanded to require a downstream analysis of the potential effects of Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates stormwater runoff to Picnic Point Creek, from the site to Puget Sound (draft letter in the project file dated July 13, 2007).

Snohomish County PDS required the applicant to retain an EIS Consultant and a Peer Review geotechnical and hydrological consultant to prepare the EIS. PDS reviewed and accepted the professional qualifications of the EIS Consultant (Vicki Morris Consulting Services) and the Peer Review geotechnical/hydrological consultant (Anthony Burgess, PhD, PE, RPG; Anthony Burgess Consulting) selected from the County’s EIS Consultant Roster. The Peer Review geotechnical/hydrological consultant 1) reviewed the geotechnical work performed and reports prepared by the applicant’s original geotechnical consultant (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.); 2) evaluated the need for additional investigations and/or modeling; and 3) performed additional analysis required for the EIS, including the downstream analysis and site geotechnical and groundwater analysis. The Peer Review geotechnical/hydrological consultant (Anthony Burgess Consulting) prepared four technical reports1 and the Earth and Water sections of this Draft EIS.

---

Technical Appendix B: Geotechnical Conditions Report Horseman’s Trail PRD. September 2013b.
Technical Appendix C: Off-Site Analysis Report Horseman’s Trail PRD. September 2013c.
The Draft EIS was published with a 30-day comment period from July 23 through August 22, 2014. Notice of Availability was sent to all agencies, Tribes, and persons on the Distribution List, including the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD Parties of Record Register (Draft EIS Chapter 5). A compact disc of the Draft EIS was sent to agencies, municipal entities, utilities and service providers, Tribes and interested organizations on the Distribution List. The Notice of Availability indicated where printed copies of the Draft EIS were available for review, and provided information regarding how interested persons could obtain a compact disc of the Draft EIS electronic files.

At the request of interested individuals and neighbors, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) extended the Draft EIS comment period for an additional 17 days, to September 8, 2014. Requesting parties were notified of the extension by e-mail on August 11, 2014. Written comments submitted to the County are reproduced in Final EIS Chapter 2, accompanied by the County's response to comments. Issues that are outside the scope of the EIS (i.e., that address matters other than the Earth and Water elements of the environment) will be considered by the County and will receive a response at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application. Minor additions to the Draft EIS are provided in Final EIS Chapter 3.

The Final EIS is produced as a companion document to the Draft EIS. The Draft and Final EIS together constitute the environmental review document for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application, and will be used by Snohomish County (along with other information about the proposal) during the decision making process on the application. There will be an additional opportunity for public comment on the proposed action during the Preliminary Plat hearing.

Notice of availability of the Final EIS will be distributed to persons who commented on the Draft EIS, and to agencies, municipal entities, utilities and service providers, Tribes and interested organizations identified on the Distribution List (Final EIS Chapter 4).

1.3 Land Use and Development History of the Site and Proposed Action

The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site has a complex history of master plan criteria that define the intended use of the property, prior applications, submittals to and communications from Snohomish County Planning and Development Services related to the current application. The Land Use and Development History section of the Draft EIS (Chapter 2, Section 2.4) explains the development criteria for those portions of the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site that lie within Harbour Pointe Master Plan Sectors 22 and 23, and the portion that lies outside the Master Plan area. The summary below focuses on the residential density analysis. Other factors (open space, street network, sewer and water) are described in Draft EIS Sections 2.4.3, and 2.4.7.2 through 2.4.7.4. Interested persons are encouraged to review the more detailed description of land use and development history in Draft EIS Section 2.4, along with figures and tables in that section.

The proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD is an assemblage of three parcels. One parcel (Lot 1 of Regatta Estates) lies within Sectors 22 and 23 of the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area (see Figure 1.3-1). Two parcels of the PRD site (Lots 27 and 28 of the Hillman’s Meadowdale Addition) are located outside the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area. The portion of the site encompassing Lot 1 of Regatta Estates lies primarily within Sector 22. A small segment of Lot 1 of Regatta Estates now lies within Sector 23. The total site area within the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area is 7.46 acres (approximately one-third of the site).

---

Technical Appendix D: Groundwater Conditions Report Horseman’s Trail PRD. September 2013d.

Final EIS Figure 1.3-1 was Figure 2.4-1 in the Draft EIS. No revisions were made to this figure in the Final EIS.
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The two parcels located outside the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area are not subject to the Harbour Pointe Master Plan or Sector 22 and 23 approvals. The combined area of these two parcels is 14.88 acres (approximately two-thirds of the overall Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site).

In the late 1960s, the Winmar Company prepared the Possession Shores Master Plan for properties within the Paine Field area of southwest Snohomish County. Snohomish County completed a contract rezone in 1969 for properties covered by the Master Plan. The Master Plan was a generalized description of land uses and allowed for refinement of detail or variations in subsequent planning stages, provided that such refinements or variations were compatible with the original intent of the Master Plan and Snohomish County Code. In the early 1970s, C-W Properties, Inc. succeeded the Winmar Company as owners of the land covered by the Possession Shores Master Plan. C-W Properties proposed a revision to the Master Plan, and Snohomish County required preparation of a full Environmental Impact Statement to analyze the potential significant environmental impacts of the Master Plan. The EIS, issued June 13, 1978, covered all elements of the environment required by the SEPA Guidelines, and identified mitigation requirements for development within the Master Plan area. These are described in Draft EIS Section 2.4.

Amendments to the Possession Shores Master Plan were approved subsequent to the EIS process, and the amended Plan was renamed the Harbour Pointe Master Plan. The Master Plan was made contractually binding when the rezone was approved in Summer 1978. The zoning of land in Sectors 22 and 23 was changed at that time from Heavy Industrial, Rural Residential 12,500 and Rural Residential 20,000 to Rural Residential 8,400 (approximately 5 dwelling units/acre). The Harbour Pointe (Possession Shores) Master Plan included provisions that allowed a transfer of residential density within and between Sectors. The Master Plan stated that such density transfers could not exceed the maximum density for the total Master Plan area (5,183 dwelling units). The Plan also stated that the transfer of surplus allowable dwelling units would be subject to a maximum resulting density of 12 units per acre for the receiving area.

The Harbour Pointe (Possession Shores) Master Plan sets forth a process for review of development within each Sector of the Master Plan area, requiring preparation of a Sector Plan, preparation of Division of Development Plans, and public hearings on Sector Plans and plat approvals (described in Draft EIS Section 2.4.2). Each Sector Plan contains a general description of the type and intensity of land use, a generalized vehicular circulation system within the Sector, a generalized open space system, and a more specific description of the topographic and environmental conditions of the Sector. Portions of the proposed Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD subdivision are located within Harbour Pointe Sectors 22 and 23, and are therefore subject to the previous approvals of the Sector Plans for these Sectors.

**Sector 22:** The Snohomish County Planning Commission approved the Harbour Pointe Sector 22 sector plan on September 28, 1982 (see Figure 1.3-2). The Plan established the maximum density in this Sector of 169 dwelling units. The plan also stated that the final calculation of the maximum allowable units would be made at the preliminary plat or Division of Development stage. The County has required all residential development within Harbour Pointe to be subject to the PRD regulations in effect on the date of complete application.

---

3 The purpose of the Division of Development process is to provide descriptive text and/or maps describing the location, type, number, density and average lot size of residential uses; the location of proposed and existing open spaces and plans for open space improvements; the location of roads, access ways and right-of-way improvements; standards for road construction and slope treatment; utility systems; and proposed design controls.

4 Final EIS Figure 1.3-2 was Figure 2.4-3 in the Draft EIS. The date of Regatta Estates PRD preliminary plat approval has been corrected to 1991 in Figure 1.3-2. This correction to the Draft EIS is also noted in Final EIS Chapter 3, the Errata Sheet.
Figure 1.3-2. Harbour Pointe Sector 22 Historical Land Use Approvals
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A Division of Development was approved for Sector 22 on May 25, 1990 for the planned subdivision of Regatta Estates. The Division of Development for the Regatta Estates PRD encompassed the entire 42.8 acres that comprise Sector 22. The preliminary plat of Regatta Estates PRD was approved in 1991. Regatta Estates divided Sector 22 into 78 single-family residential lots (including Lot 1). This left a balance of 91 potential dwelling units in the 6.76-acre Lot 1 of Sector 22.

Lot 1 was not developed with the rest of Regatta Estates; it was designated for future residential development. The Division of Development for Regatta Estates indicated that a subsequent Division of Development, preliminary plat and site layout would be submitted for development of Lot 1. This lot is included in the current Proposed Action (PRD proposal) for Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates, with 30 lots proposed for this area.

**Sector 23**: In 1980, the Snohomish County Planning Commission approved the Plan for Harbour Pointe Sector 23. The approved Sector Plan called for: development of approximately 10 acres of the Sector as an elementary school; development of 0.9 acre as a PUD electrical substation; development of 2.6 acres as a neighborhood shopping center; and 2.1 acres to remain as open space.

The Sector Plan noted that the projected residential density for Sector 23 in the Harbour Pointe Sectors would be 4.5 dwelling units per net acre. The Master Plan indicated that Sector 23 had a net area of 14 acres. Based on the projected residential density of 4.5 units per net acre in the Master Plan, the 14 net acres would yield a maximum potential of 63 dwelling units. However, the approved Sector 23 Plan did not indicate any residential development within the sector.

After approval of the Sector 23 Plan, a Division of Development was approved for development of the Picnic Point Elementary School. Ultimately, development of the Picnic Point Elementary School did not utilize the entire the 9.45-acre site, and the northerly tip (0.79 acre) remains undeveloped. The Division of Development for the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD incorporates the northerly undeveloped portion of the Picnic Point Elementary School site.

No rezone was submitted for development of a 2.6-acre neighborhood shopping center. Later, a Division of Development and plat were approved to develop this area with twelve (12) single-family residential dwelling units (Regatta Highlands). Factoring out the acreage in Sector 23 for the Picnic Point Elementary School (8.66 acres) and electrical substation (0.96 acre), the remaining area for residential development based on the latest GIS data is 5.76 acres. Applying the projected density of 4.5 dwelling units per net acre, the 5.76 acres would yield a maximum potential of 26 units. Subtracting the 12 units developed within the Regatta Highlands subdivision, the dwelling units remaining and available to Sector 23 are fourteen (14) single-family dwelling units, subject to approval of a new Division of Development and PRD plan.

**Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD (Current Proposal)**: The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site includes Lot 1 of Regatta Estates reserved for future residential development (Sector 22 and a small portion of Sector 23), and Lots 27 and 28 of Hillman’s Meadowdale Addition located outside the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area. The portion of the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site within the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area (Sector 22 and a small portion of Sector 23) total 7.46 acres.

---

5 The recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs) for Regatta Estates (Shergar Land Corporation, May 29, 1996) gave purchasers of lots within Regatta Estates notice of anticipated future development of Lot 1, and established “no right of protest or objection” to future subdivision of Lot 1 by purchasers of lots within the plat of Regatta Estates. See additional information provided in Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Final EIS Chapter 3 (Errata Sheet).
Both of these Sectors are designated for “Single Family High Density Use” in the Possession Shores (Harbour Pointe) Master Plan.

The maximum potential density for the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD is governed by a combination of the current Snohomish County Planned Residential Development (PRD) code provisions contained in SCC Chapter 30.42B, the Harbour Pointe Master Plan, and approved Sector 22 and Sector 23 Plans.

The maximum number of units permitted in the portion of the site within the Harbour Pointe Master Plan is determined by the Sector 22 and 23 Sector Plans. However, the final calculation of the maximum number of units will be made at the preliminary plat or Division of Development stage in conformance with the PRD chapter of the Snohomish County Zoning Code. The remaining number of dwelling units available in Sector 23 is fourteen, and six are proposed. The remaining number of dwelling units available in Sector 22 (Lot 1) is 91, and 30 are proposed (see Table 1.3-1).6

The portion of Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates west of 60th Avenue W is outside the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area, and is solely regulated by the Snohomish County Land Use Code. For project consistency and environmental sensitivity, the proposal is to develop this area in accordance with Snohomish County PRD regulations (SCC 30.42B) as is required in the Harbour Pointe Master Plan areas (Sectors 22 and 23). The maximum number of dwelling units permitted in the portion of the PRD site outside the Master Plan area is determined by SCC 30.42B.040 (unit yield and bonus) provisions. This portion of the site is zoned R-9600 (one dwelling unit per 9,600 sf of land area), and includes 648,388 square feet. Dividing this area by the allowed zoning density yields 67.54 lots as a base calculation, with a 20 percent bonus for using the planned residential development (PRD) approach, yielding a total of 81 lots allowed. The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Proposed Action (PRD proposal) includes 76 lots in this area, outside of Sector 22 and Sector 23.

In summary, the maximum number of dwelling units allowed for the entire Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD is 81 lots west of 60th Avenue W, and 99 lots (per Sector 22 and 23 Plans) east of 60th Avenue W, for a total of 180 allowable lots. The total lots allowed based on Snohomish County Code 30.42B (PRD) calculations would be 127. The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates proposal is for 112 lots for the development of single-family detached homes.

---

6 Final EIS Table 1.3-1 was Table 2.4-1 in the Draft EIS. No revisions were made to this table in the Final EIS.
Table 1.3-1. Land use (density and open space) allowed per Possession Shores (Harbour Pointe) Master Plan and Sector Plans compared to density and open space proposed for Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development (PRD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horseman’s Trail/ Frognal Estates</th>
<th>Maximum Allowable Residential Units(^1)</th>
<th>Number of Units Proposed in PRD</th>
<th>Open Space Requirement(^2)</th>
<th>Open Space Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector 22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.67 acre</td>
<td>2.11 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.079 acre</td>
<td>0.092 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Harbour Pointe</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.977 acres</td>
<td>5.78 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.726 acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per approved Sector Plans within Harbour Pointe. (Only applies to PRD site area within Sectors 22 and 23.)

2 Per Open Space Provisions of the Possession Shores (Harbour Pointe) Master Plan (pages 29–31). (Only applies to PRD site area within Sectors 22 and 23.)
1.4 Previously Prepared Environmental Studies and Documents

A large number of site-specific technical studies have been prepared over the course of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD application, both to accompany the August 2005 submittal of the Preliminary Plat application, and to respond to subsequent Snohomish County review comments and information requests. Technical reports used as reference documents during preparation of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and other sources cited, are listed in Draft EIS Chapter 5: References.

Because a portion of the site lies within Harbour Pointe, there are also several land use, environmental review, and technical documents that pertain to Snohomish County decisions over a period of several years in the 1980s and 1990s regarding the Harbour Pointe Master Plan, and specifically regarding Sectors 22 and 23 in which a portion of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates is located. As described above in Section 1.3, the assemblage of parcels that comprise the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site includes Lot 1 of the plat of Regatta Estates. The Regatta Estates site was similar in character to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site in that the topography included steep, forested slopes proposed for residential development. Given these similarities, and the link between the two sites through portions of Lot 1 of Regatta Estates, Snohomish County conditions of approval for the Regatta Estates plat are reviewed and summarized in Draft EIS Attachment 1. This attachment also describes changes in applicable regulations between the time of Regatta Estates plat approval and the time when the Horseman's Trail/Regatta Estates application was vested in regulations in effect in August 2005.

Study of general off-site impacts of development (e.g., traffic, demand for services and capital facilities) occurs during programmatic EIS work for periodic updates to Snohomish County Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan. This includes an EIS issued in December 2005 and a forthcoming EIS expected in summer 2015. In both cases, Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates was included as a pending development. This means that Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates was combined with other anticipated development in the area for study of its contribution to overall growth and impacts to roads, services, and facilities.

1.5 Description of the Proposed Action

Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates is a proposed Planned Residential Development (PRD) of 112 single-family detached homes on 22.34 acres in unincorporated Snohomish County (see Figure 1.5-1). The site lies between the cities of Lynnwood, Edmonds, and Mukilteo, within the Snohomish County Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA). Existing land use on surrounding properties is suburban residential, with residential zoning that allows one dwelling unit per 8,400 square-foot lot east of 60th Avenue W (within the Harbour Pointe Master Plan area), and one dwelling unit per 9,600 sf-lot west of 60th Avenue W. The County’s GMA Comprehensive Plan designation requires a minimum residential density of 4 dwelling units per acre within the UGA, and allows up to 6 dwelling units per acre. The entire site is designated for Urban Low Density Residential use at 4 to 6 dwelling units per acre on the Future Land Use Map of the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan, effective July 10, 1995. To allow more efficient use of land and to provide a variety of housing types and community options, Snohomish County Code (SCC) includes residential development options that differ from standard lot-by-lot planning methods.

---

7 Figure 1.5-1 was Figure 2.5.4-1 in the Draft EIS. No revisions were made to this figure in the Final EIS.
8 As described above in Section 1.3, there is also a long-standing history of land use regulations associated approximately one-third of the site that lies within the Harbour Pointe (formerly Possession Shores) Master Plan Area.
Figure 1.5-1
Proposed
PRD Site Plan
Frognal Estates
The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD is proposed under the County’s Planned Residential Development (PRD) regulations, as codified in SCC 30.42B. Primarily, the PRD allows for smaller lot sizes than standard planning in exchange for setting aside at least 20 percent of the site as open space. The PRD approach would make most efficient use of the site, with overall less environmental impact than conventional site planning methods for residential development (as described in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.6). Further, the PRD site planning method is the only allowable choice for portions of the site regulated by the Harbour Pointe Master Plan.

**Residential Lots, Parking and Open Space Proposal.** The County’s PRD regulations would allow 81 lots in the portion zoned R-9600 (14.88 acres), and 46 lots in the portion zoned R-8400 (7.46 acres). Thus, a total of 127 residential lots could be developed on the property per Snohomish County GMA Code, provided that at least 4.467 acres are designated for open space. However, the portions of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site that lie within Harbour Pointe Sectors 22 and 23 are also subject to the density limits established by these Sector Plans (see the discussion in Draft EIS Section 1.3 above, pages 1-4 and 1-5). The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Proposed Action (PRD proposal) includes 112 lots, and 8 acres (approximately 35 percent of the site) of open space, compared to the minimum 20 percent requirement. About 60 percent of this open space will be retained in native vegetation, with the balance to be developed for active recreational use in designated community areas. Proposed lot sizes range from 7,400 square feet to 3,587 square feet. The average lot size in the Proposed Action (PRD proposal) is 4,317 square feet. All lots would border open space or community areas.

Snohomish County Code requirements for off-street parking are: two spaces per residential unit, provided in garages and/or on driveways. The PRD requirement for guest parking is one-half space per residential unit. The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Proposed Action (PRD proposal) includes four parking spaces per residential unit (two within a garage, and two on each driveway), and one guest parking space per unit in a parking lane along the street. The total number of parking spaces required is 280, compared to 392 spaces proposed.

**Terraced Development and Retaining Walls Proposal.** Site topography ranges from a low elevation of approximately 260 feet above mean sea level (MSL) to a high of approximately 460 feet above MSL. The low-end entry at 58th Place W (370 feet above MSL), to the exit at 60th Avenue W (460 feet above MSL), spans a 90-foot change in elevation. To meet GMA density goals for the Planned Residential Development on this site with significant topographical variation, the development needs to be terraced. Proposed terracing will require retaining walls with varying structural criteria (described in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2).

**Clearing and Grading Proposal.** The clearing and grading proposal is a significant feature of the proposed action. Approximately 80 percent of the site (just under 18 acres) will be logged and cleared for development. Of this total, 14 acres will be developed for roads, infrastructure and homesites, and 4 acres will consist of developed open space tracts for recreational use. Approximately 20 percent of the site (just over 4 acres) will not be cleared, to be retained in native growth. Approximately 9.4 acres of landscaping will be installed with completion of residential development on the site.

Engineering and grading plans estimate that earthwork will be approximately balanced on the site. Approximately 275,000 cubic yards of material will be redistributed on the property (cut and fill) to achieve design grades. This material is comprised of organic surface soils, a weathered subsurface layer, lodgement till, and outwash sands. Select materials that will be imported to complete the finished grading plan will include compost soil amendments, crushed rock, asphalt pavement, and concrete to construct curbs and sidewalks. The site will be segregated into three approximate areas for soil management during grading, in order to phase the clearing and grading proposal. Segmental Retaining Walls (SRW) and/or various methods of soil reinforcement will be used to enhance the structural integrity of cut and fill
slopes. Proposed earthwork methods are described and illustrated in detail in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2. A geotechnical engineer will be onsite during structural grading to closely monitor all excavation work. A geotechnical technician will be onsite every day there is earthwork activity to monitor compliance with recommendations, and to test the density of placed soils. Before grading is initiated, the geotechnical engineer will review the areas to receive fills and provide site-specific guidance that may or may not vary from the Geotechnical Report. The geotechnical engineer will prepare written confirmation that each site segment is approved for excavation before grading begins. Grading will be scheduled during the first dry weather season after development approvals are received. (Detailed lists of mitigation measures for the grading proposal are provided in Draft EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.1.)

**Stormwater Management during Construction.** A Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and implemented during the construction phase of the project. Best Management Practices may be added or deleted at any time to adjust to “real time” issues, in compliance with the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Ecology 2005, Volume 2). Measures for erosion control will be functionally in-place before earthwork is initiated on the site. The contractor will be responsible for maintenance of all erosion control facilities. To assure compliance with the SWPPP, a Certified Erosion/Sediment Control Lead (CESCL) will be hired by the owner to review and report on compliance with the conditions of the SWPPP. The requirement is for no turbid water to leave the site in exceedance of SCC 7.53 standards, and for no work to allow water quality to be compromised. The project engineer and property owner will be responsible to Snohomish County and the Washington State Department of Ecology for compliance with water quality standards during construction.

**Developed-Condition Stormwater Management Proposal.** The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD stormwater management proposal will implement Low Impact Development (LID) techniques to provide recharge to the existing groundwater system. Consistent with the stormwater management strategies of LID, the proposal is integrated with distributed, small-scale stormwater controls that will allow stormwater to more closely mimic natural hydrologic patterns. Various techniques are proposed that will retain stormwater onsite or lengthen the “time of concentration” so as to “…reduce the size of conventional [stormwater] facilities that control storm flows.”

Site design and management strategies to meet the flow control objectives of Ecology's Low Impact Development Technical Manual Section 1.4 include distributed and integrated management practices as follows:

- Manage stormwater as close to its origin as possible by utilizing small scale, distributed hydrologic controls.
- Create a hydrologically rough landscape that slows storm flows and increases time of concentration.
- Increase reliability of the stormwater management system by providing multiple or redundant LID flow control practices.
- Integrate stormwater controls into the development design.

Open bio-retention swales with compost filter berms would receive runoff adjacent to roads; yards would be backfilled with engineered soils; linear community areas would be landscaped with bio-retention swales and rain gardens; and buried detention vaults would be located at the ends of the LID components as an extra pre-caution to receive and manage any excess runoff.

A Targeted Drainage Report has been prepared for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates proposal that conceptually demonstrates how LID stormwater management techniques can be implemented to
reduce the size of conventional facilities that control stormwater flows (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013a; Draft EIS Technical Appendix A). The developed-condition stormwater management proposal is described in detail in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.5.5.1.

**Roads and Circulation.** The proposed project has two points of access that will be connected by a continuous road system through the plat. One entry will be from 58th Place W that intersects with a collector arterial to the east, Picnic Point Road. The other entry will be from 60th Avenue W, several blocks north of its intersection with the 140th Street SW, a collector arterial. A proposed private road will serve 15 lots from proposed 60th Avenue W within the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site. Streets through the development will be designed and constructed in accordance with Snohomish County Residential Street Standards, with some modifications approved by the Public Works Department. The road section will have two 10-foot wide travel lanes, an 8-foot wide parking lane, and 5-foot wide sidewalk on one side. The private road will be constructed using the same basic road section. Emergency vehicle access will be enhanced by the connectivity provided by project roads between Picnic Point Road and 60th Avenue W.

**Trails and Pedestrian Circulation.** Pedestrian circulation will be provided within the development in the form of sidewalks and paths adjacent to the parking lane along one side of the road, and a backyard community path through a community park and community gathering area. An additional 2,800 lineal feet of recreational/community paths are also proposed. These will be constructed as low impact trails through the community and around natural areas of the site.

**Landscaping and Maintenance Proposal.** About 4 acres of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD community open space will be cleared, re-graded, and landscaped. Most of the landscaping will be a component of the Low Impact Development stormwater management plan, and therefore will provide a functional benefit as well as an aesthetic value. More than 1,200 trees are proposed in the landscape design along with nearly 4,000 shrubs. Landscape screening will be provided for proposed retaining walls within the development. Not included in these numbers is private residential landscaping that would total approximately 6 additional acres.

The Homeowners’ Association (HOA) will be responsible for maintenance of community open space areas and Low Impact Development stormwater management features. Maintenance Guidelines will be provided in the Covenants, Codes & Restrictions (CC&Rs) of the development, and in a Homeowner’s Handout. The HOA will be required to hire the services of a professional landscape maintenance company educated in the maintenance requirements of the Low Impact Development stormwater management features. Project approvals will include providing a drainage access easement to Snohomish County for the County to assure that the HOA maintains the drainage facilities, and that the cost of repair or replacement of any drainage facilities is the responsibility of the HOA.

**Water Supply and Distribution.** Alderwood Water and Wastewater District is the water supply purveyor within the project area. There are two existing 8-inch ductile iron pipe stubs extended to the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates property line. The District has confirmed to the applicant that capacity is available to serve the proposed development.

**Sewage Collection, Treatment, and Disposal.** Alderwood Water and Wastewater District is also the purveyor of the wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal system within the project area. A sewer conveyance line crosses through the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site to Regatta Estates and Picnic Point Road on the 60th Avenue W alignment in an unopened right-of-way, with an easement to the Water and Wastewater District. The property also has access to the sewer main on Picnic Point Road via a recorded road and utility easement west of 61st Avenue W and Picnic Point Road. This road alignment is mapped as Richards Road.
Certificates of Water and Sewer availability were issued by the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District (AWWD) in August 2005. The certificates are valid for a one-year period, and have been renewed as the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates project time-frame has been extended.

The new Picnic Point Wastewater Treatment Plant serves the northwestern portion of the district and has the capacity to treat 6.9 million gallons per day (mgd) of wet weather flows. Completion of this treatment plant resulted in lifting a moratorium on sewer hookups in the Picnic Point area effective April 4, 2011.

1.6 Description of Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Multi-Family Alternative

The Multi-Family Alternative is evaluated in this Draft EIS as a reasonable alternative that would meet most of the objectives of the proposal but at a lower environmental cost, in accordance with WAC 197-11-440(5)(b).9 The Multi-Family Alternative site plan consists of 112 condominium units in 28 buildings with small individual yards (see Figure 1.6-1).10 The buildings would be three and four stories (50 to 60 feet) in height, with parking garages on the lower level providing eight underground parking spaces per building. The open space concept includes undisturbed common areas totaling approximately 579,600 square feet; 87,674 square feet of lawn and landscaping; and 32,460 square feet of restored open space, for a total open space system of approximately 699,814 square feet (16.06 acres).

Road circulation and emergency access shown on the Multi-Family Alternative site plan (Figure 2.7-1) was not totally resolved for compliance with Snohomish County standards. The site plan includes a single 25-foot wide, 1,800-foot long access road from an extension of 58th Place W, through the developed plat of Regatta Estates, terminating as a dead-end street that would extend to the west portion of the project. This access road would not provide a connection to 60th Avenue W.

Implementation of the Multi-Family Alternative would have less significant clearing requirements than the Proposed Action (PRD proposal), reduced grading quantities, less impervious area, and drainage discharges equipped with innovative stormwater management (SWM) measures. However, the Multi-Family Alternative is less consistent with the objectives of the Proposed Action in that the market for 4-plex units is not currently as viable as the market for single-family detached homes such as those proposed in the PRD (preferred alternative). Also, while the Multi-Family plan would provide substantial elements and amenities for developing a “sense of community,” the 4-plex units may be considered less compatible than the Proposed Action (PRD proposal) with single-family detached homes in the surrounding neighborhood.

---

9 On April 9, 2009, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) issued a Code interpretation pursuant to Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.83.010 advising that “… under Chapter 30.63C SCC, the director of PDS may modify the bulk and PRD regulations in chapters 30.23 and 30.42B SCC in order to allow the use of low impact development to meet the requirements of Chapter 30.63A SCC when a proposal meets the LID modification criteria in SCC 30.63C.040(2). The proposed reasonable alternative is a fourplex PRD design using LID techniques and best management practices. This makes it a plausible reasonable alternate to be studied in the Horseman’s Trail EIS under the provisions of Chapter 30.63A SCC.”

10 Final EIS Figure 1.6-1 was Figure 2.7-1 in the Draft EIS. No revisions were made to this figure in the Final EIS.
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Figure 1.6-1
Multi-Family Alternative
Frogna Estates
No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no development on the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site at this time. Existing County zoning and Harbour Pointe Master Plan land use regulations that apply to portions of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site specify that the property shall be developed for residential use. Therefore, it can be anticipated that there would likely be a future application for site development, as this assemblage of parcels is one of the last remaining areas of vacant land for residential development that could be used to partially serve the Snohomish County population and housing growth projections for the current 20-year planning period. It is assumed for the purpose of environmental review that the property would temporarily remain undeveloped with the No Action Alternative.

Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Further Evaluation

Numerous alternative site planning options were considered for the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site prior to the applicant selecting the Proposed Action (PRD proposal) as the preferred development proposal. These included Traditional Lot-by-Lot Development: 8,400 and 9,600 square foot lots; Lot Size Averaging (LSA) per Snohomish County Code (SCC) 30.23.210; and Multi-Family development concept within the Reduced Drainage Discharge Demonstration Program (RDDDP) per SCC 30.34B. The Lot-by-Lot method was originally given considerable effort prior to adoption of the Growth Management Act, but never could be made to work overall on the site due to significant topographical variation. The cost of Traditional Lot-by-Lot Development and the impacts of site development in this manner would be similar to the proposal, though it would provide considerably fewer home sites. For these reasons, these two alternatives were eliminated from further evaluation, as described in Draft EIS Section 2.6.

1.7 Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The full text of the Affected Environment, Potential Impacts, and Mitigation Measures for the proposed action and alternatives is presented in Draft EIS Chapter 3. A summary matrix of potential impacts and mitigation measures is provided in Table 1.7-1, following. Summary statements of project impacts in the table are presented in the absence of the context of existing environmental conditions (the Affected Environment discussions in Draft EIS Chapter 3). For these reasons, readers are encouraged to review the more comprehensive discussion of issues of interest in the Draft EIS to develop the most accurate understanding of impacts associated with the proposed action and alternatives.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Guidelines require a summary of the proposal, impacts, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated (WAC 197-11-440[4]), and a comparison of the environmental impacts of the alternatives No Action (WAC 197-11-440[5][e][vi]). These summaries are customarily prepared in the form of a table or matrix in Draft EIS Chapters 1 and 2, respectively. In this Environmental Impact Statement, the two summaries are combined in Table 1.7-1.\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) Table 1.7-1 is the same in the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Draft EIS and Final EIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH: Topography</strong></td>
<td>Recontouring approximately 17.2 acres of the site would be required in order to develop grades suitable for housing, utilities, and road construction.</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Snohomish County will require a site excavation plan and Land Disturbing Activity Permit that will impose conditions to minimize or avoid potential adverse impacts associated with earthwork.</td>
<td>Approximately 8.6 acres of the site would be recontoured to develop grades suitable for housing, utilities, and road construction within the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>There would be no clearing, grading, or alteration of the existing topography of the site with the No Action Alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading would involve excavation in the central and southern areas of the site to provide fill for the east and west ravines.</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: • To the extent practicable, cut and fill volumes would be balanced on-site; i.e., excavated material would be redistributed and used for fill. • The proposal to balance cut and fill volumes on the site (to the extent practicable) would minimize the need for sand and gravel resources to be imported from off-site areas, thereby having the secondary beneficial effect of minimizing truck transportation impacts and mineral extraction from other sites.</td>
<td>Grading would involve excavation in the central and southern areas of the site, though more of the existing topography would be retained than with the Proposed Action. Approximately 39,000 cubic yards of fill would occur on site. It would be necessary to haul approximately 36,000 cubic yards (2,160 truck and trailer loads) of excavated material off-site for disposal or reuse elsewhere.</td>
<td>Off-site areas identified to receive excess grading materials from the site would be subject to separate permit requirements and conditions that would minimize the impacts of transporting and placing material from the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site.</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant volumes of fill material would be placed in the east and west ravines in a combination of cut and fill walls parallel to the slope to implement the Proposed Action (see Figure 3.1-2 in Draft EIS Section 3.1).</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Placement of fill would be regulated by the Snohomish County Land Disturbing Activity Permit required for the project, and by proposed stormwater management measures (described below).</td>
<td>There would be no filling near the head of the west ravine to implement the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the site would be graded to step down from the south to the north in a series of terraces to implement the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: • During final design, global stability analyses will be included to demonstrate that retaining systems and fill prisms are stable. • All slopes that will not be retained will be constructed as engineered cut or fill slopes that do not exceed 2H:1V. • These slopes will be protected by erosion control measures until vegetation growth has been re-established. • Slopes that will not be graded to a new configuration will be designated as native growth Protection Areas (NGPAs). • Steep slopes would be recontoured by grading and terracing. Soil retaining structures may include rockeries, block walls, soil nail walls, mechanically-stabilized earth walls, and/or soldier pile walls. Representative examples are described and illustrated in Draft EIS Section 2.5.2. Retaining wall construction techniques and wall types will be specified at the time of construction.</td>
<td>There are no retaining walls in the concept drawing for the Multi-Family Alternative. Some retaining walls might be added if this concept were taken to final design, but they would be less extensive than with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no permit application to alter the site, and thus no change from existing conditions and no mechanism for requiring mitigation measures.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Action</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Multi-Family Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>No Action Alternative</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final design and construction plan preparation, prior to submittal of the Land Disturbing Activity Permit application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All proposed retaining wall systems shall be properly designed and analyzed by the project Geotechnical Engineer to confirm that adjacent slopes and off-site properties would not be impacted by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It would be necessary to import limited quantities of construction material (e.g., drain rock and compost for soil amendment) to develop the site as proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicable Regulations: Off-site construction material sources would be subject to their own permit requirements and conditions that would minimize the impacts of extracting, processing, loading, and transporting material from these locations to the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site. Reusable soil materials (e.g., topsoil) will be stockpiled on-site for redistribution following site grading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Grading for the construction of roads, building lots and utilities would result in unavoidable alterations to the existing topography of the site. However, steep slopes would be stabilized with retaining structures and various soil reinforcement methods; therefore, topographical impacts with either the Proposed Action or Multi-Family Alternative would not necessarily be significant or adverse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the topography of the site as a result of the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earth: Geology and Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 275,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required to implement the Proposed Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Regulations: Snohomish County will require submission of a site excavation plan and compliance with the conditions of a Land Disturbing Activity Permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Proposed Action includes balancing excavation and fill volumes on the site to the extent practicable. These activities would constitute a change from existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Regulations: Same as above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Disturbing Activity Permit conditions will include dust control measures and limits on the hours of earthwork activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling work hours will minimize noise impacts in the surrounding area during this phase of site work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction activities would be required to comply with Washington Department of Ecology fugitive dust and odor emissions regulations cited in WAC 173-400-640.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fill will be placed as compacted structural fill under the direction of the project Geotechnical Engineer to provide the necessary strength properties for foundations and slope stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A licensed geotechnical engineer will be on-site (or on-call 24 hours/day) during grading and site construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The installation of utilities in excavations would require temporary cuts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Regulations: Excavations for the installation of utilities during construction would be stabilized by using temporary measures such as a trench boxes or sheet piles, or by laying back cut slopes in accordance with good practice and as required by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The need to haul an estimated 36,000 cy (64,800 tons) of excavated material off the site to implement the Multi-Family Alternative would result in approximately 2,160 off-site truck trips that would generate noise and emissions along the haul route(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicable Regulations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction activities would be required to comply with Washington Department of Ecology fugitive dust and odor emissions regulations cited in WAC 173-400-640.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fill will be placed as compacted structural fill under the direction of the project Geotechnical Engineer to provide the necessary strength properties for foundations and slope stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A licensed geotechnical engineer will be on-site (or on-call 24 hours/day) during grading and site construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicable Regulations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction activities would be required to comply with Washington Department of Ecology fugitive dust and odor emissions regulations cited in WAC 173-400-640.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fill will be placed as compacted structural fill under the direction of the project Geotechnical Engineer to provide the necessary strength properties for foundations and slope stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A licensed geotechnical engineer will be on-site (or on-call 24 hours/day) during grading and site construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicable Regulations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction activities would be required to comply with Washington Department of Ecology fugitive dust and odor emissions regulations cited in WAC 173-400-640.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fill will be placed as compacted structural fill under the direction of the project Geotechnical Engineer to provide the necessary strength properties for foundations and slope stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A licensed geotechnical engineer will be on-site (or on-call 24 hours/day) during grading and site construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Potential Impacts

**PROPOSED ACTION**

- A limited area of the north slope above an off-site wetland meets the criteria for definition as a "landslide hazard area" under the Snohomish County Critical Areas Regulations (SCC 30.62B.340). This area would remain undisturbed within a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) in accordance with SCC 30.62.075.

**MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE**

- Similar to the Proposed Action, although more of the existing topography would be retained with the Multi-Family Alternative.

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

- The north slope "landslide hazard area" would remain undisturbed with the No Action Alternative, though without the protection of a designated NGPA.

### Mitigation Measures

**PROPOSED ACTION**

- Topsoil and surface organic material would remain in place and undisturbed on the site under the No Action Alternative.

**MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE**

- Topsoil and surface organic material would remain in place and undisturbed on the site under the No Action Alternative.

**NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

- Topsoil and surface organic material would remain in place and undisturbed on the site under the No Action Alternative.

### APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:

- SCC 30.62B.340(2)(b) defines minimum setbacks from the top of slopes as the greater of one-third the height of the slope or 50 feet. The Snohomish County Planning and Development Services Director can approve reduced building setbacks from the steep slope hazard area subject to the conditions of SCC 30.62.200(2)(c) if a site-specific Geotechnical Report demonstrates that alternative setbacks would provide protection greater than or equal to that required by SCC 30.62.210(2).

### INCORPORATED FEATURES:

- Similar to the Proposed Action, although stripping would occur over a less extensive area due to approximately one-half the amount of site alteration required to implement the Multi-Family Alternative.

### APPROPRIATE REGULATIONS:

- Where necessary to improve infiltration characteristics, native and fill soils may be amended with organic material to improve infiltration rates, or to improve drainage.

### APPLICATIONS:

- Where necessary to improve infiltration characteristics, native and fill soils may be amended with organic material to improve infiltration rates, or to improve drainage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Soil’s with a significant fines fraction, such as till, will likely be moisture-sensitive and therefore may be difficult to operate on or adequately compact during wet weather. | Provided through lower permeability soils to the underlying permeable advance outwash.  
- Infiltration facilities will be located away from steep slopes.  
- Surface drainage will be controlled and directed away from slopes to minimize slope saturation that could lead to erosion or instability.  
- All surface and roof water shall be properly discharged and not allowed to flow over slopes or near slope crests, and shall not be allowed to enter a retaining structure drain system. | Similar to the Proposed Action, though over a less extensive area due to the reduced clearing and grading requirements of the Multi-Family Alternative. | Same as with the Proposed Action. | There would be no construction activity on the site with the No Action Alternative, and thus no disturbance of moisture-sensitive soils. |

**Incorporated Plan Features:**  
Impacts associated with moisture-sensitive soils during construction could be mitigated by undertaking earthwork in these areas during dry weather (April 1 to September 30, whenever practicable).  

**Soils with a significant fines fraction:**  
- Soils with a significant fines fraction, such as till, will likely be moisture-sensitive and therefore may be difficult to operate on or adequately compact during wet weather.  

**Incorporated Plan Features:**  
- During final design, global stability analyses will be performed to demonstrate that retaining systems and fill prisms are stable.  
- All slopes that will not be retained will be constructed as engineered cut or fill slopes that do not exceed 2H:1V. In addition, these slopes will be protected by erosion control measures until vegetation growth has been re-established.  
- Slopes that will not be graded to a new configuration will be preserved in designated Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPAs).  
- Design of foundations, slopes and retaining structures will take into account the effects of seismic loading. Additional geotechnical analysis will be performed prior to issuance of the Snohomish County Land Disturbing Activity Permit.  

**Applicable Regulations:**  
- Snohomish County Critical Areas Regulations and the International Building Code (IBC) require a factor of safety for landslide occurrences. Stability analyses along representative cross-sections of the Horseman’s Trail Frognal Estates site meet code requirements, as described in the Geotechnical Conditions Report (Anthony Burgess Consulting September 2013b).  

**Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:** Site development would consume natural resources such as sand and gravel. This impact would occur whenever within the County that provisions are made for new residential development to accommodate projected growth and achieve the County’s GMA residential density goals. | There would be no improvements designed for the site that would require seismic loading design considerations. | There would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the geology and soils of the site with the No Action Alternative. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTH: Erosion</strong></td>
<td><strong>EARTH: Erosion</strong></td>
<td><strong>EARTH: Erosion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of native vegetation coupled with site runoff during construction could potentially cause erosion and transport of sediment, particularly if there was unanticipated suspension of grading for an extended period of time.</td>
<td>Incorporated Plan Features: The applicant proposes to comply with the following specific erosion/sedimentation control measures recommended by the project Geotechnical Engineer (AESI, April 25, 2012) and approved by the Peer Review geotechnical consultant (Anthony Burgess Consulting, May 20, 2013). These measures are in addition to, or refinements of, complying with applicable requirements of the Ecology 2005 SWMMWW, NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit, and Snohomish County Code (described below).</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action. Though potential impacts should be less in proportion to the lesser amount of clearing and vegetation removal required to implement the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) Plan will be prepared and approved prior to the start of construction.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action. The Multi-Family Alternative stormwater management concept is described in Draft EIS Section 2.7.5.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action. The Multi-Family Alternative stormwater management concept is described in Draft EIS Section 2.7.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The owner and design team shall include adequate groundcover measures, access roads, and staging areas in the project bid to give the selected contractor a workable site under winter conditions (October 1 through March 31). The selected contractor shall be prepared to implement and maintain the required measures to reduce the amount of exposed ground. A site maintenance plan will be in place in the event that stormwater turbidity measures exceed Ecology standards, and to comply with the Snohomish County Pollution Control Code (SCC 7.53).</td>
<td>There would be no vegetation removal or grading of the site with the No Action Alternative, and therefore no change in erosion potential compared to existing conditions.</td>
<td>There would be no vegetation removal or grading of the site with the No Action Alternative, and therefore no change in erosion potential compared to existing conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All TESC measures for a given area to be graded or otherwise worked shall be installed prior to any activity within that area. The sequence of construction within a given area shall be to install sediment traps and/or ponds and establish perimeter flow control prior to the start of mass grading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• During the wetter months of the year (October through March), or when large storm events are predicted during summer months, each work area shall be stabilized so that if showers occur, the work area can receive rainfall without excessive erosion or sediment transport. During the winter months, areas that are to be left unworked for more than 2 (two) days shall be mulched or covered with plastic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Polycrylamide could be applied to bare soil to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horseman’s Trail/Frogmal Estates FEIS
Chapter 1, Summary: June 2015
## Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures

### Proposed Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce erosion and control sediment. If necessary, approved additives could also be used to enhance settlement of suspended sediments in temporary erosion/sedimentation control ponds during construction.</td>
<td><strong>•</strong> All disturbed areas shall be revegetated as soon as practicable. If site work is performed outside of the growing season, disturbed areas shall be covered with mulch, as recommended in the Erosion Control Plan. Straw mulch provides the most cost-effective cover measure and can be made wind-resistant with the application of a tackifier after it is placed. <strong>•</strong> Surface runoff and discharge shall be controlled during and following site development. Under no circumstances shall concentrated discharges be allowed to flow over significant slopes. <strong>•</strong> Soils that are to be reused around the site shall be stored in such a manner as to reduce erosion from the stockpile. Protective measures may include, but are not limited to, covering with plastic sheeting, the use of low stockpiles in flat areas, or the use of straw bales/silt fences around pile perimeters. These measures shall be required during the period between October 1 and March 31. <strong>•</strong> On-site erosion control inspections and turbidity monitoring shall be performed in accordance with Ecology requirements. Weekly and monthly reporting to Ecology shall be performed on a regularly-scheduled basis. TESC monitoring shall be part of weekly construction team meetings. <strong>•</strong> Temporary and permanent erosion control and drainage measures shall be adjusted and maintained, as necessary, at the time of construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multi-Family Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less extensive due to the reduced clearing and grading requirements of the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td><strong>Same as above.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same as above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applicable Regulations

- The stormwater management proposal for the site would comply with the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (SWMWW) (2005). Proper installation and maintenance of these facilities would minimize or avoid potential adverse impacts associated with erosion/sedimentation during construction.

- Construction contractor(s) would be responsible for routine inspection and proper maintenance of stormwater management facilities and Best Management Practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BMPs) during site development. Representative BMPs to be implemented are listed in Draft EIS Section 3.1.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Certified Erosion &amp; Sedimentation Control Lead (CESCL) will be on-site (or on-call 24 hours/day) during grading and site construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Geotechnical Engineer will be required to be on-site to monitor the placement of fill in ravines and placement of any temporary ponds in fill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The construction contractor would be required to obtain and comply with the conditions of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Stormwater Permit from the Washington Department of Ecology: maintain the site log book, record implementation of the SWPPP and other permit requirements, record installation and maintenance of BMPs, record site inspections to be conducted by the (CESCL), comply with and record the results of stormwater quality monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The construction contractor would be required to prepare and implement a construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with Snohomish County Rule 3044. Representative Best Management Practices are listed in Draft EIS Section 3.1.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable Regulations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proper installation and maintenance of developed-condition stormwater management facilities, as required by the Ecology 2005 SWMWW, would minimize or avoid potential adverse impacts associated with erosion/sedimentation in the completed condition of the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintenance of the developed-condition stormwater management system will be the responsibility of the Homeowners’ Association (per SCC 30.63A.350). County code includes the additional assurance that the County may cause required maintenance to be done at the sole expense of the owner in the event that this intervention should ever be needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar to the Proposed Action.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater from the northern portion of the site will be infiltrated on the developed portion of the property to the greatest extent possible. Any runoff that may not be possible to infiltrate will be conveyed to a detention facility or infiltration basin</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, stormwater would be infiltrated on-site to the greatest extent possible. Any runoff that may not be possible to infiltrate would be conveyed to a detention system with a piped discharge. There would be less development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incorporated Plan Features:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If during final engineering design and construction plan review the Geotechnical Analysis determines that the risk of erosion cannot be adequately managed in the proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates FEIS
Chapter 1, Summary: June 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td>at the west end of the project. Any discharge from a detention facility will be directed down the invert of the west ravine in a series of check dams that will provide a series of infiltration beds designed to further infiltrate runoff (see Figure 2.5.5-2 in Draft EIS Chapter 2). This series of infiltration beds will be designed with a series of check dams to avoid erosive flows, and will be lined with Permanent Turf Reinforcement fabric (or comparable). At the end of the stormwater management train, a level spreader is proposed at the toe of the ravine just above the offsite wetland. If the flow from the level spreader at the bottom of the valley were to become concentrated before reaching the wetland, rather than sheet flow, there would be a potential for erosion to occur.</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>in the southeast portion of the site with the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td>Check dams proposed in the West Basin stormwater management system would be installed by hand or with minimally invasive equipment to protect existing vegetation.</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Clearing to implement the Multi-Family Alternative would result in removal of approximately 215 existing trees and retention of approximately 340 existing trees on the property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES:**
- The Proposed Action (PRD proposal) includes retaining significant trees and existing vegetation in designated Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPAs), and replanting the developed portion of the property with at least 1,204 evergreen and deciduous trees as indicated on Horseman's Trail PRD Preliminary Plat Landscape Plans (Sheets L1 through L9) dated December 4, 2006.

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**
- The Proposed Action will comply with the Snohomish County tree retention requirements in effect at the time this application was vested (August 2005): SCC Section 30.42B.130, or provide at least 477 new evergreen conifer and 727 new deciduous trees (1,204 trees total) within the developed portion of the subject property as indicated on the Horseman's Trail Preliminary Plat Landscape Plans (Sheets L1 through L9) dated December 4, 2006.
- Each new conifer tree shall be at least 6 feet tall at the time of planting, and each new deciduous tree shall be at least 6 feet tall or of 1⅜-inch caliper at the time of planting, as indicated on the Preliminary Plat Landscape Plans.
- No existing significant tree as defined by SCC Section 30.91S.320 in effect in August 2005 shall be removed from within any NGPA or perimeter open space tracts designated on the Horseman's Trail PRD Preliminary Plat drawings.
- No individual significant tree to be retained within the development, as indicated on the Horseman's Trail PRD Preliminary Plat plans.
### Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

With proper implementation of Best Management Practices – all as required by applicable regulations administered by Snohomish County and the Washington Department of Ecology – no significant unavoidable adverse impacts in the form of erosion/sedimentation would be expected to occur during construction or in the completed and occupied condition of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates development under either the Proposed Action or the Multi-Family Alternative. Some native trees may be lost under either alternative due to removal of surrounding trees and wind-throw, especially in narrow open space tracts such as Tract 999 along the west and south edges of the site. There would be no significant unavoidable adverse erosion impacts on the site as a result of the No Action Alternative.

### Potential Impacts

#### Proposed Action

- **Surface Water**:
  - Implementation of Best Management Practices – all as required by applicable regulations administered by Snohomish County and the Washington Department of Ecology – no significant unavoidable adverse impacts in the form of erosion/sedimentation would be expected to occur during construction or in the completed and occupied condition of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates development under either the Proposed Action or the Multi-Family Alternative.
  - Some native trees may be lost under either alternative due to removal of surrounding trees and wind-throw, especially in narrow open space tracts such as Tract 999 along the west and south edges of the site.

- **General Mitigation Measures**:
  - All NGPAs, perimeter open space tracts, and any individual significant tree to be retained as indicated on the Horseman’s Trail PRD Preliminary Plat drawings dated December 4, 2006 shall be protected as follows:
    - a) Tree protective fencing shall be installed along the outer edge of the drip line surrounding the significant trees in order to protect the trees during any land disturbance activities. Fencing shall not be moved to facilitate grading or other construction activity within the protected area.
    - b) Tree protective fencing shall be a minimum height of 3 feet, visible and of durable construction (e.g., orange polyethylene laminar fencing).
    - c) “Tree Protection Area” signs must be posted on the fencing.

- **Incorporated Plan Features**:
  - The stormwater management proposal includes the use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques that would minimize the impact of stormwater generated from the developed condition of the site: bio-retention/infiltration swales, rain gardens, infiltration vaults, and compost-amended soils.
  - The meandering stream channel in the cascading pool feature between 60th Avenue W and 58th Place W will be lined for erosion control. Roads would be constructed as “shed sections” to direct sheet flow runoff to bio-retention/infiltration swales parallel to the road alignment. Additional LID technologies are described in Draft EIS Section 3.2.1. Detailed drainage modeling will be provided during final design to analyze surface and subsurface water flow characteristics.
  - The stormwater management proposal would include rain-gardens and bio-treatment cells in landscape areas to provide water quality treatment of stormwater prior to discharge to subsurface wells.

#### Multi-Family Alternative

- **Surface Water**:
  - Similar to the Proposed Action, though with less overall site alteration due to the reduced clearing and grading requirements (approximately 8.6 acres). The injection well concept for stormwater management in the Multi-Family Alternative was not fully developed or analyzed. The concept was that a vertical structure (i.e., a “well”) would convey water down to a more permeable layer since site grading would not extend to a depth that would expose the underlying outwash sands.
  - As a practical matter, stormwater would be managed in a similar manner to the Proposed Action (i.e., by infiltration), particularly in the western portion of the site and associated with access roads.
  - The Multi-Family Alternative developed-condition stormwater management proposal would include rain-gardens and bio-treatment cells in landscape areas to provide water quality treatment of stormwater prior to discharge to subsurface wells.

#### No Action Alternative

- **Surface Water**:
  - There would be no change to existing conditions of evapotranspiration, infiltration or surface water runoff from the site with the No Action Alternative.

---

13 Requests for modifications to Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) have been approved for these roadways as permitted within Planned Residential Developments as part of the PRD application and Division of Development submittal (SCC 30.42B.140).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosion potential would increase on the site during the clearing and grading phase.</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Similar to the Proposed Action, though with less overall site alteration due to the reduced clearing and grading requirements (approximately 8.6 acres) to implement the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>There would be no site clearing or grading with the No Action Alternative, and thus no change in erosion potential from existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the proposed West Basin stormwater management system (Draft EIS Figure 2.5.5-2) would have the potential to convey turbidity to the off-site wetland if not properly managed.</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: Placement of the proposed drainage blanket and pipe to carry upstream flow through the west ravine fill will be undertaken when there is no flow in the ravine. Since the only observation of &quot;flow&quot; in the west ravine occurred after a heavy rain on snow event in December 2007, there are unlikely to be weather constraints to performing this work.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less impervious surface area would be introduced and more forest vegetation would remain with the Multi-Family Alternative: Approximately 3.44 acres of total impervious surface area would be introduced in the form of roads, parking areas, and roof tops. Approximately 13.72 acres of forest would remain on the site with the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less impervious surface area would be introduced and more forest vegetation would remain with the Multi-Family Alternative: Approximately 3.12 acres of landscaping would be provided with the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be no alteration of the existing forested area of the site, and no landscaping would be introduced with the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion of the site from its present forested condition to a residential development would increase the rate and volume of surface water runoff to be managed in an on-site stormwater management system:</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: Reduction in peak flows leaving the site may be achieved by routing stormwater flows through retention ponds or vaults. Facilities and methods to be used in the on-site stormwater management system will be confirmed during final design.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less impervious surface area would be introduced and more forest vegetation would remain with the Multi-Family Alternative: Approximately 3.44 acres of total impervious surface area would be introduced in the form of roads, parking areas, and roof tops. Approximately 13.72 acres of forest would remain on the site with the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less impervious surface area would be introduced and more forest vegetation would remain with the Multi-Family Alternative:</td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be no alteration of the existing forested area of the site, and no landscaping would be introduced with the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stormwater infiltration proposal would increase groundwater recharge beneath the site, and thus would also increase shallow groundwater levels both on and off-site. The increase in shallow groundwater recharge would result in a slight increase in the volume of groundwater discharging to Picnic Point Creek, on the order of less than 1.0 percent (Anthony Burgess Consulting, September 2013c; Draft EIS Technical Appendix C). The magnitude of increase would decline with distance from the recharge location.</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Compliance with the Ecology 2005 SWMMWW will require the site stormwater discharge to Picnic Point Creek to match developed discharge durations to pre-developed durations for the range of pre-developed discharge rates from 50 percent of the 2-year peak flow up to the full 5-year peak flow.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less due to approximately 50% less stormwater runoff generated by the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action, though less due to approximately 50% less stormwater runoff generated by the Multi-Family Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There would be no alteration in the existing condition of stormwater infiltration on the site with the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The drainage system for the developed site would primarily use LID techniques to provide infiltration to the fullest extent possible. The LID infiltration</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: Any off-site discharge would be designed and implemented in accordance with applicable</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>There would be no new stormwater management system components constructed on the site with the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ACTION</td>
<td>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Potential Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features have a linear component so that if the capacity of the site and system to infiltrate is exceeded, the overflow would enter piped conveyance to a stormwater detention system. In the western portion of the site, the detained discharge would be directed into the western ravine above the off-site wetland near the northwest corner of the property. The western ravine has highly infiltrative outwash soils and is expected to infiltrate the detained discharge before it reaches the property line. Infiltrated waters would become groundwater that would partially feed the offsite wetland. Detained discharges to the wetland would lag precipitation and infiltration events. The overall effect would be to increase flows to the wetland throughout the year, with no significant change in the water depth or hydrology of the wetland.</td>
<td>Snohomish County and Washington Department of Ecology regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited filling near the head of the west ravine (parallel to the slope; see Draft EIS Figure 3.1-2) would have no impact on groundwater flow entering from the off-site area to the south. Field observations indicate that surface water that enters the site from the south under unusual conditions such as the December 2007 heavy rain on snow event occurs in an indistinct course and disappears about 100 feet north of the site property line (Anthony Burgess Consulting 2013a; Draft EIS Technical Appendix A).</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: The infrequent occurrence and small quantity of surface water that enters the site from the south would be controlled by a drainage blanket beneath the fill from which it would infiltrate into the underlying outwash sands or discharge from the downstream limit of the blanket into the west ravine. This flow would subsequently discharge to the offsite wetland either as groundwater or surface water. No water quantity impact to the wetland is anticipated.</td>
<td>There would be no filling near the head of the west ravine to implement the Multi-Family Alternative. Fill would, however, be placed in the east ravine for road construction</td>
<td>A drainage blanket would be placed beneath the fill in the east ravine for stability.</td>
<td>No fill would be placed in the east or west ravines with the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering calculations presented in Draft EIS Section 3.2.1 show that the increase in surface water flow from the site will have negligible impact on the erosive flow conditions of Picnic Point Creek.</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: Proposed stormwater management measures, properly installed and adequately maintained, will control the rate of release to Picnic Point Creek. Additional analysis of the northeast drainage basin will be performed during final design (as required by SCC 30.63A.200[2][b]) to evaluate the conveyance(s) from site discharger(s) to the creek.</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>There would be no change with the No Action Alternative to existing conditions of off-site stormwater drainage directed to a discharge point in the west ravine of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North Basin would include the roofs and backyards of Lots 9 through 28. The stormwater management proposal for this area is to infiltrate into compost-amended soil and native soil. Lots 9 through 15 will be located on the east ravine fill. This material will be predominantly till with low permeability.</td>
<td>INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES: In order to avoid introducing runoff into the East Basin fill, drainage will be directed to infiltration facilities to the west for runoff that exceeds the local infiltration capacity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As stated above, overflow discharges to the off-site wetland would lag precipitation and infiltration events, resulting in no significant change in the depth of flow in the wetland.</td>
<td>APPLICABLE REGULATIONS: • The Snohomish County Water Pollution Control Code prohibits discharge of pollutants to the County drainage system or waters of the State. Compost-amended soils in the proposed stormwater management system will absorb</td>
<td>Similar to the Proposed Action. Approximately 1.66 acres of pollutant-generating surfaces (roads and parking areas) would be introduced on the site with the Multi-Family Alternative (7.4% of the site).</td>
<td>Same as with the Proposed Action.</td>
<td>No sources of urban pollutants would be introduced on the site with the No Action Alternative; however, since the property boundary is not fenced, the potential would remain for uncontrolled activities such as dumping (by others) that could lead to potential degradation of surface water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Potential Impacts**

**Mitigation Measures**

(19% of the site).

- heavy metals, oils and grease in runoff from roads and parking areas. The system will be designed to infiltrate and/or detain “first flush” stormwater volumes rather than directly discharging to Picnic Point Creek.
- Nitrates from fertilizer would be wholly or partially taken up by the vegetation in proposed bio-cell swales and rain garden features, thus limiting conveyance to Picnic Point Creek.

**Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:** With proper installation and maintenance of stormwater management facilities and Best Management Practices during construction; and with effective design, construction and maintenance of the developed-condition stormwater management system to include LID features – all as required by applicable regulations administered by Snohomish County and the Washington Department of Ecology – no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to surface water movement, quantity or quality would be anticipated with either the Proposed Action or the Multi-Family Alternative.

**There would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to surface water quantity, quality, or movement as a result of the No Action Alternative.**

**WATER: Groundwater**

As described above under **WATER: SURFACE WATER,** the proposal to infiltrate surface water runoff on-site to the fullest extent practicable would result in an increase in recharge to shallow groundwater. This would produce a slight increase in fluxes to the off-site wetland and Picnic Point Creek. The results of hydrological modeling indicate that the approximate annual increase in discharge to the off-site wetland and Picnic Point Creek would be less than 1.0 cfs (see Table 3.2-13 in Draft EIS Section 3.2) (Anthony Burgess Consulting, September 2013c; Draft EIS Technical Appendix C).

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS:**
- Compliance with Ecology's 2005 SWMMWW requires that the base of infiltration facilities have at least 5 feet of separation from the seasonal high groundwater level. All developed facilities on the site would meet this criterion.

**INCORPORATED PLAN FEATURES:**
- Dispersal of stormwater infiltration across the site area as proposed would reduce the rise in the shallow groundwater level, compared with infiltrating stormwater at one location.
- Installation of drains and drainage blankets behind retaining structures would lower groundwater levels in these very localized areas, thereby minimizing the potential for slope instability.
- The proposed Low Impact Development techniques would provide stormwater quality treatment prior to infiltration to shallow groundwater.
- A Homeowners’ Association under either alternative could implement a public information program to educate residents on limiting the use of fertilizers and garden chemicals, and cleanup and disposal of pet wastes. These issues are typically addressed in the Operations and Maintenance Manual for the project.

**No mitigation required for no change in hydrology to the existing forest stand in Tract 999.**

**The Multi-Family Alternative stormwater management system based on injection wells would have a similar affect on recharge to shallow groundwater as that which would result from infiltrating stormwater using LID techniques in the Proposed Action, though approximately 50% less stormwater runoff would be generated by the Multi-Family Alternative.**

**Same as the Proposed Action.**

**There would be no change in groundwater conditions on the site; however, since the property boundary is not fenced, the potential would remain for uncontrolled activities such as dumping (by others) to lead to potential degradation of groundwater quality.**

**The potential effects of an increase in subsurface water flow to the existing forest stand to remain in Tract 999 were considered. Most of Tract 999 is on well-drained advance outwash soil. Direct precipitation onto Tract 999 and subsequent infiltration will not change following site development. Therefore, the groundwater source of moisture for tree growth will not be changed.**

**No mitigation required for no change in hydrology to the existing forest stand in Tract 999.**

**Same as the Proposed Action.**

**There would be no impact to the existing forest stand in Tract 999 with the No Action Alternative.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED ACTION</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>MULTI-FAMILY ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
<td>Potential Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts:</td>
<td>Identified groundwater impacts would either not be adverse (such as the minor increase in groundwater discharge to the off-site wetland and to Picnic Point Creek), or would not be significant (for example, the rise in the shallow groundwater level beneath infiltration areas).</td>
<td>There would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to groundwater quantity, quality, or movement as a result of the No Action Alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.8 Major Issues, Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty, and Issues to be Resolved

Of the issues identified in letters of comment submitted to Snohomish County Planning & Development Services regarding the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development (listed in Section 1.2, above), an area of controversy that may remain with adjacent property owners is the allowed and proposed residential density on the sloping site. The Land Use and Development History section of Draft EIS Chapter 2 (Section 2.4) clearly establishes that the proposed residential density is within the range allowed. The Chapter 3 Earth section (Draft EIS Section 3.1) includes engineering solutions for slope stabilization and erosion/sedimentation control for the Proposed Action or Multi-Family Alternative. The Chapter 3 Water section (Draft EIS Section 3.2) lists engineering solutions for stormwater management during construction and in the developed condition of the site.
2.0 Comments and Responses

The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Draft EIS (EIS) was circulated for a 30-day public comment period from July 23 through August 22, 2014. At the request of interested individuals and neighbors, Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (PDS) extended the comment period for an additional 17 days, to September 8, 2014. Requesting parties were notified of the extension by e-mail on August 11, 2014. Written comments were received from two Snohomish County agencies; five organizations, and approximately 184 individuals representing approximately 148 households. Of the households represented in the comments received, approximately 24 (16%) of these were from out of the area (i.e., not within the 98026 zip code in which the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is located).

The site is within the Snohomish County Southwest Urban Growth Area, and within the Possession Shores (Harbour Pointe) Master Planned Community. Residential development has been anticipated at this location since the late 1970s/early 1980s. The potential environmental effects of implementing the Possession Shores (Harbour Pointe) Master Plan and the County's Growth Management Act (GMA) Comprehensive Plan were evaluated in programmatic EISs. The development proposal for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is consistent with the type and density of development anticipated in these planning documents (as described in Draft EIS Section 2.4, pages 2-2 through 2-20). The project proponent submitted sufficient information at the time the application was deemed complete in 2005 for the County to determine that no probable significant adverse impacts would result to most elements of the environment. For all of these reasons, Snohomish County required preparation of a limited-scope EIS. The EIS scoping notice identified only the Earth element to be addressed in the project-specific EIS, to evaluate the significant grading proposal. As a result of scoping comments received in 2007, the County expanded the scope of the EIS to include the Water element of the environment. Specifically with regard to the Water element, Snohomish County required a downstream analysis of the potential effects of Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates stormwater runoff to Picnic Point Creek, from the site to Puget Sound.

The Snohomish County website offered forms for submitting electronic comments on the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS and development proposal during the Draft EIS comment period. Two forms were provided, titled Frognal Estates Project – SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request, and Frognal Estates Project – General Comments & Party of Record Request. General comments that are outside the scope of the EIS will be considered by Snohomish County at the time of the Frognal Estates Preliminary Plat hearing, and will receive a response at that time.1

Final EIS Chapter 2 is organized in four sections, as follows:

2.1 SEPA Comments Received from Agencies
2.2 SEPA Comments Received from Organizations
2.3 SEPA Comments Received from Individuals
2.4 General Comments Received from Individuals.

Written comments are organized alphabetically within each section. Letters of comment in Sections 2.1 through 2.3 are followed by the County's written response. Individual letters of comment reproduced in Section 2.3, followed by the County's response, raise substantive issues that are within the scope of the EIS (e.g., steep slope and stormwater issues). Comments received that are outside the scope of the EIS are

1 Several comments identified as SEPA Comments are actually General Comments and therefore are reproduced in Section 2.4. Individual comments that were more specific, technical and on subjects that were within the scope of the Draft EIS (Earth and Water elements) are reproduced in Section 2.3, followed by the County's response to these comments.
summarized in the introduction to Section 2.4, followed by the individual letters of general comment received. The general comments are reproduced in the Final EIS for the record to show all comments received during the Draft EIS comment period. As stated above, general comments will be considered by the County and will receive a response at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application.

2.1 SEPA Comments Received from Agencies

Snohomish County received SEPA Comments on the Draft EIS from two agencies: Snohomish County Parks & Recreation, and Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1. These comments have been numbered in the margin of each letter (as needed) for ease of correlating written responses. Each letter received from an agency is reproduced in this section, followed by the County's response. Unmarked original letters of comment have been retained in the County's project file.
I have taken a quick look on the project proposal. Information in the report is not current (2007/2008) especially on the off-site analysis report. Some exhibits are outdated. Flow analysis may have changed over these many years. Where it was taken is not identified. It would be helpful to have current data for the basin area. Though the stormwater design is based on the proposed development, the concern is the impact downstream. Any increase in the discharged volume (report using old data) into a confined creek and culverts downstream could possibly blow out and inundate the parking lot in the county park.

Note: There is no discussion about the carrying capacity of the culverts downstream. Assumptions are implied and not verified.

---

James Yap, PLA, CESCE, Arborist
Park Planning Supervisor
Snohomish County Parks & Recreation
6705 Puget Park Drive, Snohomish WA 98296
425-388-6610/ FAX: 425-388-6645
jyap@snoco.org

1963-2013 - Celebrating 50 years of Fun!

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

---

We received the attached notice regarding a proposed development located in the Picnic Point vicinity and further information is located on the website. I'm not familiar with the stream conditions at Picnic Point to know if this is a concern or not and if we want to comment. Please let me know if feedback should be submitted.

Thank you -

Sharon Swan
Principal Park Planner
Snohomish County Parks & Recreation
6705 Puget Park Drive, Snohomish WA 98296
425-388-6616/ FAX: 425-388-6645
sharon.swan@snoco.org
Response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1: There have been no significant changes in land use or development within the Picnic Point Creek basin since the field work and calculations for the Off-Site Analysis Report (Anthony Burgess Consulting, Inc., September 2013c) were undertaken. Therefore, the flow analyses are appropriate and no revisions are considered necessary.

Any new projects to be built are required to comply with Federal, State, and County regulations for stormwater management. State (Washington Department of Ecology ["Ecology"]) laws and Snohomish County Code require management of stormwater discharges so as not to impact offsite properties or drainages. Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates will comply with these regulations; therefore, discharges from the site will not negatively impact flows in Picnic Creek.

At the time the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application was deemed complete in August 2005, it became vested to Ecology's 1992 Drainage Manual, a primary feature of which was utilizing the Santa Barbara method for sizing stormwater detention facilities. This method did not take into account the cumulative effects of back-to-back storms. The 1992 Manual included few options for use of Low Impact Development (LID) technologies (such as the use of bio-retention swales and pervious pavement). The applicant submitted a waiver request (which was approved) to use what was then Ecology's new (2005) Stormwater Water Management Manual for Western Washington (SWMMWW). All the stormwater runoff and offsite analysis for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates proposal is based on Ecology's 2005 Manual, which is more stringent and more environmentally protective than the Snohomish County Drainage Code in effect at that time.


Response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #2: Locations of the flow measurements in Picnic Point Creek were at the mouth of the creek and in the County Park upstream of the BNSF railroad crossing (6 to 8 cfs), and at the discharge of the Regatta Estates stormwater pond (about 4 cfs). These data are provided in Section 4.3 of the Off-Site Analysis Report, Horseman's Trail PRD (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013c), and in Draft EIS Section 3.2.1 (pages 3.2-5 through 3.2-9).

Response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #3: Preliminary design of the stormwater management system for the proposed development follows Ecology's 2005 Stormwater Manual for Western Washington, so as not to increase flows for return periods of 2 years or greater. These medium to high flows are the most significant for streams in terms of erosion and flooding.

Response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #4: The capacity of the Picnic Point Creek culvert beneath Picnic Point Road is calculated to be about 40 cfs with the upstream water level at the crown of the culvert, and about twice this with a surcharge of 4.5 feet above the crown of the culvert. The capacity of the culverts under the BNSF railroad tracks is estimated to be about 80 cfs with the upstream water level at the crown of the culvert, and about twice this with a surcharge of 4.5 feet above the crown of the culvert. A detailed description of the culverts is provided in Section 4.2 of the Off-Site
The Peer Review consultant (Anthony Burgess) conducted his field work for the *Off-Site Analysis Report* on December 21, 2007. At that time, he described large woody debris partially obstructing the entrance to the twin culverts beneath the BNSF railroad crossing. This obstruction has since been cleared, restoring both the conveyance capacity of the culverts, and improving conditions for anadromous fish passage above these culverts. This location was inspected by Merle Ash, Land Technologies on May 24, 2015, who provided a brief letter report with photographs to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services for the project file (Land Technologies, Inc., May 25, 2015). Subsequently, Merle Ash visited the location of the twin concrete culverts (36 inches wide x 40 inches tall) beneath the BNSF Railroad crossing with a WDFW Habitat Biologist, who provided a description of her observations in an e-mail communication dated June 4, 2015, as follows:

*While undersized for the stream width, [these culverts] may provide limited fish passage during moderate flows. Neither culvert is perched at the end; both empty into a shallow pool. Due to the size of the culverts and the stream gradient, a sediment wedge has developed above the culverts. This is not necessarily an issue for fish, just an indication of a constricted channel. During high flows this sediment is moved downstream. There is enough energy in the creek to move it through the culverts, but there was almost no sediment in the culvert, another indication of an undersized culvert. Above these culverts are two large wood jams. One seems to be constructed while the other is natural. At any time, this material may move to the culvert, but it will be too large to pass. The railroad will likely remove any wood that is stuck in front of the culverts [within their right-of-way]. They do not typically request an HPA to do so. Nor is the Department notified when they do. Even with the undersized culverts and the limited fish passage, this is a fish bearing stream as we expect that the culverts will be upsized at some point in the future.*

*We also walked up to the next two culverts. The lower one under the residential road is perfectly sized for the stream and is performing well. The one above that is undersized and experiencing the same issues as the railroad culverts: a developed sediment wedge and no material in the bottom of the culvert. If and when this culvert is replaced, it will be designed to meet the current guidelines for fish passage based on channel bed width.*

The purpose for this additional information is to update the description of current conditions as they relate to the carrying capacity of Picnic Point Creek culverts downstream from input the stream will receive from the developed condition of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD. The development will manage stormwater runoff in accordance with all applicable State (Ecology) and Snohomish County regulations, with the result that the net increase in volume of runoff and groundwater flow (from onsite infiltration) to Picnic Point Creek will represent less than 1.0 percent of the total basin flow volumes for the average and wet years (as reported in Draft EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1, page 3.2-15).
August 11, 2014

Paul MacCready
Planning & Development
3000 Rockefeller, M/S #604
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

Reference Number: 05 123050 Frognal Estate aka Horseman’s Trail
District DR Number 14-137

The District presently has sufficient electric system capacity to serve the proposed development. However, the existing District facilities in the local area may require upgrading. Any removal or relocation of District facilities necessary to accommodate this project shall be at the expense of the project developer. Please include any project-related utility work in all applicable utility permits.

Please be aware that if your project is being reviewed by Snohomish County and there are critical areas or buffers within your project as defined by Snohomish County in SCC 30.62A.300, you may be required to do a critical area study. Any utility work that will increase the utility footprint, such as installation, extension or construction is subject to these standards and requirements. New utility construction and installation is only allowed within critical areas or buffers when no alternative location exists and when you mitigate any impacts to the area. Snohomish County can provide the critical area study and has listed its fee structure under SCC 30.86.525. Snohomish PUD requires that, prior to applying for electrical service from the PUD, you address any critical area considerations and obtain the appropriate approvals to proceed with your project.

Cost of any work, new or to upgrade, existing facilities that are required to connect this proposed development to the District electric system shall be in accordance with the applicable District policies. The District policy requires the developer to provide a 10-foot easement and an 8-foot clearance between any building/structures and transformers/switch cabinets upon its property for underground electrical facilities that must be installed to serve the proposed development. We recommend contact with the District prior to design of the proposed project.

For information about specific electric service requirements, please call the District’s Plat Development Team at (425)783-4350.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Elisabeth A. Tobin
Senior Manager
Planning, Engineering, & Technical Services
Response to Snohomish County PUD Comments: The comments received from Snohomish County PUD regarding available electrical capacity to serve the development and cost responsibilities for any facility alterations that may be required relate to the development approval stage of review of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD application and will be retained in the record for that process. No response is required as it relates to the EIS.
2.2 SEPA Comments Received from Organizations

Snhomish County received SEPA Comments on the Draft EIS from five organizations: Aramburu & Eustis (representing the Picnic Point Preservation Committee); Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers; Lake Stickney Conservancy; Picnic Point Preservation Committee; and the Sno-King Watershed Council. These comments have been numbered in the margin of each letter (as needed) for ease of correlating written responses. Each letter received from an organization is reproduced in this section, followed by the County's response. Unmarked original letters of comment have been retained in the County's project file.
Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning and Development Services
Snohomish County
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046

Re: Draft EIS for Frognal Estates

Dear Mr. MacCready,

On behalf of the Picnic Point Preservation Committee, we write to comment on the Draft EIS for the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development. These comments supplement comments submitted directly by Picnic Point and its consultants.

In general, the DEIS fails to adequately address and analyze the full range of significant, adverse impacts likely to result from the Frognal Estates proposal. The scope of the DEIS principally is limited to the elements of earth and water. However, the proposal would also generate significant impacts upon land use and transportation, which are not fully covered. As well, the EIS fails to consider a full range of alternatives, including those that would result in fewer environmental impacts. To resolve these deficiencies, the county should revise and re-issue a Draft EIS, so that the public and affected agencies would have an opportunity to review and comment upon it before it is finalized.

2 Land Use

At section 1.3, the DEIS gives an erroneous account of the development history of the site, which results in the failure to consider significant land use impacts concerning density of the project.

Frognal Estates includes the subdivision of Lot 1 of Regatta Estates into 30 lots, but nowhere does the DEIS address the plat restriction governing future development of that parcel. As approved by the County Council, the Regatta Estates Final Plat carries the following restriction:
Lot 1 shall be treated essentially as a Native Growth Protection Area provided that a single homesite with access thereto may be developed on said lot. Site development plans for the access driveway and homesite, including clearing and revegetation plans and detailed geotechnical analysis will be required to have received approval from the Planning Division prior to the issuance of any site development permits or any disturbance of said Lot.

We have not reviewed any documentation that this plat restriction has been removed. Accordingly, it continues to govern future development of Lot 1.

But the DEIS, which should be an objective, full disclosure document, does not mention this plat restriction and repeatedly misrepresents to the contrary, that Lot 1 is an area designated for future development. For example, see the following passages:

Lot 1 was not developed with the rest of Regatta Estates; it was designated for future residential development. The Division of Development for Regatta Estates indicated that a subsequent Division of Development and preliminary plat and development design would be submitted for development of Lot 1. This lot is included in the current Proposed Action (PRD proposal) for Horseman’s Trail/Frognatal Estates, with 30 lots proposed for this area. DEIS at 1-4

The Horseman’s Trail/Frognatal Estates PRD site includes Lot 1 of Regatta Estates reserved for future residential development (Sector 22 and a small portion of Sector 23) . . . id. at 1-5.

The remaining number of dwelling units available in Sector 23 is fourteen, and six are proposed. The remaining number of dwelling units available in Sector 22 (Lot 1) is 91, and 30 are proposed. id.

The DEIS makes similar representations at sections 2.4.6, 2.4.7.1 and at Table 2.4-1. The DEIS directs the reader to a more detailed discussion of land use at Attachment 1, which also fails to correct these erroneous statements. Lot 1 is a significant portion of the site. At 6.6 acres (prior to a boundary line adjustment), it makes up nearly 30% of the 22.34 acre site. See DEIS Figure 2.4.1.

Since the DEIS fails to identify the project’s conflict with the Regatta Estate plat restrictions, if fails to identify mitigations and alternatives that would address the conflict, principally a restriction of the development of the Lot 1 area to a single homesite and driveway.

If the plat restriction on Lot 1 no longer applies, a re-issued DEIS should fully document and analyze why it would not.
3 Circulation

The DEIS at section 2.4.7.2 describes the proposed circulation system but fails to analyze the proposal's traffic impacts. The discussion of the circulation system ends with a statement that the Department of Public Works has issued a Letter of Transportation Concurrency for the project, but fails to include that letter as a reference, to state when it was issued or address whether it continues to be valid. Our review of correspondence during the threshold determination process seven years ago causes us to believe that the concurrency determination expired long ago.

Even if issued, a letter of concurrency would only address whether the project generated volumes within the adopted levels of service for the roads and intersections impacted. Yet other traffic impacts would not be addressed by a concurrency determination, such as sight distances, impacts from and mitigations for inclement weather, exacerbation of congestion in the vicinity of Picnic Point Elementary School, increased hazards to school children and other pedestrians created by peak morning traffic generated by the site. Those impacts remain for review and mitigation under SEPA.

The movement and circulation of people and goods and traffic hazards are elements of the environment, WAC 197-11-444(2)(c)(v) and (vi), which all environmental documents must address. WAC 197-11-060(4)(a) and -740. The failure to address and propose mitigations for transportation-related impacts should be corrected through the re-issuance of a Draft EIS, so that that discussion may be commented upon. As well, the traffic analysis should consider the cumulative impacts of the current proposal in conjunction with other, similar projects contemporaneously proposed. WAC 197-11-060(4)(e).

4 Alternatives

SEPA mandates adequate consideration of a sufficient range of alternatives, "Openminded, imaginative design and consideration of alternative courses of agency action is crucial to SEPA's ultimate quest—environmentally optimum government decisionmaking." R. Settle, The Washington State Environmental Policy Act: A Legal Policy and Analysis §14.01[2][b] (Matthew Bender & Co). The required contents of an EIS are set forth at RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c), which provides in relevant part:

The legislature authorizes and directs that, to the fullest extent possible . . . (2) all branches of government of this state . . . shall:
(c) Include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major actions significantly affecting the quality of the environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on:

(iii) alternatives to the proposed action;

(Emphasis supplied).

The Washington Supreme Court has found that the consideration of alternatives cannot simply be cast aside. "The required discussion of alternatives to a proposed project is of major importance, because it provides a basis for a reasoned decision among alternatives having differing environmental impacts." *Weyerhaeuser v. Pierce County*, 124 Wn.2d 26, 42, 873 P.2d 498.

The range of reasonable alternatives that must be discussed in the EIS "shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal’s objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." WAC 197-11-440(5)(b).

Courts have enforced the requirement for consideration of a sufficient range of alternatives. *See, e.g., Weyerhaeuser*, 124 Wn.2d at 42 (EIS held inadequate for failure to consider alternative sites to a proposed solid waste landfill); *Solid Waste Alternative Proponents v. Okanogan Cy. (SWAP)*, 66 Wn. App. 439, 444, 832 P.2d 503, review denied 120 Wn.2d 1012, 844 P.2d 435 (1992); ("The range of alternatives considered in an EIS must be sufficient to permit a reasoned choice"); and *Methow Valley Citizens Council v. Regional Forester*, 833 F.2d 810, 815 (9th Cir. 1987) ("[t]o be adequate, an environmental impact statement must consider every reasonable alternative"), *rev’d. on other grounds*, 490 U.S. 332 (1989).

The discussion of alternatives must be sufficiently detailed to permit a comparative evaluation of different courses of action. A superficial presentation of alternatives which contains only brief, conclusory descriptions and prevents "any meaningful comparison" is legally inadequate. *Weyerhaeuser* at 41.

The DEIS fails to consider a full range of alternatives. The document compares the proposed 112 lot single family development to a 112 unit development of quadruplexes, one that the DEIS at 2-58 concedes would be less compatible with the surrounding neighborhood than even the preferred alternative. The document casts aside less intense, single family alternatives that would provide such amenities as protected open space and trails through the site as proposed within the PRD alternative. The DEIS asserts that less dense alternatives would not be economically viable, but without any substantiation as to the threshold for economic viability. A re-issued Draft EIS should give consideration to a less dense, single family development.
The range of alternatives also fails to consider one that would meet the density limits for Lot 1 of Regatta Estates. At the very least, a re-issued Draft EIS should consider the reduction from 30 dwelling units to a single homesite in the Lot 1 area.

5 Conclusion

For the reasons given above and within other comments submitted on behalf of the Picnic Point Preservation Committee, the county should revise and re-issue a Draft EIS for the proposed Frognal Estates development.

Sincerely yours,

ARAMBURU & EUSTIS, LLP

Jeffrey M. Eustis

cc: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #1: The SEPA Procedures and Public Involvement section of the Draft EIS (Chapter 1, Section 1.2, pages 1-1 through 1-3) describes the EIS scoping process conducted by Snohomish County. The section lists issues that were raised in scoping comments, and the County's decision to require a limited-scope EIS (consistent with WAC 197-11-408[1]) to address Earth and Water elements. Sufficient information was submitted by the project proponent in 2005 when the application was deemed complete for the County to determine that no probable significant adverse impacts would result to other elements of the environment. Therefore, the EIS was not required to address other elements listed in WAC 197-11-444. The potential land use and transportation impacts raised in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #1 were addressed in a programmatic EIS for the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan in December 2005. This analysis will be updated in a forthcoming programmatic EIS for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, for which the expected date of issue is summer 2015.

Draft EIS Section 1.2 notes that the EIS scoping comment period ended May 30, 2007; the appeal period for the Determination of Significance ended June 6, 2007; and no appeal of the County's SEPA Threshold Determination was filed (page 1-1). The scoping process is conducted to "... narrow the scope of every EIS to the probable significant adverse impacts and reasonable alternatives, including mitigation measures. For example, if there are only two or three significant impacts or alternatives, the EIS shall be focused on those" (WAC 197-11-408[1]). Snohomish County PDS narrowed the scope of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS according to this rule.

Issues raised in the 2007 EIS scoping comments, in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #1, and in general comments submitted to Snohomish County by individuals during the Draft EIS comment period will be considered by the County at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing. (Also see the response to General Comments in Final EIS Section 2.4.)

Response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #2 - Land Use: A detailed summary of the land use and development history of the site is provided in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.4 (pages 2-2 through 2-20). This summary was prepared by Jim Miller, former Snohomish County Planning and Development Services Senior Planner during the years when these land use actions were taken. Draft EIS Section 2.4 was also carefully reviewed and confirmed by Snohomish County Principal Planner Darryl Eastin during Draft EIS preparation. Aramburu & Eustis Comment #2 cites a summarized account of the Chapter 2 description from Chapter 1, the Draft EIS Summary, and suggests a different interpretation; i.e. that Regatta Estates Lot 1 is a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA) tract. However, Draft EIS Section 2.4 gives information and analysis of the development potential of Regatta Estates Lot 1, documenting that it is actually a future development tract.

The recorded covenants of the Regatta Estates plat (Shergar Land Corporation, May 29, 1996) include the following provisions with regard to Lot 1. This information has been added to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS by means of the Errata Sheet (Final EIS Chapter 3):

"With the exception of Lot 1, all lots within the Plat of Regatta Estates are in the final developed size and configuration. Lot 1, however, is an over-sized lot, which the Declarant intends, at some time in the future, to subdivide. The owners of Lots in the Plat of Regatta Estates shall take ownership subject to the right of the Declarant and/or its successors to further subdivide Lot 1 pursuant to applicable rules, ordinances, and/or regulations of the governmental entity regulating development of the same. Accordingly, no lot owner shall have the right to protest...

Mr. Miller was retired from the County and working as a planning consultant when he prepared this Draft EIS text section.
and/or object to the Declarant or its successors’ efforts to subdivide said real property so long as such subdivision is being requested and/or completed consistent with the rules and regulations of the municipality regulating development at the time of such subdivision.” (Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions and Easements for Regatta Estates, Section 7.1 – Future Development/Subdivision of Lot 1, Snohomish County Auditor File Number 9605290598.)

Additional documentation regarding future development of Regatta Estates Lot 1 can be found in a detailed response to County staff questions about the development potential of this lot, recounting specific conditions set forth by the Snohomish County Hearing Examiner during the decision-making process for the plat of Regatta Estates (Land Technologies, Inc., May 25, 2006). The Land Technologies document is appended to the Final EIS as Attachment A.

Response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #3 – Circulation: Subsection 2.4.7 of the Draft EIS (pages 2-13 through 2-20) cited in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #3 provides site description information as set forth in the Harbour Pointe Master Plan and Sector Plans in which the assembled parcels are located. Section 2.4 is titled Land Use and Development History of the Site and Proposed Action; it was not intended to include an analysis of traffic impacts. Transportation was not an element of the scope of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS (see the response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #1, above).

The 2006 Transportation Concurrency Determination for the application expired June 8, 2012. Snohomish County Code includes a provision for the Applicant to request a new concurrency determination based upon the prior technical report and analysis (SCC 30.66B.155[5]). The Applicant has submitted this request, and the County has required analysis of traffic operations at three additional intersections. Mitigation conditions identified in the 2006 Transportation Concurrency Determination expired with that determination on June 8, 2012. Transportation mitigation to be required of the development will be tied to the new (2015) concurrency determination (SCC 30.66B.055[2]).

Specific transportation operation concerns identified in paragraph 2 of Aramburu & Eustis Comment #3 will be considered at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing. There are no other similar projects contemporaneously proposed within the project area that would generate cumulative traffic impacts for analysis.

Response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4 – Alternatives: The Draft EIS indicates in Chapter 1, Section 1.6 (page 1-10), and in Chapter 2, Section 2.7 (page 2-58), that the Multi-Family Alternative was selected for analysis and comparison to the PRD Proposal in the EIS because it is "... a reasonable alternative that would meet most of the objectives of the proposal but at a lower environmental cost, in accordance with WAC 197-11-440(5)(b)." The PRD Proposal is used as the benchmark for comparing alternatives, consistent with WAC 197-11-440(5)(c)(v). Detailed quantitative information provided in Chapter 2 (pages 2-60 through 2-64), and in Chapter 1, Table 1.7-1 (pages 1-12 through 1-24) shows how the Multi-Family Alternative would result in less environmental impact compared to the PRD Proposal even though the two site plans have the same number of dwelling units.

Alternatives that were considered but eliminated from detailed evaluation are also described in Draft EIS Chapter 1 (pages 1-10 and 1-11), and Chapter 2 (Section 2.6, pages 2-56 and 2-57). These alternatives were eliminated because they did not meet the criteria of WAC 197-11-440(5)(b) cited above in this response. WAC 197-11-440(5)(b)(i) confirms that: "The word "reasonable" is intended to limit the number and range of alternatives, as well as the amount of detailed analysis for each alternative."

Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4 argues that the Draft EIS fails to consider a full range of alternatives, including those that would result in fewer environmental impacts, and therefore that the Draft EIS should be re-issued to include "less intense, single family alternatives" or "the reduction from 30 dwelling units
to a single home site on the Lot 1 area." SEPA does not require the evaluation of these alternatives, and including those alternatives would be contrary to County Code and the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

When a proposal is for a private project on a specific site (like the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD proposal in this case), SEPA requires evaluation of "... only the no action alternative plus other reasonable alternatives for achieving the proposal’s objective on the same site" (WAC 197-11-440[5][d], emphasis added). The objectives of the proposal are not defined by Aramburu & Eustis or any other third-party, but by the private project proponent; in this case, Frognal Holdings, LLC (the Applicant). As stated in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.2 (page 2-1), the objectives of the proposal are to achieve the Applicant’s desired development in conformance with the density and types of uses called for in Snohomish County regulations. For this reason, the Draft EIS considered an alternative development that would achieve the same density but via a different development concept. The alternatives described in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4 would not meet the objectives of the proposal and, therefore, such alternatives are not required to be considered in the EIS.

In support of its argument, Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4 cites Weyerhaeuser v. Pierce County, 124 Wn.2d 26, 873 P.2d 498 (1994). That case, however, makes clear the distinction between the alternatives analyses required in public versus private projects. In Weyerhaeuser, the Court held that the project was a public project and, therefore, the limited alternatives analysis described in WAC 197-11-440(5)(d) did not apply. Here, the Applicant’s project clearly is a private project and SEPA requires evaluation of "... only the no action alternative plus other reasonable alternatives for achieving the proposal’s objective on the same site" as cited above. Alternatives compliant with WAC 197-11-440(5)(d) are considered and evaluated in the EIS, and there is no requirement in SEPA for the County to also evaluate the desired alternatives expressed in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4.

Not only is there no SEPA requirement for the County to evaluate the alternatives suggested in Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4, the arguments for less intense, single-family alternatives would violate the minimum density requirements of the Snohomish County Code and the County’s Comprehensive Plan policies. The site is within the Snohomish County Southwest Urban Growth Area (UGA). Pursuant to SCC 30.23.020(1): "A minimum net density of four dwelling units per acre shall be required in all UGAs for . . . new subdivisions, short subdivisions, PRDs, and mobile home parks." This minimum net density requirement is supported by the Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan, which states at Land Use Goal 2: "Establish development patterns that use urban land more efficiently." To help achieve Land Use Goal 2, Land Use Policy 2.A.1 provides: "Within UGAs, development regulations shall be adopted and maintained which will require that new residential subdivisions achieve a minimum net density of 4-6 dwelling units per acre in all unincorporated UGAs." Thus, the Aramburu & Eustis argument that the Draft EIS should be re-issued and include "less intense, single family alternatives" or "the reduction from 30 dwelling units to a single home site on the Lot 1 area" would be contrary to both the minimum density requirements of Snohomish County Code and the County’s Comprehensive Plan policies.

Response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #5 – Conclusion: Based on the responses provided to Aramburu & Eustis Comments #1 through #4 above, Snohomish County PDS does not find reason to revise and reissue the Draft EIS.
September 8, 2014

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/s 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046

Dear Mr. MacCready:

Concerning the Frognal Estates development proposal Draft EIS, we offer the following comments:

1. The presence of neo-natal, juvenile endangered Chinook Salmon has been documented in lower Picnic Point Creek, but was not discussed in the Draft EIS. This endangered species has been documented in the recent study, JUVENILE CHINOOK SALMON REARING IN SMALL NON-NATAL STREAMS DRAINING INTO THE WHIDBEY BASIN, December 3, 2013. This report states that juvenile Chinook salmon are not just present in these small streams, but are actively rearing and growing in them. They appear to be using these small streams discharging to Puget Sound, such as Picnic Point Creek, as a nursery much like natal and pocket estuaries are used by juvenile Chinook salmon to transition from fresh to saltwater. It has been documented that Picnic Point Creek plays a critical role in helping neo-natal juvenile Chinook Salmon in adapting to saltwater; therefore, Picnic Point is a water of statewide significance.

Under SCC 30.62A a Critical Areas Study must be performed to determine the extent of this endangered species' critical habitat area, including preparation of a critical area site plan, and restrictions placed on the construction of new structures or the removal of native vegetation within the fish habitat conservation area. This must be accomplished as a part of the Draft EIS to determine the extent of the impact on the critical habitat for the endangered Chinook Salmon.

2. SCC 30.62A.460(5) requires the developer to use Best Available Science (BAS) applicable to the endangered species, demonstrating how the proposal will provide sufficient protection of the critical species and its habitat.

3. The project proponent has proposed to use the Department of Ecology's Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, 2005 edition for the design of its stormwater flow control, water quality treatment, and temporary erosion and sediment controls (TESC). This manual is now outdated and has
been superseded by the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, 2012 edition (SWMMWW). All stormwater design work must be accomplished under the newer stormwater manual.

4. Furthermore, the project proponent proposes to use the Department of Ecology's Low Impact Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound, 2005 edition. This manual is also outdated and no longer represents BAS. Rather the 2012 edition of the Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound should be used as a design standard.

5. Picnic Point Creek has been impacted and degraded by stormwater runoff from developments permitted or constructed prior to the adoption of the current Snohomish County Drainage Manual, 2005 edition, which is not in compliance with the current Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Development projects that were vested prior to October 1, 2010 are only required to meet the requirements of the very obsolete Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin, 1992 edition. Many more projects using outdated stormwater design manual within the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin may be pending and contribute to the cumulative impacts to the already degraded Picnic Point Creek.

6. The Draft EIS did not address Indirect and Cumulative Impacts from the Frognal Estates development. SEPA also requires Snohomish County, as the lead agency, to identify and evaluate probable impacts. These include:

   • Indirect (or secondary) cumulative impacts;
   • Direct cumulative impacts; and
   • Climate change as a cumulative effect.

7. If permitted the Frognal Estates development should be required to enhance Picnic Point Creek to mitigate any degradation from this development or cumulative impacts from future development.

8. The Draft EIS did not address Indirect and Cumulative Impacts from the Frognal Estates development. SEPA also requires Snohomish County, as the lead agency, to identify and evaluate probable impacts. These include:

   • Indirect (or secondary) cumulative impacts;
   • Direct cumulative impacts; and
   • Climate change as a cumulative effect.

9. The Draft EIS did not identify and evaluate probable impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures, emphasizing important environmental impacts and alternatives (including cumulative, short-term, long-term, direct and indirect impacts as required by WAC 197-11-030(2)(b) and (g).
These impacts could include impacts from further development in the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin or other developments such as retail strip malls and other services required to support the Frognal Estates homeowners.

10. A map should be prepared for the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin delineating current or proposed developed areas with impervious surfaces not in compliance with current stormwater flow control and water quality treatment; and future areas that could possibly be developed with stormwater flow control and water quality treatment meeting the requirements of the 2012 edition SWMMWWW.

11. As one of several possible mitigations for this project, the project proponent should agree to replace the fish blocking culvert at stream crossing at Picnic Point Road, immediately north of the Frognal Estates project. Replacing this non-conforming culvert with a culvert designed in accordance with most current WDFW design requirements per its Water Crossing Design Guidelines 2013 or most current edition will open up several miles of high quality salmon spawning beds.

12. The Draft EIS indicated that it would be the homeowner’s responsibility to maintain the proposed LID installed as a part of this project. While some homeowner’s may maintain the LID’s on their property, experience has shown that many others do not. This puts an undue burden on County staff to contact each non-compliant homeowner.

   In lieu of this, the Draft EIS should require that the maintenance of all LID measures be the responsibility of the homeowner’s association. In the event that LID measures are not maintained, the County can notify the homeowner’s association to correct the problem before the County must take action to correct the problem and back charge the homeowner’s association.

13. As a mitigation to help protect endangered Chinook Salmon, the homeowner’s association should strictly limit the use of outdoor fertilizers and prohibit the use of fungicides, insecticides, and other pesticides. The use of high runoff grass lawns as well as non-native ornamental plants that require frequent and heavy use of pesticides and fertilizers should be prohibited. All plantings should be local, native vegetation that is low maintenance and requires less water when fully established.

Thank you for your consideration and incorporation of the Lake Forest Park StreamKeepers comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Halliday  
Mark Phillips

Jim Halliday and Mark Phillips,  
Co-chairs of Lake Forest Park StreamKeepers  
http://www.lfpstreamkeepers.org/home
Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1: At the time the Off-Site Analysis Report was prepared, there were no published data on fish use and habitat in Picnic Point Creek. As noted in Section 2 of the Off-Site Analysis Report, and in Draft EIS Section 3.1.3 (page 3.1-20), the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Regional Habitat Biologist was contacted for this information. Ms. Ginger Holser indicated “... it is likely that chum and coho salmon and possibly cutthroat come up the creek as far as the Picnic Point road crossing, which is a barrier to further migration.” The report Juvenile Chinook Salmon Rearing in Small Non-Natal Streams Discharging into the Whidbey Basin (Beamer et al.) has been added by means of the Final EIS Errata section (Chapter 3) to the EIS list of references (Chapter 4), and to the Off Site Analysis Report list of references.

The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates development will not result in physical alteration of Picnic Point Creek (see the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1). The nearest location of the site to the creek is 640 feet south (see Draft EIS Figure 3.2-1, page 3.2-3). Intervening development between Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates and the creek includes Picnic Point Road, the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District wastewater treatment plant, and a built-out division of the Regatta Estates development. SCC 30.62A.320(1)(a) Table 2a requires a buffer of 150 feet from a salmon-bearing stream. Restrictions on impervious surfaces are imposed within a 300-foot Riparian Management Zone (RMZ). The site is distant from either of these criteria. Snohomish County Code states that: “All development activities, actions requiring project permits and clearing that comply with the buffer requirements of SCC 30.62A.320(1)(a) through (g) satisfy the avoidance criteria of SCC 30.62A.310(3).” For the reasons described in this response, a Critical Areas Study is not required.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #2: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1, above. The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is not within a critical area for juvenile Chinook salmon habitat. Stormwater management practices will be implemented through both temporary (interim during construction) and developed conditions, designed in accordance with Ecology's 2005 SWMMWW (see Draft EIS Sections 2.5.3 and 2.5.5.1, pages 2-28 through 2-31, and pages 2-44 through 2-53, respectively).

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #3: See the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1 above regarding the stormwater management manual used for design of stormwater flow control, water quality treatment, and TESC measures on the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #4: Snohomish County has not adopted Ecology's 2012 Low Impact Technical Guidance for Puget Sound. The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates development is vested to regulations in effect at the time the application was deemed complete in August 2005. See the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #5: There are no development applications pending at the time of this writing within the Picnic Point drainage basin. Any future development proposals would be required to comply with stormwater management regulations in effect at the time such applications were deemed complete. It would be speculative and outside the scope of the project-specific Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS to attempt to quantify potential impacts associated with prospective future projects.

The purpose of Snohomish County Code (SCC 30.63A.010[1]) is to “. . . implement the provisions of the Federal Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.) as administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology through issuance of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System 2-20 Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates FEIS Chapter 2, Comments and Responses: June 2015
Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #6: The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) identifies limited requirements for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. The SEPA Rules limit the scope of environmental review to impacts that are probable (WAC 197-11-782) and significant (WAC 197-11-794), with attention to impacts that are likely, not merely speculative (WAC 197-11-060[4][a]). The SEPA Rules specifically define only direct and indirect impacts, as follows: those effects resulting from growth caused by a proposal (direct impacts), and the likelihood that the present proposal will serve as a precedent for future actions (indirect impacts) (WAC 197-11-060[4][d]). Recent court cases have indicated that cumulative impacts under SEPA are those impacts of the project that, when combined with the impacts of other projects that are dependent on the proposed project or upon which the proposed project depends, are significant. A cumulative impacts analysis is prospective only (i.e., it is required under SEPA only when it is probable that the project under review will facilitate future action that will result in additional impacts). The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is the last area of developable land within Harbour Point Sectors 22 and 23. Adjacent properties are developed. For this reason, the proposed development is not construed to facilitate additional growth or development. This information has been added by means of the Final EIS Errata section (Chapter 3). Also see Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #5 above, and the response to that comment.

Climate change was not an element of the environment evaluated in the limited-scope EIS for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates development. Snohomish County does not require climate change analyses in SEPA documents.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #7: There are no identified significant potential degradation impacts to Picnic Point Creek from the proposed development (see the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1). Therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

Requiring one development to shoulder the burden of future developments and potential impacts is not reasonable and is not required under SEPA. To impose any development exaction requires the County to establish a nexus between a negative impact resulting directly from the development, as well as rough proportionality between that impact and the County's proposed mitigation. RCW 82.02.020 also mandates that a government imposing a mitigation requirement demonstrate that such requirement is "reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development or plat.” Courts have also clarified that the statute further requires that a mitigation condition not be imposed on a new subdivision to address a pre-existing deficiency, as opposed to one directly resulting from the subdivision. These prohibitions

5 Benchmark, 146 Wn.2d at 695-96.
are intended to “stop the imposition of general social costs on developers, while at the same time allowing the continued imposition of costs that are directly attributable to development.”

**Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #8:** Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #8 is a duplicate of their Comment #6. See the response to that comment above.

**Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #9:** WAC 197-11-030 is a policy statement for the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and the SEPA Rules. Section (2)(b) states as a policy that agencies shall, to the fullest extent possible, "Find ways to make the SEPA process more useful to decision makers and the public; promote certainty regarding the requirements of the act; reduce paperwork and the accumulation of extraneous background data; and emphasize important environmental impacts and alternatives." It is not clear how this provision relates to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #9. The Draft EIS contents were prepared in compliance with the SEPA Guidelines, including WAC 197-11-440. Alternatives are described in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 evaluates the probable impacts of the alternatives and describes proposed and required mitigation measures.

WAC 197-11-030(2)(g) states as a policy that agencies shall, to the fullest extent possible, "Identify, evaluate, and require or implement, where required by the act and these rules, reasonable alternatives that would mitigate adverse effects of proposed actions on the environment." Alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIS were formulated in compliance with WAC 197-11-440(5)(b) which states that: "Reasonable alternatives shall include actions that could feasibly attain or approximate a proposal's objectives, but at a lower environmental cost or decreased level of environmental degradation." Ways in which the Multi-Family Alternative would result in less impact that the PRD Proposal are described throughout the Draft EIS and summarized in Table 1.7-1 (pages 1-12 through 1-24).

The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is within a designated Urban Growth Area. The Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan was reviewed under SEPA in a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (December 2005). Through these documents, the County has planned for urban residential development of the site and support services for residential use (such as commercial development). It is also important to note that, as described in RCW 36.70B.030, "Fundamental land use planning choices made in adopted comprehensive plans and development regulations shall serve as the foundation for project review." Therefore, during project review, the type of land use permitted at a site under applicable regulations is not subject to re-examination (RCW 36.70B.030).

**Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #10:** Basin-wide analysis of areas not in compliance with regulations relating to stormwater management and impervious surfaces is not required of a private development proposal under SEPA. This level of planning and analysis is the County's responsibility.

**Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #11:** The proposed development will not significantly adversely impact Picnic Point Creek. Therefore replacement of the stream crossing at Picnic Point Road is not a mitigation requirement that can be attributed to the proposed development. Replacement of this stream crossing has been identified in the County’s Drainage Needs Report (Snohomish County Public Works Department 2002), which states in Section 9.3:

> In the Picnic Point Creek basin, two CIP projects along Picnic Point Creek were developed. The first project (PS-PP-27) would reconstruct a fishway along the south side of Picnic Point Road, and the other project (PS-PP-26) would replace a culvert under the road with a fish passage culvert.

---

As discussed in Section 7, current County code does not require that any of the proposed habitat CIP projects be implemented. These projects represent a list of opportunities that, if constructed, would help to alleviate existing habitat problems, such as lack of instream pools or adequate shade.

Also see the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1. Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates is outside all required critical area buffers for listed species that utilize Picnic Point Creek per Chapter 30.62 SCC, the code in effect when the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates application was submitted and under which it is reviewed. Compliance with Chapter 30.62 SCC is considered sufficiently protective of the creek; therefore, there is no basis for requiring mitigation from this project in the form of Picnic Point Creek culvert replacement.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #12: The Draft EIS describes maintenance responsibility for proposed Low Impact Development (LID) features in several locations, as follows. These responsibilities are consistent with Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #12.

_The Homeowners’ Association (HOA) will be responsible for maintenance of community open space areas and Low Impact Development stormwater management features. Maintenance Guidelines will be provided in the Covenants, Codes & Restrictions (CC&Rs) of the development, and in a Homeowner’s Handout. The HOA will be required to hire the services of a professional landscape maintenance company educated in the maintenance requirements of the Low Impact Development stormwater management features. Project approvals will include providing a drainage access easement to Snohomish County for the County to assure that the HOA maintains the drainage facilities, and that the cost of repair or replacement of any drainage facilities is the responsibility of the HOA_ (Section 1.5, page 1-9; Table 1.7-1, page 1-18; Section 2.5.4.5, page 2-40; and Section 2.5.5.1, page 2-53).

If for some reason the Frognal Estates Homeowners' Association were to disband, maintenance requirements within the development would be the responsibility of all homeowners, not individuals.

Response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #13: The Draft EIS includes the mitigation measure recommended in Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #13 in Section 3.2 (page 3.2-27), also summarized in Table 1.7-1 (page 1-23), as follows:

_A Homeowners’ Association under either alternative could implement a public information program to educate residents on limiting the use of fertilizers and garden chemicals, and cleanup and disposal of pet wastes. These issues are typically addressed in the Operations and Maintenance Manual for the project._

A Targeted Drainage Study (conceptual engineering) was prepared for the preliminary plat application to demonstrate how site engineering could be designed to comply with County codes and other applicable laws. The proposal includes using LID technologies per existing County code to the fullest extent practicable. At the time when design engineering is performed, a full Drainage Report will be provided that will detail the design parameters. This Drainage Report will encourage the use of sustainable practices in landscape care as it relates to stormwater runoff quantity and quality. An Operations and Maintenance Manual will be provided with the Drainage Report that will also advocate the use of sustainable practices for care and maintenance of landscape areas. These sustainable practices will direct the caretakers of the system to use natural or organic fertilizers along with natural control to the extent practicable with pesticides and herbicides. The lawns and yard areas will not be “high runoff” lawns as even the concept design shown in the preliminary plat plans with cross sections such as those provided on Sheet P 7 indicate that all yard areas will be built up with 12 to 18 inches of compost-amended soils as part of the LID BMP stormwater management system (SWM). Lawn areas and yards are conceptually
designed to be part of the SWM. Compost-amended soils applied on the surface will provide stormwater treatment and attenuation. Most of the soils below yard areas are sandy and therefore will infiltrate significant portions of stormwater that lands on yards and rooftops.
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Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 11:19 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.
First Name* Last Name*
Joyce Altaras

Contact Email
jaltaras@msn.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[ ] Stormwater drainage
[ ] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
In general, I think this is a BAD IDEA! This area is prone to slides, and anything that could change the course of the land, water, and drainage, could be devastating to all properties involved. Take A Lesson from Oso Slide. I am opposed to this development for this reason.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) No

Organization
Lake Stickney Conservancy

Please include the name of the entity, group or agency that you are the designated spokesperson for, if any.
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Joyce
Last Name: Altaras
Contact Email: jaltaras@msn.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Other

Comment Field: In general, I think this is a BAD IDEA! This area is prone to slides, and anything that could change the course of the land, water, and drainage, could be devastating to all properties involved. Take A Lesson from Oso Slide. I am opposed to this development for this reason.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Organization: Lake Stickney Conservancy
Mailing Address 1: 1508 N. Lake Stickney Dr.
City: Lynnwood
State: WA
Zip: 98087
Phone Number: 425-745-4553

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/1/2014 11:18:39 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.131.102
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project
LAKE STICKNEY CONSERVANCY (JOYCE ALTARAS)

Response to Lake Stickney Conservancy: See the URS (Martin McCabe) letter of comment submitted as an attachment to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter (following), and the response to those comments.
Paul MacCready, Senior Planner  
Planning and Development Services  
Snohomish County  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604  
Everett, WA 98201-4046  

Dear Mr. MacCready,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed Frognal Estates (File number 05-123050-SD). Please consider this letter a part of the record. There are several issues the county should investigate further which are either incorrect or are not covered or review sufficiently in the DEIS provided by the developer.

1. **Acreage size and potentially other inaccurate numbers:** The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates proposal discusses the development of 22.34 acres of land. Throughout the DEIS it describes and 'assemblage of 3 parcels' often referencing them in terms of sectors and lots. The maps/figures it uses also describes them in terms of sectors and lots. Specifically it says in section 2.4 (page 2-3 of the DEIS) that Lot 1 is 7.46 acres and the other two parcels combined are 14.88 acres, for a combined 22.34 acres. However, when the tax parcels for this site (3 separate tax parcels) are reviewed and calculated, the total acreage of 21.98 acres. The parcel that appears to be referenced as Lot 1 in the DEIS is actually 7.56 acres and the combined total of the two other parcels is 14.42. This information comes from the Snohomish County Assessors webpage, from the SCOPI maps. The tax parcel numbers are as follows: 00473300002701 (4.71 acres), 00473300002800 (9.71 acres) & 00853500000100 (7.56 acres). When this property on the Snohomish County, Permit, Planning and Zoning Map is reviewed there are not any other adjacent vacant land parcels that appear to be a part of this development or permit application to add the additional .36 acres.

2. **The maintenance costs of the retaining walls and water management systems.** Throughout the proposal the developer states that the new Homeowners Association would be responsible for paying for the management and maintenance of water drainage systems as well as the maintenance of the grounds and open spaces of this property, which would include all berms, walls and retention structures; water drainage and maintenance, open space landscaping and private landscaping; in addition to the administrative fees of an HOA. However, it does not offer any indication of what these costs could be for regular maintenance or damage/replacement costs. It would be prudent to know what the potential costs would be over a 5-10-20+ years. And if these costs would be manageable by an HOA, and particularly the financial demographic of what this HOA demographic would be, based on the home value. And if they are not manageable or if the HOA or private homeowners do not meet the requirements or cost what will the county do to ensure maintenance and environmental protections are insured?

3. **The impact to the roads and intersections.** Snohomish County should be concerned about the potential inadequate road conditions on 60th Ave Wes; & 140th St SW, and particularly where those two roads intersect. If the proposed 1120 new ADT that the Frognal Estates (112 homes) comes to fruition, this would create very dangerous road and intersection conditions. Currently 60th is barely a two lane road, and parking is allowed on the west side of it, making it a single lane road. There is currently no stop sign at the intersection with 137th St SW. There is sidewalk only on the south side of 60th.
which is of particular concern as it boarders Picnic Point Elementary School, where hundreds of children and parents walk daily to get to and from class and activities. During school hours buses use the intersection of 60th & 140th to begin their routes. Traffic backs up and on 140th is gridlocked during drop off and pick up hours, and during after school activities as there are no turn lanes or bus lanes on 140th. Currently the amount of traffic is manageable, though not ideal. However, the addition of even half of the 1120 ADT throughout the day and particularly during peak commuting and school hours would gridlock everything and pose great danger to the children coming to and from school. The Frognal Estates plan does not address traffic on these streets at all, nor provide any mitigation for road improvement needs or impact.

In addition, Picnic Point Road, Beverly Park Rd, 52nd, 148th Street, Shelby Way, and Lincoln Way with be heavily impacted, let along the Mukilteo Speedway and Hwy 525. The Letter of Concurrency from the Department of Public Works for the Frognal Estates project, mentioned on page 2-18 of the DEIS, from 2006 has expired. Please consider the cumulative effects of not only the 1120 trips from this estate but also the new homes built off Maplewood Drive on lower Picnic Point Road, the new development just beginning on Picnic Point Road to the east of 52nd, as well as the over 50 homes in the new Azi Lee Estate on Lincoln way. Traffic is getting much worse. And Picnic Point Road in particular can be dangerous during winter, due to ice and snow on the ground.

These are major concerns that have far reaching impacts beyond the initial construction of this development. These concerns, in addition to the comments made and submitted by Jeff Eustis, Attorney at Law, Martin MacCabe, Geotechnical Project Manager, Bill Lindor, Lindor Engineering, the Sno/King Watershed Council, and the other citizens and friends of the Picnic Point Community and members of the Picnic Point Preservation Committee are presented to the county not only as issues to addressed as immediate concerns, but because of the cumulative effect this development will have on the environment, our neighborhood and our county. I ask Snohomish County to seriously consider these comments and questions and decide if this development is in the best interest of the community and county.

Sincerely,

Emily Mydynski
Picnic Point Preservation Committee
6009 137th PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Geotechnical Consultation
Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS
Snohomish County, WA

Dear Mr. Eustis,

I have been able to take only a brief look into the materials you sent regarding this proposed development, but I see some possible reasons for concern that I would like to follow up on with some additional time I hope is available.

I have attached a figure prepared by the Washington Department of Natural Resources in “Washington Geology” magazine (Gerstel et al, 1997) that shows the typical landslide geologic condition in the greater Puget Sound region, which is a steep slope in which at least two geologic materials of significance are present. The first material is an advance outwash sand (called Esperance Sand and shown in the middle portion of the slope), and the second lying directly beneath the sand is the clay (often called Lawton Clay, but in Snohomish County is the Whidbey Formation). The presence of the Whidbey Formation clay has been associated with a number of landslides. In the presence of groundwater seeping from the bottom of the sand, the underlying clay gets softened and slippery, and the sand tends to slide or flow -- as illustrated in the attached drawing.

For the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site in question, the published geologic map and recent studies have shown the same three geologic materials and likely the slide-prone geologic profile present in the vicinity. I have not yet seen enough information about the nature of groundwater conditions there, although the presence of the wetland on the west side of the site could be evidence of groundwater from the slopes above.

Sincerely,

URS Corporation

W. Martin McCabe, PhD, PE
Senior Geotechnical Engineer

REFERENCES

At the beginning of an idealized cycle, the bluff has a uniform slope. Water infiltrates the surface soils and perches above the relatively impermeable materials at the base of this sandy sequence. Saturation creates pore-water pressures that reduce the effective strength of these materials.

Runoff and precipitation introduced by the sources shown in A have infiltrated and weakened the sediments, causing failure of the unconsolidated upper sand unit. Once mobilized, the sand moves (sometimes episodically, sometimes continuously) along the contact with the underlying less permeable unit on the mid-slope bench, often cascading as a secondary landslide off the bluff formed by the lower unit. This migration of material across the bench decreases the buttressing of the upper bluff. Failure surfaces can be deep (those that project into the lower, less permeable materials) as well as shallow.

Benchd bluff retreat continues. Movement of slide debris toward the lower bluff further destabilizes the upper bluff, causing continued sloughing onto the bench. Either failure of the upper bluff onto the bench or failure of the slide debris off the lower bluff can trigger a cycle of movement. Movement along a deep-seated surface can reset this sequence of events.

Ref: Gerstel et al (1997)
WA Department of Natural Resources
Response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #1: The total acreage and acreage of parcels that comprise the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site were carefully reviewed and confirmed by Snohomish County Senior Planner Darryl Eastin during Draft EIS preparation. Minor differences between these acreages and those cited from Snohomish County Assessor's records in Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #1 are attributable to unopened rights-of-way to be vacated through the site, and may also be attributable to the higher degree of accuracy that can now be achieved using geographical information system (GIS) methods (see footnote 14 on Draft EIS page 2-9). The 0.36-acre discrepancy cited in this comment would not alter the number of lots proposed, as the number proposed is already below the number allowed by underlying zoning and the bonus density for the PRD approach (see Draft EIS Section 2.4.7.1A and Table 2.4-1, pages 2-13 through 2-15).

Response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #2: SEPA does not require an estimate of Homeowners' Association maintenance or damage/replacement costs or administrative fees. Neither is it standard practice for this information to be included in Maintenance Manuals submitted to Snohomish County. See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #12. Also see the response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #1.

Response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #3: Issues raised in Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #3 are outside the scope of this EIS, which addresses Earth and Water elements of the environment. Except for schools, the issues outside the scope of this EIS raised by the Picnic Point Preservation Committee were addressed in a programmatic EIS for the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan in December 2005. This analysis will be updated in a forthcoming programmatic EIS for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update, for which the expected date of issue is summer 2015. Impacts to schools from growth, including growth as a result of residential development on the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates property, are considered in the Mukilteo School District Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The School District updates their CFP every two years. The County will consider issues such as schools, traffic, wildlife and habitat at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing. These comments will be addressed at that time.

Response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #4: See the response to comments submitted by Aramburu & Eustis; URS (Martin McCabe, below); Lider Engineering; and Sno-King Watershed Council in Final EIS Section 2.2; and the response to General Comments Received from Individuals in Final EIS Section 2.4.

Response to the undated URS Letter attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee Letter of Comment: The Geotechnical Conditions Report (Section 3) describes the sequence of deposits encountered in exploratory borings and test pits on and adjacent to the proposed development (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013b). Vashon till, advance outwash and pre-Vashon deposits were identified. The pre-Vashon deposits consist of silty sand with silt seams and restrict the downward movement of groundwater. The figures attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee comment letter do not reflect the conditions at the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site. Specifically, the pre-Vashon deposits do not outcrop on the slope and there is no erosional action at the toe of the slope. Also, for the site area, there is no evidence from air photographs, LIDAR imagery or site inspection, of deep-seated rotational failures as depicted in the figures attached to the comment letter. LIDAR imagery of the

---

8 Unopened rights-of-way (ROW) to be vacated through the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site include: 1) the ROW through Lot 1 that connects from 58th Place W in Regatta Estates with the unopened ROW of 60th Avenue W extended that passes between Lot 28 and Lot 1; 2) the extended but unopened ROW of 60th Avenue W; and 3) unused ROW that is the north half of what was to be 136th Street SW.
proposed development and areas downstream are shown on Figure 2.2-1. The landforms associated with landslides are clearly seen in the bluffs and the Picnic Point Creek valley west of the intersection of Picnic Point Road and Maplewood Avenue (bowl-shaped landslide headscarp, irregular topography of landslipped soils). By contrast, the slopes further upstream on the south side of the valley that are on and adjacent to the proposed development do not show any of these features.
Dear Mr. MacCready -

I have attached comments regarding the Frognal Estates proposed development. Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Adman
Sno-King Watershed Council
September 2, 2014

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/s 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046

SUBJECT:  Frognal Estates Draft EIS
Comment Due Date:  September 8, 2014

We offer the following comments:

1.  The presence of neo-natal, juvenile endangered Chinook Salmon has been documented in lower Picnic Point Creek, but was not discussed in the Draft EIS. This endangered species has been documented in the recent study, *JUVENILE CHINOOK SALMON REARING IN SMALL NON-NATAL STREAMS DRAINING INTO THE WHIDBEY BASIN*, December 3, 2013. This report states that juvenile Chinook salmon are not just present in these small streams, but are actively rearing and growing in them. They appear to be using these small streams discharging to Puget Sound, such as Picnic Point Creek, as a nursery much like natal and pocket estuaries are used by juvenile Chinook salmon to transition from fresh to saltwater.

Under SCC 30.62A a Critical Areas Study must be performed to determine the extent of this endangered species' critical habitat area, including preparation of a critical area site plan, and restrictions placed on the construction of new structures or the removal of native vegetation within the fish habitat conservation area. This must be accomplished as a part of the Draft EIS to determine the extent of the impact on the critical habitat for the endangered Chinook Salmon.

2.  SCC 30.62A.460(5) requires the developer to use Best Available Science (BAS) applicable to the endangered species, demonstrating how the proposal will provide sufficient protection of the critical species and its habitat.

3.  The project proponent has proposed to use the Department of Ecology's *Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington*, 2005 edition for the design of its stormwater flow control, water quality treatment, and temporary erosion and sediment controls (TESC). This manual is now outdated and has
been superseded by the *Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, 2012 edition* (SWMMWW). All stormwater design work must be accomplished under the newer stormwater manual.

4. Furthermore, the project proponent proposes to use the Department of Ecology's *Low Impact Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound, 2005 edition*. This manual is also outdated and no longer represents BAS. Rather the 2012 edition of the *Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound* should be used as a design standard.

5. Low Impact Development does not mean NO Impact Development. Again potential impacts to the endangered species critical habitat area must be identified for the Frognal project.

6. Picnic Point Creek has been impacted and degraded by stormwater runoff from developments permitted or constructed prior to the adoption of the current Snohomish County Drainage Manual, 2005 edition, which is not in compliance with the current Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Development projects that were vested prior to October 1, 2010 are only required to meet the requirements of the very obsolete *Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin, 1992 edition*. Many more projects using outdated stormwater design manual within the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin may be pending and contribute to the cumulative impacts to the already degraded Picnic Point Creek.

7. If permitted the Frognal Estates development should be required to enhance Picnic Point Creek to mitigate any degradation from this development or cumulative impacts from future development.

8. The Draft EIS did not address Indirect and Cumulative Impacts from the Frognal Estates development. SEPA also requires Snohomish County, as the lead agency, to identify and evaluate probable impacts. These include:

   - Indirect (or secondary) cumulative impacts;
   - Direct cumulative impacts; and
   - Climate change as a cumulative effect.

9. The Draft EIS did not identify and evaluate probable impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures, emphasizing important environmental impacts and alternatives (including cumulative, short-term, long-term, direct and indirect impacts as required by WAC 197-11-030(2)(b) and (g).

   These impacts could include impacts from further development in the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin or other developments such as retail strip malls and other services required to support the Frognal Estates homeowners.

10. A map should be prepared for the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin delineating current or proposed developed areas with impervious surfaces not in compliance
with current stormwater flow control and water quality treatment; and future areas that could possibly be developed with stormwater flow control and water quality treatment meeting the requirements of the 2012 edition SWMMWWW.

11. As one of several possible mitigations for this project, the project proponent should agree to replace the fish blocking culvert at stream crossing at Picnic Point Road, immediately north of the Fronsol Estates project. Replacing this non-conforming culvert with a culvert designed in accordance with most current WDFW design requirements per its Water Crossing Design Guidelines 2013 or most current edition will open up several miles of high quality salmon spawning beds.

12. The Draft EIS indicated that it would be the homeowner’s responsibility to maintain the proposed LID installed as a part of this project. While some homeowner’s may maintain the LID’s on their property, experience has shown that many others do not. This puts an undue burden on County staff to contact each non-compliant homeowner.

In lieu of this, the Draft EIS should require that the maintenance of all LID measures be the responsibility of the homeowner’s association. In the event that LID measures are not maintained, the County can notify the homeowner’s association to correct the problem before the County must take action to correct the problem and back charge the homeowner’s association.

13. As a mitigation to help protect endangered Chinook Salmon, the homeowner’s association should strictly limit the use of outdoor fertilizers and prohibit the use of fungicides, insecticides, and other pesticides. The use of high runoff grass lawns as well as non-native ornamental plants that require frequent and heavy use of pesticides and fertilizers should be prohibited. All plantings should be local, native vegetation that is low maintenance and requires less water when fully established.

Thank you for your consideration and incorporation of the Sno-King Watershed Council comments.

Respectfully submitted

Eric Adman, President
Sno-King Watershed Council
www.snokingwatershedcouncil.org
snokingwatershedcouncil@gmail.com
SNO-KING WATERSHED COUNCIL

With the exception of Comment #5, the Sno-King Watershed Council letter of comment is identical to the Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers letter of comment. For this reason, cross-reference is made to responses to the Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers comments above.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #1: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #2: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #2.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #3: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #3.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #4: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #4.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #5: Stormwater management design for the project followed the Stormwater Manual for Western Washington 2005 edition and the Low Impact Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound 2005 edition. The objectives of the requirements and guidelines in these documents are to minimize or avoid adverse impacts to receiving water bodies. By following the methodologies described in these documents it was concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts to Picnic Point Creek. Draft EIS Chapter 3 identifies potential impacts to Earth and Water Resources. Section 3.2 discusses the potential impacts to surface and groundwater resources, and notes that proposed low-impact development technologies will result in increased recharge to groundwater. The duration of flows to the wetland to the northwest of the site and ultimately to Picnic Point Creek will increase throughout the year, including the summer months when existing stream and groundwater flows are at their lowest. It is estimated that the changes in runoff and groundwater recharge will result in an increase of less than 1.0 percent in the total basin flow volumes for both average and wet years.

Also see the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1, and to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #6: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #5.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #7: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #7.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #8: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #6.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #9: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #9.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #10: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #10.
Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #11: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #11.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #12: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #12.

Response to Sno-King Watershed Council Comment #13: See the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #13.
2.3 SEPA Comments Received from Individuals

Snohomish County PDS received approximately 184 letters of comment and e-mail communications from individuals during the 47-day Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Draft EIS comment period. These comments were signed by persons representing approximately 148 households. Approximately 16% (24) of the individual comments were submitted by persons with non-local addresses. The majority of the letters received from individuals expressed concern about the proposal. Approximately 46 letters of comment included a statement expressing opposition to the project. Four of the comments submitted by individuals residing within the local area suggest that larger home sites should be considered, or that the size of the project should be limited. Two different individuals (one living outside the local area) submitted comments indicating they would support lower-density development on the site.

All comments received in writing from individuals are reproduced in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the Final EIS. Comments that receive a response in Section 2.3 are more specific, technical, and on subjects that were within the scope of the Draft EIS (Earth and Water elements). General comments are reproduced in Section 2.4, and receive general responses in that section.
Dear Mr. MacCready,

I live near these woods, I have walked in them. I was shocked to hear of the idea that someone would build there.

I already sent a letter to become a party of record on Frognal Estates. I have looked over the DEIS. Despite what it looks like on paper, in the light of Oso, I feel it is unconscionable to build on a slide prone area, no matter how advanced the techniques may be, building on such a steep slope cannot account for Mother Nature, the power of water to undermine and the possibility of earthquakes as evidenced by the following excerpt from the mentioned study.

From the North Edmonds Earth Subsidence and Landslide Hazard Area Summary Report, Edmonds, Washington- pg. 9
CONCLUSIONS spoke of the use of sewers and storm drainage improvement to improve stability in landslide area but also said it could change because of groundwater and drainage seepage back into the area over time and concluded with "Nonetheless, it is imperative that applicants and homeowners understand that living in a known landslide area presents a real and substantial risk to both public safety and private/public property. Residents in and immediately adjacent to the North Edmonds ESLHA should be prepared to accept that risk."

Not a good selling point. People will be more skeptical because of Oso. I hope this project is not allowed to go forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Baczewski
6200 137th PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
MARY BACZEWSKI (AUGUST 21, 2014)

Response to Mary Baczewski August 21, 2014 Comments: As stated in the report cited by Ms. Baczewski, the North Edmonds landslide area has a documented history of instability. However, as noted in the response to the URS letter attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter of comment in Final EIS Section 2.2, conditions that lead to landslides in the Puget Sound bluffs, such as in the North Edmonds area, are significantly different compared to the slopes at the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site. Please see the response to those comments.
Good afternoon Paul,

Our home at 6014 133rd pl sw, is adjacent and on a very steep downward slope to the proposed construction site. Obviously downing the amount of trees that are needed to build 112 homes is going to affect the root system of all the trees, which will pose increased threats of falling trees and inevitably problematic drainage. Some of the questions that I have are:

1) How will they prevent drainage from affecting our properties?
2) Is there a map of the proposed layout?
3) Are they going to leave a buffered tree line between our house and the 112 houses that they are building?
4) Do we as affected homeowners have any voice in the proposed construction?
5) Will the city allow a permit if construction has potential to (presumably) drastically affect homeowners adjacent to construction?

We have not had a general HOA meeting yet but I imagine there may be several concerned homeowners at the Regatta Estates that have many other questions and would love to understand exactly when, where, and how the construction will occur.

Thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you. Have a great weekend!

Julie Burson
360.840.6347
Response to Julie Burson Introductory Comments: It appears from the address that the Julie Burson residence is in Regatta Estates, which is at the base of the proposed development. Mitigation measures proposed and required to stabilize slopes during construction and in the completed condition of the development are described in Draft EIS Section 3.1.1 Topography (page 3.1-4); Section 3.1.2 Geology and Soils (pages 3.1-16 through 3.1-19); and Section 3.1.3 Erosion (pages 3.1-21 through 3.1-25). Mitigation measures proposed and required for stormwater management during construction and in the completed condition of the development are described in Draft EIS Section 3.2.1 Surface Water Movement, Quantity and Quality (pages 3.2-18 through 3.2-20).

Response to Julie Burson Comment #1: Mitigation measures proposed and required for stormwater management during construction and in the completed condition of the development are described in the Draft EIS on pages 3.2-18 through 3.2-20.

Response to Julie Burson Comment #2: A map of the proposed layout of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD can be located using the Draft EIS List of Figures. See Figure 2.5.4-1 in Draft EIS Chapter 2, Section 2.5 (page 2-34).

Response to Julie Burson Comment #3: A 180-ft wide buffer of existing forest trees and vegetation is proposed between the Burson residence at 6014 133rd Pl SW and the backs of lots in Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates. Along the north property line of the development, a forest vegetation buffer varying in width from the minimum 120 feet to 200 feet is proposed to screen homes along 133rd Place SW. Where the proposed buffer will be at its narrowest width (120 feet), there is an existing buffer of 25 feet behind the homes along 133rd Place SW.

Response to Julie Burson Comment #4: Existing homeowners in the neighborhood have a voice through commenting on the Draft EIS and at the upcoming Preliminary Plat hearing for the County's consideration during the decision-making process on the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application. Snohomish County PDS also accepts comments any time between issuance of the Draft EIS (which occurred on July 23, 2014), and the hearing (not yet scheduled).

Response to Julie Burson Comment #5: The County will consider potential construction effects to adjacent homeowners during the Preliminary Plat hearing.
Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Frognal Estates proposal. I did send in the same information using the county website and comment form this proposal, but am sending it to you directly as well to ensure they reach you.

Thank you,
Peggy Cox
6301 136th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Frognal Estates Development Proposal Response

From: Peggy Cox
       6301 136th Pl SW
       Edmonds, WA

August 17th, 2014

Hello,
Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed Frognal Estates development. My concerns are related to the following:

1. Lack of road and transportation infrastructure to safely handle the increased number of vehicles and population related to the density of the housing development being proposed. There are limited entries and exits into this area, which means the county will not be able to mitigate any negative traffic impacts in the future.

2. There are many people, including children, outside of the school zone, that walk, bike and run on Picnic Point Road, 140th and neighboring streets. I consider the unavoidable increase in vehicle traffic that will result from this development, mixed with people traffic, to be a significant safety hazard. Without a way to mitigate vehicular traffic and people, it seems irresponsible to allow this development without requiring a substantial decrease in the number of homes being proposed.

3. The current confidence level in Snohomish County to appropriately manage building permits in slide prone areas is low. What are the steps being taken to ensure this development will not exacerbate slides if this steep area is developed? I understand there is an environmental evaluation that takes place. I would ask that this development not be viewed as 'business as usual' but that the steepness and soil characteristics seriously be considered for fit with the large-scale proposal. Residents in the area have much to be concerned about in this regard.

4. I am concerned about noise from the additional development, but do not consider that this factor would be taken into account in the approval or denial of the proposal.

5. There are currently four major developments underway in this area - the development close to the entrance of Meadowdale Beach Park; the development spanning the corner of 168th and Beverly Park Road behind the school in Lynwood; the development of a large lot along Picnic Point road a few blocks before the split of the road going to Picnic Point County Park and the Picnic Point School; and the large apartment development at the intersection of Beverly Park road and Mukilteo speedway. The loss of tree canopy, open spaces, and the decrease in the number of undeveloped areas and the benefits they provide is happening at an astonishing rate. It is not obvious that Snohomish County has given the combined impacts of these developments as they come to completion due consideration. I do not see any time being set to allow for evaluation of the impacts of
these developments prior to considering the Frognal Estates proposal and as someone who lives live in the area; I would ask that this be part of your decision making process.

6 I would encourage you to factor in the desirability of variety in housing options for the citizens of Snohomish County. It appears that all of the new development taking place is high density and urban in nature. Before all of our forested and natural areas have been re-purposed for business and urban style residential developments, please consider what we stand to lose for the minimal gain in the area that has been selected for development. Is there not another more suitable area for this type of development?

Sincerely,
Peggy Cox
pccox@ix.netcom.com
Response to Peggy Cox Comment #1: Road and transportation infrastructure and mitigation to be required of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates development will be addressed during the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application.

Response to Peggy Cox Comment #2: See the response to Peggy Cox Comment #1, above.

Response to Peggy Cox Comment #3: Landslide potential on the subject property has been evaluated on a site-specific basis, considering groundwater conditions, geotechnical properties of the soils that form the slope (grain size, strength properties), slope geometry, and prior history of mass movement in the vicinity. See the response to the undated URS Letter attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter of comment following the response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #4 in Final EIS Section 2.2.

Response to Peggy Cox Comment #4: The issue of noise during construction and in the completed condition of the development is outside the scope of this EIS, but will be considered among potential conditions to be applied by the Hearing Examiner during the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application.

Response to Peggy Cox Comment #5: The four developments listed in Peggy Cox Comment #59 are all within the Urban Growth Area and underwent environmental review prior to the issuance of permits that authorized their construction. Planning for new development within the Urban Growth Area was also subject to programmatic environmental review, to consider the combined impacts of development at densities contemplated within the UGA, prior to receipt of those specific project applications. None of the projects cited in this comment constitute growth caused by Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates (e.g., a direct impact), nor are they an indirect result of Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates, facilitated by this proposal (see Section 2.11 added to the Draft EIS by means of the Final EIS Errata Sheet, Chapter 3, page 3-1). For these reasons, a cumulative impacts analysis to address these other development activities already underway is not required in the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates EIS (see the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #6 in Final EIS Section 2.2).

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) identifies limited requirements for the evaluation of cumulative impacts (see the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #6 in Final EIS Section 2.2).

Response to Peggy Cox Comment #6: The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requires evaluation of "... only the no action alternative plus other reasonable alternatives for achieving the proposal’s objective on the same site" (WAC 197-11-440[5][d]). For this reason, the County will be considering the alternatives evaluated in the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Draft EIS during the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application. Also see the response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #4 in Final EIS Section 2.2.

---

9 A) The Preserve at Meadowdale Beach Park is built-out and homes are mostly sold. This development relied on entirely different infrastructure than that which will serve Frognal Estates. B) Glenwick Grove near the corner of 168th Street SW and 52nd Avenue W had completed all infrastructure at the time of this writing, and home construction was underway. This project is approximately 1.8 miles south of Frognal Estates. C) Property on the north side of 140th Street SW across from the "Y" with Picnic Point Road is a one-acre parcel zoned for Neighborhood Business use. An application for a Day Care Center was filed for this site in 2009. Development on this site would be served by existing infrastructure currently available in the adjacent roadway. D) The apartment complex at the location of Beverly Park Road and Mukilteo Speedway is approximately 1.8 miles east of Frognal Estates, and does not constitute growth caused by, or facilitated by, the Frognal Estates proposal.
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: Judy Heydrick <judystan01@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2014 12:13 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: General Comments
Attachments: IMG_0781.JPG; IMG_0782.JPG; IMG_0784.JPG

Project Manager

The proposed Frognal Estates Project appears to have many similarities to the failed Sultan development, Timber Ridge. I believe much can be learned from the Timber Ridge debacle in preventing a similar type development from becoming an environmental, financial and public health disaster in Snohomish County.

Timber Ridge was approved for a 33 acre, 87 unit development on a steep hill nearly ten years ago. The site was covered with a canopy of mature coniferous and deciduous trees until they were all cut to allow for the construction of two roads and scores of housing units. To date only 6 homes have been built and some or all have structural problems.

In 2004 when the Timber Ridge land use review process began, the City of Sultan requested input from various natural resources experts regarding the suitability of the site for development. After site visits the experts shared their multiple concerns with Sultan's City Administrator, who was clearly not interested in their findings. A natural resources expert from the Tulalip Tribes advised:

*Within the ravines of most of the streams in the proposal there is evidence of bank instability as well as in-channel deposits that have resulted from slope instability.*
*The failures appeared to occur in a deep seated rotational fashion. With site clearing, acres of existing trees would be clear cut and the hillside would be graded. If vegetation is removed as proposed, increased movement of the slope is likely to occur. The Applicant proposes to mitigate the impact with the planting of one gallon size Western red cedars and willows. Unfortunately young trees that come in small containers take years to develop a root system capable of stabilizing steep hillsides and grow canopies large enough to shade salmon bearing streams. Until the trees mature, this proposed mitigation effort is totally useless in stabilizing a hillside that has shown considerable evidence of instability.*

In 2005, Sultan's City Council ignored the collective advice of the natural resources professionals and overrode both of the Hearing Examiner's denials to approve the geologically unstable site for development. A few years later, the land was in fact slipping and sliding, just as the experts predicted. Consequent engineering studies determined that "the potential exists for extreme structure damage due to possible earth settlement and landslide activity." A moratorium was enacted during a lengthy study period and just lifted. It's doubtful that the mostly vacant overgrown project site has a future.

Over the years millions of dollars have been lost by a string of developers, banks, bond insurers, the six current homeowners plus the City of Sultan that provided the costly infrastructure.

I understand that Picnic Point has had several recent documented landslides, a clear indication that the project site sits on geologically unstable ground. If the forest canopy is removed, the steep hillside is likely to become even more unstable, putting future residents and their properties in harms way. As the permitting agency, does the County want to assume this sort of liability? In order to avoid another Timber Ridge debacle I urge you to DENY the project based on RCW 36.70A.030 (9) "Geologically hazardous areas" means areas that
because of their susceptibility to erosion, sliding, earthquake, other geological events, are **not suited to the siting of commercial, residential, or industrial development consistent with public health or safety concerns.**

I would like to become a Party of Record for this proposed project. Thank you for your consideration.

Judy Heydrick  
P.O Box 352  
Sultan, WA 98492
**Judy Heydrick (August 15, 2014)**

**Response to Judy Hedrick Comments:** The potential for landslides must be evaluated on a site-specific basis; in particular, the groundwater conditions, geotechnical properties of the soils that form the slope (grain size, strength properties), slope geometry, and history of mass movement. From the information provided in the Judy Heydrick comment letter, it appears that the Timber Ridge site in Sultan had existing rotational landslides prior to that site being developed. At the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site, there is no evidence of landslides on or immediately adjacent to the property. Also see the response to the URS letter attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter of comment.
Davis Hyslop  
13102 Puget Sound Blvd  
Edmonds, WA 98026

I own property fronting Picnic Point Creek and am an advocate for the protection of the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales (a listed population under the Federal Endangered Species Act), and their food source, salmon.

I am concerned about adverse environmental impacts to the SRKWs due to increased water pollution from stormwater runoff generated by the project's impervious surfaces. The project will produce additional sediments and pollutants like fertilizers, herbicides, oil, gas, heavy metals, etc., which will threaten their sole food source, salmon, due to increased risks of sedimentation from clear cutting of trees and vegetation on the project's steep slopes and pollution to their spawning grounds.

I am attaching a report which documents Picnic Point Creek as salmon habitat: "Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report for the Cedar & Sammamish Basin." The report documents how land development activity like the proposed project adversely affect salmon.
Salmon and Steelhead
Habitat Limiting Factors Report

for the

CEDAR – SAMMAMISH BASIN
(Water Resource Inventory Area 8)

Prepared by:

John Kerwin
Washington Conservation Commission
Olympia, Washington

September 2001
# TABLE of CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................... 3

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ....................................................................................................... 12

PURPOSE OF REPORT .......................................................................................................... 32

INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 34

HISTORIC AND CURRENT SALMONID POPULATION CONDITIONS IN THE LAKE WASHINGTON BASIN ........................................................................................................... 38

KNOWN FRESHWATER DISTRIBUTION OF SALMONIDS IN THE CEDAR - SAMMAMISH BASIN (WRIA 8) ............................................................................................................. 68

THE RELATIVE ROLE OF HABITAT IN HEALTHY POPULATIONS OF NATURAL SPAWNING SALMONIDS IN THE LAKE WASHINGTON BASIN (WRIA 8) .................. 70

WATERSHED CONDITION .................................................................................................... 78

HABITAT LIMITING FACTORS IDENTIFICATION .................................................................. 80

DIRECT DRAINING STREAMS TO PUGET SOUND ................................................................. 83

BOEING CREEK ...................................................................................................................... 84

PIPERS CREEK ....................................................................................................................... 89

SNOHOMISH COUNTY STREAMS DRAINING DIRECTLY TO PUGET SOUND .................... 94

NEARSHORE MARINE HABITATS OF WRIA 8 ................................................................. 99

LAKE WASHINGTON ........................................................................................................... 271

LAKE WASHINGTON TRIBUTARIES .................................................................................. 294

THORNTON CREEK ............................................................................................................... 295

MC ALEER CREEK ............................................................................................................... 302

LYON CREEK ....................................................................................................................... 305

JUANITA CREEK ................................................................................................................... 308

KELSEY CREEK .................................................................................................................... 313

COAL CREEK ....................................................................................................................... 319

EAST LAKE WASHINGTON SMALL TRIBUTARIES ......................................................... 323

CEDAR RIVER AND CEDAR RIVER TRIBUTARIES .................................................... 326
DAVIS HYSLOP

Response to Davis Hyslop Comments: Snohomish County acknowledges that Southern Resident Killer Whales tend to follow the return of anadromous salmon to their natal streams that discharge to Puget Sound. Stormwater management design for the project followed the Stormwater Manual for Western Washington 2005 edition and the Low Impact Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound 2005 edition. (Also see the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1.) The objectives of the requirements and guidelines in these documents are to minimize or avoid adverse impacts to receiving water bodies. Based on this approach, it was concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts to Picnic Point Creek. (Also see the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1.) Construction at the site will meet State requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion (see Draft EIS Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and Targeted Drainage Report Attachment C). The document Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report has been added to the list references for the Off Site Analysis Report (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013c) by means of the Final EIS Errata sheet (Chapter 3).

The Draft EIS describes potential water quality concerns associated with urban development of the site under Surface Water Quality in Section 3.2 (pages 3.2-16 and 3.2-17), and describes proposed and required mitigation measures for these potential effects on pages 3.2-18 through 3.2-20. Also see Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #13, and the response to that comment.
Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Reed  
Last Name* Johnson

Contact Email  
1234teri@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

- [X] Traffic impacts
- [X] Tree Canopy
- [X] Neighborhood Character
- [X] Noise
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater
- [X] Other

Comment Field

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: • Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. • Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. • This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. • The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. • Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. • Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. • The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake
Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. • This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all. • There are adverse environmental impacts to both the federally- and state-protected SRKWs (due to increased water pollution from additional stormwater runoff generated by the project’s impervious surfaces, which will provide additional sediments and pollutants like fertilizers, herbicides, oil and gas, heavy metals from vehicles, yards, etc.) and the SRKWs sole food source, salmon (due to increased risks of sedimentation and pollution to their spawning grounds). • Picnic Point is a salmon habitat. "These nearshore streams support small numbers of anadromous and resident salmonids (Snohomish County, Planning and Development Services, unpublished data, 1985-1987; C. Kraemer, 2001; M. Chamblin, 2001; S. Foley, 2001; J. Jacobson, 2000). The larger of the streams, such as Big Gulch Creek, Picnic Point Creek, Lund’s Gulch Creek, Norma Creek, and Shell Creek, are capable of supporting naturally spawning coho salmon (O.kisutch) populations. Many of these streams have been routinely stocked with coho fingerlings by school and fishing groups (Kraemer, 2001)." "Asynchronous pulses of sediment originating from basin-wide soil disturbing activities (e.g., clearing and grading, streambank disturbance) characterize the delivery and routing of sediments in these Puget Sound nearshore streams. Sediment is also be routed to streams by way of the increased drainage network of roads, ditches, outfalls, and surface flow. Where stream discharge has increased, stream channels tend to over-widen, and mass wasting of streambanks and side slopes in the higher gradient stream gullies is common (Snohomish County, unpublished data). Total Suspended Solids (TSS) have been measured as high as 1500 mg/l in winter in Norma Creek (Thornburgh and Williams 2000). Much of the sediment contributing to high turbidity levels likely comes from eroding streambanks and mass wasting of side slopes. As gradient moderates in the lower reaches, riffles tend to dominate (>90 percent in Big Gulch, Picnic, Lund’s Gulch and Norma creeks) and substrate is embedded (Snohomish County, unpublished data)." "One example of how development can influence channel complexity is the road that parallels most of Picnic Creek, which limits the lateral migration of the stream channel. The loss of channel complexity, floodplain habitat and floodplain connectivity have all contributed to limiting the natural production of salmonids in these streams." "In WRIA 8, four surf smelt spawning beaches have been documented along the shoreline; the north side of Picnic Point; north of Point Edwards, the south shore of Point Wells, and Richmond Beach (Lemberg et al. 1997)." Sincerely, Reed & Teri Johnson

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frogna! Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X)Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

(  ) No

Mailing Address 1
6003 137th Place SW

City State Zip

2 - 62
The following form was submitted via your website: Froninal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Froninal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Reed

Last Name: Johnson

Contact Email: 1234teri@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character, Other

Comment Field: After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Froninal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
• There are adverse environmental impacts to both the federally- and state-protected SRKW's (due to increased water pollution from additional stormwater runoff generated by the project's impervious surfaces, which will provide additional sediments and pollutants like fertilizers, herbicides, oil and gas, heavy metals from vehicles, yards, etc.) and the SRKW's sole food source, salmon (due to increased risks of sedimentation and pollution to their spawning grounds).

• Picnic Point is a salmon habitat. "These nearshore streams support small numbers of anadromous and resident salmonids (Snohomish County, Planning and Development Services, unpublished data, 1985-1987; C. Kraemer, 2001; M. Chamblin, 2001; S. Foley, 2001; J. Jacobson, 2000). The larger of the streams, such as Big Gulch Creek, Picnic Point Creek, Lund’s Gulch Creek, Norma Creek, and Shell Creek, are capable of supporting naturally spawning coho salmon (O. kisutch) populations. Many of these streams have been routinely stocked with coho fingerlings by school and fishing groups (Kraemer, 2001)."

"Asynchronous pulses of sediment originating from basin-wide soil disturbing activities (e.g., clearing and grading, streambank disturbance) characterize the delivery and routing of sediments in these Puget Sound nearshore streams. Sediment is also routed to streams by way of the increased drainage network of roads, ditches, outfalls, and surface flow. Where stream discharge has increased, stream channels tend to over-widen, and mass wasting of streambanks and side slopes in the higher gradient stream gullies is common (Snohomish County, unpublished data). Total Suspended Solids (TSS) have been measured as high as 1500 mg/l in winter in Norma Creek (Thornburgh and Williams 2000). Much of the sediment contributing to high turbidity levels likely comes from eroding streambanks and mass wasting of side slopes. As gradient moderates in the lower reaches, riffles tend to dominate (>90 percent in Big Gulch, Picnic, Lund’s Gulch and Norma creeks) and substrate is embedded (Snohomish County, unpublished data)."

"One example of how development can influence channel complexity is the road that parallels most of Picnic Creek, which limits the lateral migration of the stream channel. The loss of channel complexity, floodplain habitat and floodplain connectivity have all contributed to limiting the natural production of salmonids in these streams."

"In WRIA 8, four surf smelt spawning beaches have been documented along the shoreline; the north side of Picnic Point; north of Point Edwards, the south shore of Point Wells, and Richmond Beach (Lemberg et al. 1997)."

Sincerely,

Reed & Teri Johnson

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frolgnal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 6003 137th Place SW

City: Edmonds

State: WA

ZIP: 98026
REED JOHNSON (SEPTEMBER 6, 2014)

Response to Reed Johnson September 6, 2014 Comment #1: See the response to Davis Hyslop comments above in Final EIS Section 2.3 with regard to concerns about potential water quality impacts to Southern Resident Killer Whale and salmon habitat in Picnic Point Creek.

Response to Reed Johnson September 6, 2014 Comment #2: See the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1 in Final EIS Section 2.2 regarding drainage manuals and regulations used to design the stormwater management system for the proposed development. There are no side slopes to Picnic Point Creek with the potential for mass wasting (landslides) that are within the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates project area.

Response to Reed Johnson September 6, 2014 Comment #3: See paragraph one of the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #7 in Final EIS Section 2.2. Technical reports prepared by a Peer Review consultant identified no significant potential degradation impacts to Picnic Point Creek from the proposed development.

Response to Reed Johnson September 6, 2014 Comment #4: Surf smelt spawning beaches were not a subject that was considered in the limited-scope EIS prepared for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD proposal, which evaluated potential impacts to the Earth and Water elements of the environment. Snohomish County will consider this comment at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing.
September 4, 2014

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201-4046

SUBJECT: Frognal Estates Draft EIS
Comment Due Date: September 8, 2014

Please consider the following comments:

1. The presence of neo-natal, juvenile endangered Chinook Salmon has been documented in lower Picnic Point Creek, but was not discussed in the Draft EIS. This endangered species has been documented in the recent study, JUVENILE CHINOOK SALMON REARING IN SMALL NON-NATAL STREAMS DRAINING INTO THE WHIDBEY BASIN, December 3, 2013, copy attached. This report states that juvenile Chinook salmon are not just present in these small streams, but are actively rearing and growing in them. They appear to be using these small streams discharging to Puget Sound, such as Picnic Point Creek, as a nursery much like natal and pocket estuaries are used by juvenile Chinook salmon to transition from fresh to saltwater.

Under SCC 30.62A a Critical Areas Study must be performed to determine the extent of this endangered species' critical habitat area, including preparation of a critical area site plan, and restrictions placed on the construction of new structures or the removal of native vegetation within the fish habitat conservation area. This must be accomplished as a part of the Draft EIS to determine the extent of the impact on the critical habitat for the endangered Chinook Salmon.

2. SCC 30.62A.460(5) requires the developer to use Best Available Science (BAS) applicable to the endangered species, demonstrating how the proposal will provide sufficient protection of the critical species and its habitat.

3. The project proponent has proposed to use the Department of Ecology’s Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, 2005 edition for the design of its stormwater flow control, water quality treatment, and temporary erosion and sediment controls (TESC). The 2005 manual is now outdated, does not represent the best available science (BAS), and has been superseded by the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, 2012 edition.
4. Likewise, the project proponent proposes to use the Department of Ecology's *Low Impact Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound*, 2005 edition. This manual is also outdated and no longer represents BAS. Rather the 2012 edition of the *Low Impact Development Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound* should be used as a design standard and does not represent BAS.

5. Low Impact Development does not mean NO Impact Development. Again potential impacts to the endangered species critical habitat area must be identified for the Frognal project.

6. Picnic Point Creek has been impacted and degraded by stormwater runoff from developments permitted or constructed prior to the adoption of the current Snohomish County Drainage Manual, 2005 edition, which is not in compliance with the current Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington. Development projects that were vested prior to October 1, 2010 are only required to meet the requirements of the very obsolete *Stormwater Management Manual for the Puget Sound Basin*, 1992 edition. Many more projects using outdated stormwater design manual within the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin may be pending and contribute to the cumulative impacts to the already degraded Picnic Point Creek.

7. If permitted the Frognal Estates development should be required to enhance Picnic Point Creek to mitigate any degradation from this development or cumulative impacts from future development.

8. The Draft EIS did not address Indirect and Cumulative Impacts from the Frognal Estates development. SEPA also requires Snohomish County, as the lead agency, to identify and evaluate probable impacts. These include:

   - Indirect (or secondary) cumulative impacts;
   - Direct cumulative impacts; and
   - Climate change as a cumulative effect.

9. The Draft EIS did not identify and evaluate probable impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures, emphasizing important environmental impacts and alternatives (including cumulative, short-term, long-term, direct and indirect impacts as required by WAC 197-11-030(2)(b) and (g)).

   These impacts could include impacts from further development in the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin or other developments such as retail strip malls and other services required to support the Frognal Estates homeowners.

10. A map should be prepared for the Picnic Point Creek drainage basin delineating current or proposed developed areas with impervious surfaces not in compliance with current stormwater flow control and water quality treatment; and future areas
that could possibly be developed with stormwater flow control and water quality treatment meeting the requirements of the 2012 edition SWMMWW.

11. As one of several possible mitigations for this project, the project proponent should agree to replace the fish blocking culvert at stream crossing at Picnic Point Road, immediately north of the Frognal Estates project. Replacing this non-conforming culvert with a culvert designed in accordance with most current WDFW design requirements per its Water Crossing Design Guidelines 2013 or most current edition will open up several miles of high quality salmon spawning beds.

12. The Draft EIS indicated that it would be the homeowner’s responsibility to maintain the proposed LID installed as a part of this project. While some homeowner’s may maintain the LID’s on their property, experience has shown that many others do not. This puts an undue burden on County staff to contact each non-compliant homeowner.

In lieu of this, the Draft EIS should require that the maintenance of all LID measures be the responsibility of the homeowner’s association. In the event that LID measures are not maintained, the County can notify the homeowner’s association to correct the problem before the County must take action to correct the problem and back charge the homeowner’s association.

13. As a mitigation to help protect endangered Chinook Salmon, the homeowner’s association should strictly limit the use of outdoor fertilizers and prohibit the use of fungicides, insecticides, and other pesticides. The use of high runoff grass lawns as well as non-native ornamental plants that require frequent and heavy use of pesticides and fertilizers should be prohibited. All plantings should be local, native vegetation that is low maintenance and requires less water when fully established.

Thank you for your consideration and incorporation of these comments.

Respectfully submitted,
LIDER ENGINEERING, PLLC

William Lider, PE, CESCL
Principal Engineer

Attachment: JUVENILE CHINOOK SALMON REARING IN SMALL NON-NATAL STREAMS DRAINING INTO THE WHIDBEY BASIN, December 3, 2013
JUVENILE CHINOOK SALMON
REARING IN SMALL NON-NATAL STREAMS
DRAINING INTO THE WHIDBEY BASIN

E.M. Beamer¹, W.T. Zackey², D. Marks², D. Teel³, D. Kuligowski³,
and R. Henderson¹

December 3, 2013

Strawberry Point N Creek, photo by Rich Henderson

¹ Skagit River System Cooperative, LaConner, WA
² Tulalip Tribes, Tulalip, WA
³ NOAA Fisheries, Seattle, WA
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William Lider may have been the source of the technical comments that appear in both the Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers and Sno-King Watershed Council letters of comment. Responses are provided to these comments at the first location where they appear in the Final EIS, which is these two letters of comment received from organizations. Cross-reference is made to those responses rather than duplicating them here in response to the William Lider comments.
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Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2014 4:50 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Julie Meghiji

Contact Email
Juliemeghiji@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[ ] Stormwater drainage
[ ] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field

One major problem with the DEIS as submitted is that reports and conversations dating back to 2005 are frequently referenced in the DEIS and are outdated. The environment in the Picnic Point Valley has changed since 2005. The data referenced is 7-9 years old and does not take into account recent development in the area, documented landslide activity, weather and water flow changes, etc. All the geotechnical reports submitted should be updated to reflect CURRENT conditions in the proposed development area. Thank you for reading my comment.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Julie

Last Name: Meghji

Contact Email: Juliemeghji@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Other

Comment Field: One major problem with the DEIS as submitted is that reports and conversations dating back to 2005 are frequently referenced in the DEIS and are outdated. The environment in the Picnic Point Valley has changed since 2005. The data referenced is 7-9 years old and does not take into account recent development in the area, documented landslide activity, weather and water flow changes, etc. All the geotechnical reports submitted should be updated to reflect CURRENT conditions in the proposed development area. Thank you for reading my comment.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 1516 204th Ave NE

City: Sammamish

State: WA

Zip: 98074

Phone Number: 4253679927

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 9/8/2014 4:49:53 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 174.239.227.207
Response to Julie Meghji Comments: Although the field work and analyses for the technical reports were primarily undertaken in 2007 and 2008, there have been no significant changes in land use or development within the Picnic Point Creek basin since these reports were prepared. There has been no documented landslide activity on or adjacent to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site, either historically or in recent years. For these reasons, the County considers the geotechnical reports appropriate and no revisions are considered necessary.

With reference to weather and water flow changes, the analyses used the meteorological records that are included in the Western Washington Hydrological Model (WWHM). This software package was developed by the Washington State Department of Ecology specifically for the types of analyses that were carried out for this project.
Dear Mr. MacCready,

Project Manager – Horseman’s Trail
Senior Planner Snohomish County

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed Horseman’s Trail Estates (File number 05-123050-SD). I recently received notice that you are considering putting 112 homes on this rugged and beautiful land. My property is adjacent to the proposed entry to this new estate. I have walked on this property and am acutely aware of how steep the hillsides are. Within 20 feet of the road entry to this property the hillside drops away, the amount of effort, materials and infrastructure to build a road, let alone homes, is of great concern to me. Despite the advances in engineering and the ability to move mountains when needed, I worry nature would win out over roads in this area. I believe there is great possibilities of landslides on these hills and the burden of maintaining streets that could fail away is not something that my neighborhood would be able to pay for, nor should it be a burden on the county.

I am sure you are acutely aware of the destruction and impact of the Oso mudslide, I have family very near the area who were greatly impacted, and a part of the rescue and recovery operations. Since then I have looked into our own neighborhood areas to assess the risks, and while I could not find public resources that evaluation the hillside behind my house I see that according to the Department of Ecology, the land to the west, and it would appear to continue up the hillsides of the valley of this plot, is deemed “unstable”. (See Department of Ecology Website http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/femaweb/Snohomish.htm, specifically map: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/femaweb/Snohomish/5N_9iith.jpg) This is a concern for my home and I would be greatly concerned that clear cutting and restructure of the hillside (let alone the extra weight of homes, roads and vehicles) would greatly compromise the stability and security of the land.

Without the large trees and shrubs that currently hold the hillside in place I would be concerned about washouts. This hillside is the watershed for many acres of land and neighborhoods, including my home which had 3” of standing water in the backyard during a single downpour in fall 2013. In addition, while I know the Picnic Point creek does not run through the property, the rainwater from this area enters the creek to the west and into the Puget Sound. The adverse effects of building on this land the impact to my own property and security is of great concern.

Please carefully address the environmental impact, including the risks of landslides and washout; the watershed impact and the cost of maintaining roads and property in risky locations. I want to know that my home is safe, that I will not be impacted by costs or inconvenience of road closures and rework. And even more so I want to know that my neighborhood would be safe and there won’t be need to worry about the loss of life and property due to natural disasters caused by pushing the limits of engineering for the sake of development.

I know you are only considering the environmental impact of the site currently, but I would also raise awareness of the impact to our schools and road traffic. My husband and I moved to the neighborhood for the school district and close proximity to Picnic Point elementary. I am currently pregnant with our first child and we are so grateful to have a great school so close. It is a concern that this school is already at capacity with portable classrooms being used for the overflow of children. Where would you put the students from 112 more homes, let alone all the other new development properties going up in the area? Traffic is also a concern, I know there are reports submitted to the county already raising concerns about the volume of traffic our roads and community can support. And lastly the environmental impact on the wildlife in our area needs to be considered as well. This is habitat for the Douglas Squirrel which is a protected species in our state. Additionally, I hear owls regularly and see evidence of burrows and nests of other types of wildlife which may also be types of protected species. I would strongly seek understanding of what is out there and the protection needed for their habitat.

MacCready, Paul

From: Mydynski, Emily <mydyna@spu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 9:55 AM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Comments of concern - Horseman’s trail

Mydynski, E
7/22/2014
Thank-you for giving notice for public concerns and allowing my voice to be heard. As you can see I am greatly concerned and opposed to development of this land adjacent to my property. Please do not allow this risky development to happen, taking away from the quality of our neighborhood, our schools, our traffic, or our wildlife. The impact is too great and the risk to make one developer richer now is not worth the costs later of the potential adverse effects to our communities, environment and county.

If there is anything else I can do or further information I can give feel free to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,
Emily Mydynski
Homeowner
6009 137th PL SW
Edmonds, 98026
206-498-0557
mydyne@spu.edu
Coastal Zone Atlas of Washington, Vol. 5, 1979 (Snohomish County)

Click on red markers to view relative slope maps.
- Slope maps are large files (230K) and may take time to open.
- Scroll top and bottom of side to side to find desired location.
- See legend to interpret maps.

These maps are intended to educate the public about Washington's shoreline and to guide regional land use decisions. These maps should not be used as a substitute for site-specific investigations carried out by qualified geologists and engineers. For additional information, contact the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program, Washington State Department of Ecology.

Designations, delineations, and boundaries were based on the best judgment of geologists and their depiction on the maps reflects the mapping and cartographic methods applied at the time. Due to either lack of geological evidence or to cartographic limitations, some unstable areas may not be fully identified on these maps. The Department of Ecology can make no warranty of the accuracy, completeness, or fitness for use of this information.
Response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #1: Based on the address provided in the Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 letter of comment, Ms. Mydynski’s residence is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection 60th Avenue W and 136th Place SW, approximately 450 feet from the proposed entrance to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site (see Draft EIS Figure 2.4-1 on page 2-4). There are existing slopes where the 60th Avenue W alignment would extend into the site. These existing slopes are fairly steep, but are not defined as Landslide Hazard Areas per SCC 30.91L.040. Slopes at this location will be eliminated by the grading proposal. Soil cut from the higher site areas will be used to fill the ravine and eliminate the steep side slopes. This is expected to increase the stability of slopes in this area. The closest location of any onsite road to a steep slope following finish grading will be 85 feet.

If any of the project roads should fail, existing landowners in the surrounding area would not be responsible for repairs. Project roads dedicated to Snohomish County as public roads will be maintained and repaired by Snohomish County Public Works. Maintenance and repair responsibility for private roads within the development will be the responsibility of the homeowners within Frognal Estates.

There are no signs of unstable slopes on Frognal Estates and no indications of any slope failures since these slopes were generally created about 10,000 years ago. See the response to Julie Meghji comments, above.

Response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #2: The Oso landslide resulted in a tragic loss of life and property. The geological and geotechnical conditions at Oso were significantly different from the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site. In particular, the damaging debris flow at Oso was caused primarily by failure and liquefaction of the 2006 slide debris (Keaton et al., 2014). This material was only lightly consolidated and thus susceptible to liquefaction when saturated. By contrast, the soil that forms the slope at Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates is advance outwash, a sandy deposit that was overconsolidated by the ice sheet during the last glaciation. As a result, it is densely compacted with much greater strength properties than the Oso 2006 slide debris.

The geology of the slopes at the site is not the same as along the bluffs and the immediately adjacent portion of the valley of Picnic Point Creek. As noted in the response to the URS letter attached to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee comments, the pre-Vashon deposits are at or below the toe of the slopes on the site, and there is no active erosion at the base of the slope. The map http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/femaweb/Snohomish/SN 9iith./jpg only extends to just west of the intersection of Picnic Point Road and Maplewood Avenue. No data are provided for the area between that point and the site, a distance of about 2,000 feet. The Off-Site Drainage Analysis Report (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013c) does identify instability of the north bank of Picnic Point Creek at Station 36+50 (see report Figure A2-19), located about 600 feet upstream of the Picnic Point Road crossing (as measured along the creek). This is on the opposite side of the Picnic Point Creek valley from the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates development.

Response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #3: As shown in Draft EIS Figure 2.5.4-1 (page 2-34), the slope above Regatta Estates will be preserved as a Native Growth Protection Area (NGPA). Some of the ravines on the site will be regraded and filled, thus eliminating the steep slopes on the ravine

10 Both the applicant's geotechnical consultant (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.) and the County's EIS Geotechnical Peer Review consultant (Anthony Burgess Consulting, Inc.) reviewed their analysis following the Oso landslide and provided letters affirming that their investigations, calculations, and recommendations are appropriate for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site. These memos appear in their technical reports that accompanied publication of the Draft EIS, and have been reproduced in Attachment B to this Final EIS.
sides. The runoff from the existing residential area south of 136th Place SW currently drains to the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site. Since the proposed development is topographically downstream from the existing residential area, it will not adversely affect the drainage in that area. As noted in the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1, the stormwater management system for the proposed development has been designed to meet the 2005 Stormwater Manual for Western Washington, which is more rigorous than required by Snohomish County regulations in effect at the time the application was deemed complete.

Response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #4: See the response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #3.

REFERENCES

Dear Mr. MacCready:

I am writing to submit two reports recently conducted on the Picnic Point Creek and surrounding Watershed area to be included and considered with the comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please consider these as a part of the record. I, and many others, are very concerned about a development with this amount of dramatic impact to the land, its effects to adjacent properties and especially the fragile ecosystem of forest, creek, Puget Sound.

Thank-you,
Emily Mydynski
6009 137th PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Picnic Point Preservation Committee  
c/o Jeffrey Eustis  
Aramburu & Eustis LLP  
720 Third Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104

Geotechnical Consultation  
Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates EIS  
Snohomish County, WA

Dear Mr. Eustis,

I have been able to take only a brief look into the materials you sent regarding this proposed development, but I see some possible reasons for concern that I would like to follow up on with some additional time I hope is available.

I have attached a figure prepared by the Washington Department of Natural Resources in “Washington Geology” magazine (Gerstel et al, 1997) that shows the typical landslide geologic condition in the greater Puget Sound region, which is a steep slope in which at least two geologic materials of significance are present. The first material is an advance outwash sand (called Esperance Sand and shown in the middle portion of the slope), and the second lying directly beneath the sand is the clay (often called Lawton Clay, but in Snohomish County is the Whidbey Formation). The presence of the Whidbey Formation clay has been associated with a number of landslides. In the presence of groundwater seeping from the bottom of the sand, the underlying clay gets softened and slippery, and the sand tends to slide or flow — as illustrated in the attached drawing.

For the proposed Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates site in question, the published geologic map and recent studies have shown the same three geologic materials and likely the slide-prone geologic profile present in the vicinity. I have not yet seen enough information about the nature of groundwater conditions there, although the presence of the wetland on the west side of the site could be evidence of groundwater from the slopes above.

Sincerely,

URS Corporation

W. Martin McCabe, PhD, PE  
Senior Geotechnical Engineer

REFERENCES

At the beginning of an idealized cycle, the bluff has a uniform slope. Water infiltrates the surface soils and perches above the relatively impermeable materials at the base of this sandy sequence. Saturation creates pore-water pressures that reduce the effective strength of these materials.

Runoff and precipitation introduced by the sources shown in A love infiltrated and weakened the sediments, causing failure of the unconsolidated upper sand unit. Once mobilized, the sand moves (sometimes episodically, sometimes continuously) along the contact with the underlying less permeable unit on the mid-slope bench, often cascading as a secondary landslide off the bluff formed by the lower unit. This migration of material across the bench decreases the buttressing of the upper bluff. Failure surfaces can be deep (those that project into the lower, less permeable materials) as well as shallow.

Benched bluff retreat continues. Movement of slide debris toward the lower bluff further destabilizes the upper bluff, causing continued sloughing onto the bench. Either failure of the upper bluff or the bench or failure of the slide debris off the lower bluff can trigger a cycle of movement. Movement along a deep-seated surface can reset this sequence of events.

Ref: Gerstel et al (1997)
WA Department of Natural Resources
The Cumulative Effects of Urbanization on Small Streams in the Puget Sound Lowland Ecoregion

Christopher W. May  
Applied Physics Laboratory, College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington

Background

In the Pacific Northwest (PNW), as in many areas of North America, urban development is rapidly expanding into areas containing much of the remaining natural aquatic ecosystems. In the Puget Sound lowland (PSL) ecoregion, the natural ecosystems most directly affected by urbanization are small streams and associated wetlands. These ecosystems are critical spawning and rearing habitat for several species of native salmonids (both resident and anadromous), including cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*), steelhead trout (*O. mykiss*), coho salmon (*O. kisutch*), chum salmon (*O. keta*), chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), pink salmon (*O. gorbuscha*), and sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*). These fish, especially the salmon species, are of great ecological, cultural, and socio-economic value to the peoples of the PNW. Despite this value, wild salmonids are in considerable jeopardy of being lost to future generations (Figure 1). Over the past century, salmon have disappeared from about 40% of their historical range, and many of the remaining populations (especially in urbanizing areas) are severely depressed. (Nehlsen et al., 1991). There is no one reason for this decline. The cumulative effects of land-use practices, including timber harvesting, agriculture, and urbanization, have all contributed significantly to this widely publicized "salmon crisis."

![Graph showing the decline in salmon stocks in the Puget Sound lowland (PSL) region, using 1978 as the base year for spawner counts (Washington State Department of Fisheries data).](image)

The effects of watershed urbanization on streams are well documented (Leopold, 1968; Hammer, 1972; Hollis, 1975; Klein, 1979; Arnold et al., 1982; Booth, 1991). They include extensive changes in basin hydrologic regime, channel morphology, and physiochemical water quality. The cumulative effects of these alterations has produced an in-stream habitat that is significantly different from that in which salmonids and associated fauna have evolved. In addition, development pressure has a negative impact on riparian forests and wetlands, which are essential to natural stream functioning. Considerable evidence of these effects exists from many studies of urban streams in the PNW (Perkins, 1982; Richey, 1982; Steward, 1983; Scott et al., 1986; Booth, 1990; Booth and Reineit, 1993; Taylor, 1993). Nevertheless, most previous work has fallen short of establishing cause-and-effect relationships between physical and chemical variables resulting from urbanization and the response of aquatic biota.
EMILY MYDYNSKI (AUGUST 4, 2014)

Response to Emily Mydynski August 4, 2014 Comments: With reference to the figure showing slide potential along the shoreline, see the response to Emily Mydynski July 22, 2014 Comment #2, above. The conclusions of the paper by May are incorporated into the requirements for stormwater management issued by Ecology in the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington, used for analysis and design of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates stormwater management system. See the response to Snohomish County Parks & Recreation Comment #1.

The Christopher May report submitted with the Emily Mydynski August 4, 2014 comments discusses existing conditions at the time of earlier development of Puget Sound watersheds. Figure 1, for example, shows a period of effect between 1978 and 1994. Having been written prior to 2000, this report describes urban development conditions before many of the current regulatory protections were instituted. New development is subject to significant changes in laws and codes that now protect the quantity and quality of water in streams and wetlands. Water quality protection is also regulated by the Federal Clean Water Act and the Department of Ecology Water Pollution Control Act (90.48 RCW).

Also see the response to Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1. The Christopher May report makes several references to the riparian zone corridor and his recommendation (page 67) for a 30 meter to 100 meter (98- to 325-foot) buffer. The closest point of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site to Picnic Point Creek is approximately 640 feet south of the creek (with intervening development that includes Picnic Point Road, the Alderwood Water and Wastewater District wastewater treatment plant, and a division of the Regatta Estates).
Dear Mr. Paul MacCready,

Thank you so much for giving us some of your time yesterday, Barbara and I really appreciated meeting you and getting a few of our questions answered.

I would formally like to request an extension of the comment period for Frognal Estates, file # 05-123050-SD.

Currently the last day to submit comments is August 22nd, 2014. I would like to request that period be extended as much as possible for the following reasons:

1) Late July & August are typically months when many people take vacations, they are not receiving mail or email and so communication about the Frognal Estates has not reached many of our neighborhood citizens.

2) Several of the HOAs in our area do not meet during the month of August for the reason mentioned above, and so are unable to communicate or discuss with the community this proposal.

3) Mukilteo School District (particularly Picnic Point Elementary) Administrative staff just came back from summer break this previous Monday (4th) and so have missed much of the comment period, and will need time to catch up with the rest of the backlog of summer before giving appropriate time to review this proposal. In addition teachers at this school, who will be impacted, will not return from summer for another week.

4) Finally, the concerned citizens of this neighborhood are in the process of hiring a Hydrologist and Environmental Lawyer to better understand the DEIS and get expert opinion on its impact. Being that it is summer, and such professionals also take vacation, and the urgent request to find an expert who has availability within their work schedule now has been difficult. Once hired they will need time to review the hundreds of pages, data and other information regarding this proposal and the land itself.

We would greatly appreciate an extended comment period.

Thank-you,

Emily Mydynski
Picnic Point Preservation Committee
206-498-0557
EMILY MYDYNSKI (AUGUST 7, 2014)

Response to Emily Mydynski August 7, 2014 Comments: The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates comment period was extended by 15 days, from August 22, 2014 to September 8, 2014.
Dear Mr. MacCready and all,

Thank you so much for your consideration, my neighbors and I really appreciate this extension.

Emily Mydynski
Picnic Point Preservation Committee
206-498-0557

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready,

Thank you so much for giving us some of your time yesterday, Barbara and I really appreciated meeting you and getting a few of our questions answered.

I would formally like to request an extension of the comment period for the Frognal Estates, file # 05-123050-SD.
Currently the last day to submit comments is August 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2014, I would like to request that period be extended as much as possible for the following reasons:

1) Late July & August are typically months when many people take vacations, they are not receiving mail or email and so communication about the Frognal Estates has not reached many of our neighborhood citizens.

2) Several of the HOAs in our area do not meet during the month of August for the reason mentioned above, and so are unable to communicate or discuss with the community this proposal.

3) Mukilteo School District (particularly Picnic Point Elementary) Administrative staff just came back from summer break this previous Monday (4\textsuperscript{th}) and so have missed much of the comment period, and will need time to catch up with the rest of the backlog of summer before giving appropriate time to review this proposal. In addition teachers at this school, who will be impacted, will not return from summer for another week.

4) Finally, the concerned citizens of this neighborhood are in the process of hiring a Hydrologist and Environmental Lawyer to better understand the DEIS and get expert opinion on its impact. Being that it is summer, and such professionals also take vacation, and the urgent request to find an expert who has availability within their work schedule now has been difficult. Once hired they will need time to review the hundreds of pages, data and other information regarding this proposal and the land itself.

We would greatly appreciate an extended comment period.

Thank-you,

Emily Mydynski
Picnic Point Preservation Committee
206-498-0557
EMILY MYDYNISKI (AUGUST 11, 2014)

Response to Emily Mydynski August 11, 2014 Comments: See the response to Emily Mydynski August 7, 2014 comments.
Dear Mr. Paul MacCready,

Project Manager
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services

I am writing with a question regarding the Frognal Estates 05-123050 SD in the Picnic Point neighborhood. Thank-you so much for taking my call today, I just wanted to follow up on my acreage question.

The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates proposal discusses the development of 22.34 acres of land. Throughout the DEIS it describes and “assemblage of 3 parcels” often referencing them in terms of sectors and lots. And the maps/figures it uses also describes them in terms of sectors and lots. Specifically it says in section 2.4 (page 2-3 of the DEIS) that Lot 1 is 7.46 acres and the other two parcels combined are 14.88 acres, for a combined 22.34 acres. However, when I look up the tax parcels for this site (3 separate tax parcels) I calculate a total acreage of 21.98 acres. The parcel that appears to be referenced as Lot 1 in the DEIS is 7.56 acres and the combined total of the two other parcels is 14.42. This information comes from the Snohomish County Assessors webpage, from the SCOPI maps. The tax parcel numbers are as follows: 00473300002701 (4.71 acres), 00473300002800 (9.71 acres) & 0085350000100 (7.56 acres). When I review this property on the Snohomish County, Permit, Planning and Zoning Map I don’t see any other adjacent vacant land parcels that appear to be a part of this development or permit application to add the additional .36 acres.

Before I move further to make this a part of the comment record I just wanted to make sure that I am not being foolish and interpreting the language and the maps incorrectly, or that I am not missing some way of calculating land removed from the property for “tax parcel” purposes. I don’t see any evidence of boundary line adjustments in the last 10 years other than the one accounted for as a part of Lot 1. Can you please confirm my understanding of reading the information provided by the county and the DEIS or direct me to the correct department that can confirm what the total actual acreage is of this site and how the developer got the "22.34 acres" number from, if that is in fact the accurate size of this development.

Thank-you so much, I really appreciate it.
Emily Mydynski
206-498-5557.
EMILY MYDYNISKI (AUGUST 29, 2014)

Response to Emily Mydynski August 29, 2014 Comments: See the response to Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #1 in Final EIS Section 2.2.
Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  Last Name*
Erika  Price

Contact Email
erikaparkerprice@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[X] Stormwater drainage
[ ] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
As a neighbor of the proposed Frognal Estates, I have been interested in understanding the impact of this development. After reading the Targeted Drainage Report Horseman's Trail PRD, I am deeply concerned about the safety of the occupants of the new homes as well as the surrounding areas. As stated in the PRD, "The site is therefore assessed as in the High Risk category for erosion." Although we have existing high risk neighborhoods, we know more now about the impact of development and the devastating consequences and loss of human life that can occur from landslides. The PRD also shows an example of erosion the only time it was observed after a heavy rain on snow event in December 2007 (similar to the event in the winter of '96/97 that caused so many landslides). "For a short distance north from the property line, the forest duff had been eroded." Erosion occurring before the development has taken place is a warning sign that should not be ignored. Thank you.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
12222 Marine View Drive

City: Edmonds
State: wa
Zip: 98026

Phone Number: 4252458207

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Erika
Last Name: Price
Contact Email: erikaparkerprice@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage

Comment Field: As a neighbor of the proposed Frognal Estates, I have been interested in understanding the impact of this development. After reading the Targeted Drainage Report Horseman's Trail PRD, I am deeply concerned about the safety of the occupants of the new homes as well as the surrounding areas.

As stated in the PRD, "The site is therefore assessed as in the High Risk category for erosion." Although we have existing high risk neighborhoods, we know more now about the impact of development and the devastating consequences and loss of human life that can occur from landslides. The PRD also shows an example of erosion the only time it was observed after a heavy rain on snow event in December 2007 (similar to the event in the winter of '96/97 that caused so many landslides). "For a short distance north from the property line, the forest duff had been eroded."

Erosion occurring before the development has taken place is a warning sign that should not be ignored.

Thank you.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 12222 Marine View Drive
City: Edmonds
State: wa
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 4252458207

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 9/2/2014 8:15:25 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 67.161.106.169
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Response to Erika Price Comments: Section 4 of the Targeted Drainage Report addresses the erosion hazard for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site, using the criteria identified in Snohomish County Rule 3044. It is important to note that the considerations for erosion in this section of the report relate to construction activities, not to the developed condition of the project. When the project is completed, the potential for erosion will be reduced due to the presence of hard surfaces (such as houses, driveways, roads and retaining walls), landscaping (grass and other plantings), and undisturbed Native Growth Protection Areas that will be preserved on portions of the existing steep slopes.

With reference to observations of the effects from the December 2007 rain-on-snow event, the “erosion” that was observed was less than 1 foot in width with a depth of a few inches into the forest duff that exposed the underlying mineral soil. Because organic soil has a low density, it is readily transported by floating. Mineral soil requires much greater flow velocities to be eroded. The potential for soil erosion has not been ignored; it will be addressed in the construction phase by appropriate erosion control measures, and in the completed development by landscaping and stormwater management. Proposed and required mitigation measures for the erosion potential of the site are described in Draft EIS Section 3.1.3 (pages 3.1-21 through 3.1-25).

---

12 The December 2007 observations on the site are reported in Draft EIS Chapter 3, Section 3.2.1 Surface Water Movement, Quantity and Quality (page 3.2-10).
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Friday, August 15, 2014 4:13 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  Last Name*
Peggy  Toepel

Contact Email
ptoepe@frontier.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[X] Stormwater drainage
[ ] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
Incorporation of LID features and BMPs may not suffice for long at the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site in our vulnerable Convergence Zone. Drainage maintenance management by the Home Owners Association could readily falter, over costs or competing priorities, for infrastructure of the proposed size and complexity, reliant upon 3 separate conveyance routes, eventually seeking County assistance. Regarding groundwater, climate change will progress, and Picnic Point Creek terrain and natural habitat will remain vulnerable. Although residential development itself will displace some wildlife habitat, it also can result in risk to human life: the risk of concurrent super-saturation of slope soils above, PLUS earthquake along the nearest quake fault, although relatively small, is finite and a genuine hazard to human safety. High density of human home sites (and their vehicles), inherent in PRDs, heightens risks of damage, injuries, and disruption of access to such locations.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1
Peggy N. Toepel

Mailing Address 2
11110 3rd Pl. SE

City State Zip
Everett WA 98208

Phone Number
425 290 6274

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request.

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Peggy
Last Name: Toepel
Contact Email: ptoepel@frontier.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage

Comment Field: Incorporation of LID features and BMPs may not suffice for long at the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site in our vulnerable Convergence Zone. Drainage maintenance management by the Home Owners Association could readily falter, over costs or competing priorities, for infrastructure of the proposed size and complexity, reliant upon 3 separate conveyance routes, eventually seeking County assistance.

Regarding groundwater, climate change will progress, and Picnic Point Creek terrain and natural habitat will remain vulnerable. Although residential development itself will displace some wildlife habitat, it also can result in risk to human life: the risk of concurrent super-saturation of slope soils above, PLUS earthquake along the nearest fault, although relatively small, is finite and a genuine hazard to human safety. High density of human home sites (and their vehicles), inherent in PRDs, heightens risks of damage, injuries, and disruption of access to such locations.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: Peggy N. Toepel

Mailing Address 2: 11110 3rd Pl. SE
City: Everett
State: WA
Zip: 98208
Phone Number: 425 290 6274

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/15/2014 4:12:44 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.47.112.125
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Response to Peggy Toepel Comments: The areal variability of precipitation, for example due to the Puget Sound Convergence Zone, is included in the precipitation statistics embedded in the software (Western Washington Hydrology Model [WWHM]) used to model the stormwater management system for the proposed development. WWHM was developed for the Washington State Department of Ecology specifically for the design of stormwater management systems appropriate for the varied soil and meteorological conditions of different locations in western Washington.

The advance outwash (sand with variable amounts of silt and gravel) that underlies the site is free-draining. The full thickness of the advance outwash is 173 feet. The maximum thickness of the saturated zone at the base of the advance outwash is about 20 feet in monitoring well #1 (MW-1), and decreases to about 10 feet at MW-2, located closer to the existing slope. As noted in Section 3 of the Groundwater Conditions Report, short-term fluctuations in groundwater levels in response to significant precipitation events have been observed to be a maximum of only 0.6 feet. Thus, the natural slopes that will be retained in the development will not become saturated to the ground surface. For the slope stability analyses, the change in groundwater level following development was included in the evaluation of the slopes under seismic loading.

See the Groundwater Conditions Report: Horseman's Trail PRD (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013e), Section 2.4.
August 12, 2014

Mr. Paul MacCready
Project Manager
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg. East
2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

RE: Fronal Estates 05-123050-SD, aka Horseman’s Trail

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

As 10 year residents of the Picnic Point area in of Snohomish County, we wanted to take this opportunity to voice our concerns regarding the above referenced project. We are vehemently opposed to the proposed plan to build 112 densely-packed homes on the land currently being identified as Fronal Estates, just as we were when the project was known as Horseman’s Trail and the plan was to build 120+ homes on the same amount of land. After reviewing the draft Environmental Impact Statement for Fronal Estates, 05-123050-SD, we have the following concerns:

1. When we built our home in 2003/2004, we were told by Snohomish County that this area was highly prone to slides and that any clearing of land or trees had to meet the strictest of county requirements for water and slope mitigation via Geo-Tech inspection, supervision and sign-off approval. Based on the slides in the area over the past ten years alone, we can only imagine that the requirements have become, or should have become, even more stringent. Therefore, we cannot possibly see how clear cutting an area the size of Fronal Estates can be done without causing severe slope instability, not to mention water erosion and runoff into Picnic Point Creek.

2. Both the traffic and population in this area are already overloading the current infrastructure (roads and schools). Approval of Fronal Estates will only put more of a burden on an already stressed infrastructure that currently does not have the funding needed to fix.

3. The area for the proposed Fronal Estates project is currently home to a multitude of wildlife, from deer to coyotes and foxes to bald eagles. Additionally, Picnic Point Creek is a spawning tributary for wild salmon. All of this wildlife would be either displaced or endangered due to the lack of habitat, food supply or pollution if this project were to be approved. As stewards for the protection of our planet, we find this outcome/scenario appalling.
The home owners in this area have endured several multi-year projects that have disrupted our ability to get to and from our homes. From the Alderwood Water Treatment Plant and now the Picnic Point Sewer Repair and Rehab project (which by the way no homeowner on Puget Sound Blvd will get any benefit from) we have been inconvenienced for going on 5 years. Now we will have to put up with construction vehicles for another project if Frognal Estates are approved. In our estimation we do not believe you would be highly motivated to live in an area that have these drawbacks.

We are requesting that you add our names as a Party of Record to this project and strongly encourage you to listen to the feedback you are receiving that opposing the approval of this project. Thank you for your attention and consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Richard Waddell

Lesley Halverson
Response to Waddell and Halverson Comment #1: The geotechnical investigations undertaken to-date at the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site meet or exceed the requirements of Snohomish County. The conclusions and recommendations contained in the *Horseman’s Trail Geotechnical Conditions Report* (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc., September 2013b) are based on three groundwater monitoring wells, six soil borings, and 28 exploration pits as well as on-the-ground observations and interpretation of LiDAR imagery. See the response to the URS (Martin McCabe) letter of comment submitted as an attachment to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter in Final EIS Section 2.2 for additional details regarding the potential for landslides in the proposed site area compared with areas further downstream along Picnic Point Creek and areas adjacent to the bluffs overlooking Puget Sound.

Clearing and grading for site development will be subject to Snohomish County requirements for earthwork activities. These requirements include development and implementation of appropriate best management practices to minimize erosion and sediment transport off site. The Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan is included as Attachment C to the *Targeted Drainage Report, Horseman’s Trail PRD* (Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc. September 2013a). This plan will be revised as necessary prior to and during construction activities, with inspection by Snohomish County to ensure adherence to the plan.

Response to Waddell and Halverson Comment #2: Traffic, population, and infrastructure issues raised in Waddell and Halverson Comment #2 are outside the scope of the EIS, which addressed Earth and Water elements of the environment. The County will consider these issues at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application.

Response to Waddell and Halverson Comment #3: Loss of wildlife habitat on the site will be considered at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application. With regard to concerns about potential impacts to Picnic Point Creek and spawning habitat for wild salmon that use this creek, see Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1 and the response to that comment in Final EIS Section 2.2. Also see the response to general comments regarding wildlife and wildlife habitat in Final EIS Section 2.4 that follows.

Response to Waddell and Halverson Comment #4: Comments noted regarding multi-year construction projects over the past 5 years in the Picnic Point area that have disrupted vehicular access to homes.

---

14 A list of geotechnical reports prepared to-date is provided in Draft EIS Chapter 4 (page 4-1) under the authors: Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc. and Associated Earth Sciences, Inc.

15 Detailed descriptions of mitigation measures proposed and required for erosion/sedimentation control are provided in Draft EIS Section 3.1.3 Erosion (pages 3.1-21 through 3.1-25).
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila
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Dear Mr. Paul MacCready,
Project Manager – Frognal Estates, Horsemans Trail
Senior Planner Snohomish County

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed Frognal Estates (File number 05-123050-SD). There are several issues the county should investigate further that the DEIS provided by the developer either does not cover or does not review sufficiently.

1) **Mitigation of environmental concerns such as landslides and washout.** The scale of change for this acreage is unprecedented in other developments in the area. This track of land is already identified as an area of landscape risk. But additionally Snohomish County has identified the whole Picnic Point Area as a “particular problem area” on page 15-14, in section 15 of its Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (Volume 1 – Planning Area – Wide Elements, PART 3 Risk Assessment). The trees located in this area are holding the area together. Without those roots, nothing remains to keep the slopes in place. As we are aware of the tragedy of Oso, I know the county is reassessing how it handles, slope, water control and landslide risk evaluation. I would like to see this DEIS take into account any new codes being considered and the high risk area in which we live.

Landslide and washout on Picnic Point Road in 1997 caused Unstable Road conditions was also a concern in 2008 for Clearview drive and Maplewood lane just across the Picnic Point Creek from the proposed development. Putting more roads in similar unstable areas should be a concern for the county and the cost of maintenance and emergency repair should be evaluated. Damage to infrastructure is not our only concern, as a landslide in this area with a development could lead to a tragic loss of human life.

2) **The maintenance costs of the retaining walls and water management systems.** Throughout the proposal the developer states that the Homeowners Association would be responsible for paying for the management and maintenance of water drainage systems as well as the maintenance of the grounds and open spaces of this property, which would include all berms, walls and retention structures. However, it does not at all offer any indication of what these costs could be for regular maintenance or damage/replacement costs. It seems the county has yet inquired into these costs. It would be prudent to know what the potential costs would be over a 5-10-20+ year period. If these costs would be manageable by an HOA, and particularly the demographic of this HOA. It would be prudent of the county to determine the costs and the amount of finances needed, ongoing and for emergency funds. Would the HOA be able to afford this? Who will pay for it if the HOA is unable or unwilling to? Is the county willing to take over cost of this area if an HOA never forms or disbands? The cost of upkeep itself should be a major consideration for the county.

3) **The impact to the roads and intersections.** Particularly the use of 60th Ave and the intersection of 60th & 140th adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary school. The DEIS implies there is no change required and that they have a document of concurrency from the department of planning. I would like to request that the Department of Planning in conjunction with the Department of Transportation take a closer look at 60th avenue.
60th is currently not very wide, nor does it have any street markings (center line, fog line, etc.) and with the potential additional 1120 ADT from the Frognal Estates added to the current traffic I do not believe this road would be up to code. Nor is there even mention of a stop sign added to the intersection of 60th & 137th, 60th also runs along the South side of the Picnic Point Elementary. This is a very pedestrian heavy area. Small children & parents are constantly walking up and down the street from the surrounding areas for school, sports and other school functions. There is currently only sidewalk on one side of this narrow street. Parking is allowed on the south side of the street; if there is a car parked on the street it limits traffic to one lane. This can be very dangerous for pedestrians as there is limited space and visibility. The intersection of 60th & 140th is also the crossroads where children and buses leave school. Children walk to and from school from the Windgate development, Picnic Point development and hundreds of other surrounding houses. It would be absolutely putting our children at risk if we add an additional 1120 vehicles to the road throughout the day without considering the impact to the arterial roads.

I would like the Departments of Planning and Transportation to also consider the high traffic on 140th, especially during the school year and the hours when school starts and when students are released throughout the day. There are significant backups as general commuters, parents and buses all try to share the roadway that does not have parking lanes, school or bus pick up lanes or turning lanes.

The intersection at Picnic Point Rd and 140th is also a concern. With heavier traffic, especially with the cumulative effect of the other new developments from the past few years in the area this intersection could need a stoplight.

4) Additionally the loss of the trees, wildlife and impact to the Picnic Point creek. As stated above the scale of change is huge. The natural beauty that the woods bring to our neighborhoods would be lost. There is Douglas squirrel & Pileated Woodpecker, just to name a couple of protected species in the trees. Below the property in the Picnic Point Creek are found Chinook Salmon Fry which is a threatened species. The loss of life and habitat surely is worth consideration of a smaller footprint to this development.

These are some of the big issues that the DEIS either does not address, or does not sufficiently address. These are major concerns that have far reaching impacts beyond the initial construction of this development. Many issues addressed will be an immediate concern, but the cumulative effect will last for years. I ask the county to seriously consider these questions and decide if this development is in the best interest of these beautiful woods. It is my hope, with the concern raised above and the unsatisfactory ways the builder has answered the problems with this area, that the county will see this area as unfit for development and will do what is necessary to protect the people of Snohomish County and the environment.

Sincerely,

Jonathon Wood
9/29/14
Response to Jonathon Wood Comment #1: The latest (2010) edition of the Snohomish County Natural Hazards Area Mitigation Plan does not include Section 15 as cited in Jonathon Wood Comment #1. This plan does include a map (Map 14-1) that shows landslide hazard areas identified by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and potential landslide areas identified by the authors of the report on the basis of Slope greater than 33% and elevation change greater than or equal to 10 feet, intersecting soft and stiff soils. The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is not included as a DNR landslide hazard area. However, the valley of Picnic Point Creek from the mouth to about 1.5 miles inland is identified as potential landslide area, including the steep slopes on and adjacent to the proposed development. There is no indication that other attributes important for narrowing-down landslide potential, such as groundwater conditions and historical evidence of mass movement from aerial photographs or LiDAR imagery, were examined in delineating these potential landslide areas. Thus, it is likely that portions of these areas will have a low potential for slides.

Without further detailed investigation of the geological and groundwater conditions at the Maplewood Avenue and Clearview Drive areas cited in Jonathon Wood Comment #1, direct relevance to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates proposed development cannot be determined. Additional discussion regarding the potential for landslides in the proposed site area compared with areas further downstream along Picnic Point Creek and areas adjacent to the bluffs overlooking Puget Sound is provided in the response to the URS (Martin McCabe) letter of comment submitted as an attachment to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter in Final EIS Section 2.2.

Response to Jonathon Wood Comment #2: See Picnic Point Preservation Committee Comment #2 and the response to that comment in Final EIS Section 2.2.

Response to Jonathon Wood Comment #3: Road and intersection concerns will be addressed at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application. Also see Aramburu & Eustis Comment #3 and the response to that comment in Final EIS Section 2.2.

Response to Jonathon Wood Comment #4: The loss of trees and wildlife, and the size of the footprint of the proposed development will be considered at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application. With regard to concerns about potential impacts to Picnic Point Creek and Chinook salmon fry that use this creek, see Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #1 and the response to that comment in Final EIS Section 2.2. Also see the response to general comments regarding wildlife and wildlife habitat in Final EIS Section 2.4 that follows.
2.4 General Comments Received from Individuals

Several of the comments received from individuals included a bullet list of issues. Some of these comments identified the Picnic Point Preservation Committee as the source of this list. Most of these same issues were also raised at the time the County published the Notice of Application, SEPA Threshold Determination, and notice of the EIS scoping period in 2007. In general, comments received from individuals were within the categories of the italicized bullet items listed below this paragraph. To the extent that these issues are within the scope of the Earth and Water elements of the environment addressed in the EIS, cross references are provided below to where these issues have received a response in Final EIS Section 2.1, 2.2, or 2.3. Cross-referencing is used to avoid duplication. Issues raised on subjects other than Earth and Water will be considered by Snohomish County at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application, and will receive a response at that time.\(^{16}\) Actual written comments submitted to the County of a general nature regarding the proposed project are reproduced following this introductory summary to Section 2.4.

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

**Response to the Slide-Prone Area General Comment:** See the URS (Martin McCabe) letter of comment submitted as an attachment to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter, and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.2. Also see comments submitted by Mary Baczewski and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.3.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

**Response to the Stormwater Runoff Water Quality Concern General Comment:** See Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comments #1 and #2, and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.2.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road generally increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

\(^{16}\) Also see the response to Aramburu & Eustis Comment #1 in Final EIS Section 2.2.
• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• The forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Response to General Comments Above: Comments expressed in the six bullet items above are outside the scope of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD EIS, and will be considered by Snohomish County at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing on the application.

Other general comments received from individuals are grouped and summarized as follows:

GRADING AND DRAINAGE

• The proposed massive amount of grading and complicated drainage are inappropriate for this natural land above Picnic Point Park.

• Concern was expressed about excavating 285,000 cy of fill dirt, which the commentor correlated to the equivalent of 390 railroad coal cars.

• The amount of grading and disruption of existing drainage will likely have a permanent damaging impact on neighboring homes and the environment.

• There will be inevitable problematic drainage. How will they prevent drainage from affecting properties below [in Regatta Estates]?

• Neighbors of the proposed clear-cut, regrade and development of densely-packed homes are fearful of the environmental impacts and safety. The potential negative impacts on stormwater drainage and grading/earthwork are astounding. Pin pilings must be required at least.

• The plan fails to address potential impacts if the weather fails to cooperate during development, before the various mitigations can actually be put in place.

• The plan does not address the amount of dust and other pollutants in the air, or increased noise that will impact current residents during the construction phase.

• Considerable negative impact would be caused by clearing trees and grading the terrain, resulting in additional mudslides along the Burlington Corridor.

• The project will have a significant impact on the salmon spawning stream flowing right below.

• Stormwater runoff is of special concern because it will increase contamination in Puget Sound, on a salmon run in Picnic Point Creek, and result in negative effects on groundwater replenishment. Streets and driveways will collect contamination from automobiles (oil, asbestos, heavy metals), and stormwater runoff will include pesticides and herbicides, in conflict with the current process underway to reduce Puget Sound contamination. Fertilizer causes rapid algal growth which, when it dies and decays, creates an oxygen deficit for young salmon.

• Picnic Point Creek is at capacity and its weirs are in a failing state.

Response to General Comments regarding Grading and Drainage: The grading and drainage impacts of the proposed development were evaluated in numerous technical studies prepared by consultants under contract to the applicant between 1998 and 2012 (as cited in technical reports prepared by Anthony Burgess Consulting (ABC) Inc. During preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, a qualified Peer Review Consultant considered the findings of the reports prepared by others,
conducted additional studies, independently evaluated potential effects, and provided mitigation recommendations. These technical reports were summarized in Draft EIS Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and are appended to the EIS in their entirety:


With regard to the proximity of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site to Picnic Point Creek and potential water quality impacts to salmon in Picnic Point Creek, see Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comments #1 and #2 and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.2.

PERCEPTION OF LANDSLIDE HAZARD

- The current confidence level in Snohomish County to appropriately manage building permits in slide-prone areas is low.
- We don't want another Oso.
- Several lessons were learned from the landslide in Darrington: over-development and over-forestation has a tremendous amount of consequences.
- The whole area is a cliff; have we learned nothing from Oso?
- Our home backs up to Picnic Point Elementary School and the buffer zone above Regatta Estates. We have nightmares of our home becoming part of a landslide akin to the disaster of the Oso mudslide. Can you provide our neighborhood assurance this will not happen? Or is the tax money worth the risk to citizens and nature?
- After the tragedy of Oso, how anyone of good conscience can propose to build in a slide-prone area is beyond me – an outrage!
- Very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude in the slide-prone Picnic Point area. It could become another Oso, in which case the County (and therefore the taxpayers) would be sued.
- We value Picnic Point County Park. This area is too fragile for the proposed kind of land use (concerns correlated to the Oso landslide).
- Concern was expressed about slides and downstream flooding, with reference to what happened in 1997.
• By stating that the Proposed Action has the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts [Draft EIS Section 1.2], Snohomish County PDS recognizes that Picnic Point is historically a slide-prone area and clearly states this development has the very real potential to cause natural or man-made destructive ecological damage.

• What steps are being taken to ensure this development will not exacerbate slides if this steep area is developed?

• Have observed many episodes of landslides due to the slope and soil make-up of the area. Developers can hire an engineering firm to say whatever they want them to say about the feasibility of development on steep unstable slopes.

• The area is historically prone to slide due to the slope. A development of this nature would increase risk to residents below. The development would remove all vegetation from the steep hillside, creating a significant risk of mud flow both during and after construction.

• Slide problems would affect rail transportation, resulting in delays and loss of people and cargo.

• If they try to build on the property abutting me it would be impossible to access without major damage to the staircase and my property. To build on this property would only be safe with much fewer, larger properties that sit closer to ground level with our subdivision [Regatta Estates], and leave the rear hillside open, natural land as my property is.

Response to General Comments regarding the Public Perception of Landslide Hazard: See the URS (Martin McCabe) letter of comment submitted as an attachment to the Picnic Point Preservation Committee letter, and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.2. Also see comments submitted by Mary Baczewski and the response to those comments in Final EIS Section 2.3.

WILDLIFE AND WILDLIFE HABITAT

• The development will destroy a substantial amount of wildlife habitat.

• This development is short-sighted and not conducive to protecting salmon and wildlife habitat.

• You are about to destroy the home of wildlife and likely endangered species that enrich all of us.

• The site provides natural habitat for rare mountain beavers.

• Absolutely appalled that this land could be considered for anything but a protected habitat.

• We need to keep our green spaces green and preserve wildlife.

Response to General Comments regarding Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat: Wildlife and wildlife habitat are out-of-scope elements as they relate to the Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared for the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD. The County will consider these comments at the time of the Preliminary Plat hearing. It should be noted, however, that there are no endangered animal species known to occur on the site. In particular, the legal status of mountain beaver in Washington is "unclassified." They are abundant in moist forests, on ferny slopes, and in damp ravines in urban areas in western Washington, western Oregon, and south into California (WDFW 2015).

A Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) database search was requested during preparation of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates Final EIS. The database search results (February 26, 2015) identify no Federally-listed threatened or endangered species, and no State-listed species on the site. The property is mapped within a priority habitat identified as Biodiversity Areas and Corridors that includes undeveloped forested slopes from Norma Beach northward along the
Puget Sound shoreline to Picnic Point, and eastward along the slopes above Picnic Point Creek. The WDFW PHS Section Manager clarified the meaning of this map designation as follows (personal communication with Keith Folkerts, WDFW, March 9, 2015):

This Priority Habitat type is used to show habitat areas that are relatively important to various species of native fish and wildlife. Biodiversity areas within [Urban Growth Areas] UGAs typically contain habitat that is valuable to fish or wildlife and is mostly comprised of native vegetation. Site characteristics often include multiple layer canopy, snags and downed logs, diverse communities of species, etc. WDFW has no land use authority, so the implications of such a designation are up to the local jurisdiction. Within PHS areas we recommend that site-specific analysis inform the management of the land and that appropriate steps be taken to conserve habitat functions.

Snohomish County does not directly use the Priority Habitat designations from WDFW as a regulatory tool. Rather, Priority Habitat is one piece of information used in local planning. Actions taken by Snohomish County to protect wildlife habitat in this area include purchasing significant acreage from Chevron for parkland (1978), adopting critical areas regulations to “protect unique, fragile, and important elements of the natural environment” (SCC 30.62.010) (2002), and lowering the comprehensive plan designation for residential density along Picnic Point Road from Urban Medium Density Residential to Urban Low Density Residential (2005).

**FORESTED LAND**

- The forested land is home to many animals and birds.
- Please preserve this little pocket of wilderness enjoyed by children. It is important green space.
- One of the attractions when we bought our house in this neighborhood a year ago was the green space that would be used for this development. For health reasons, we need to be in an area with lots of trees for cleaner air.
- I strongly believe in the outdoors and know what it means to grow up in an area that has trees and trails to walk and explore which teaches respect for the environment. Stop this senseless proposal and allow this area to stay the way it is to enjoy the beauty and environmentally positive area.
- Can we not leave some trees?
- Residents of this area take pride in living among a beautiful 22-acre forest.
- Trees remove pollution from the air and allow groundwater to be slowly absorbed.
- One function of trees is the retention of rainwater in such a way that it replenishes the underground water supply. Removing more than 16 acres of trees will reduce the natural replenishment of groundwater.
- Downing the amount of trees that are needed to build 112 homes is going the affect the root system of all the trees, which will pose increased threats of falling trees and inevitably problems with drainage.
- The green belt serves as a wind breaker. Gusts of wind from Puget Sound break power lines.
- Concern was expressed about clear-cutting 17.5 acres.
- Will there be a buffer adjacent to Regatta Estates?
To construct 60th Avenue W through Frognal Estates to Picnic Point Road would require removing approximately 150 to 200 important trees for the road alone. This corridor has signage advising that it is a protected zone, off-limits to the public, in order to protect the watershed and stream that runs down to Picnic Point Park and Puget Sound. This slope should be protected to secure the uplands, watershed and stream for salmon passage and for stabilization of the slope leading down to the railroad tracks.

I was told this land was preserved for green space by the County and would never be built on. Then the School District sold it and the County changed the provisions.

Shame on Snohomish County for proposing a change to Ordinance #14-070 that will allow developers to more easily remove old growth trees without replacement. The proposed change to the area into an urban growth zone must be reverted to protect this last pristine area upstream from Puget Sound.

If the project goes forward, the developer should be required to provide for Parcel 00569000000100 to be acquired and eventually or immediately converted to a forest preservation/wetland/green space area. This parcel is located just south of the intersection of 140th Street SW with Picnic Point Road. It is hoped that compromise aimed at retaining some decent residential quality of life can be arrived at.

Has the County considered the cumulative impact of loss of tree canopy and reduction in number of undeveloped areas with four major developments underway in the area: 1) close to the entrance of Meadowdale Beach Park, 2) spanning the corner of 168th and Beverly Park Road behind the school in Lynnwood, 3) large lot along Picnic Point Road a few blocks before the split going to the County Park and Picnic Point School, and 4) large apartment development at the intersection of Beverly Park Road and Mukilteo Speedway.

Response to General Comments regarding Forested Land: Snohomish County adopted tree retention requirements in January 2009 (Ordinance No. 08-101). These requirements were revised in October 2014 (Ordinance 14-073). The Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates application is vested to regulations in effect at the time the application was deemed complete (August 2005); therefore, the County's tree retention requirements do not apply to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD. The applicant's proposal for planting trees within the development, and for retaining trees within Native Growth Protection Areas on the site under either development scenario evaluated in the EIS, is described in Section 2.5.4.6 (Draft EIS page 2-44), and summarized again in mitigation measures for Erosion (Draft EIS Section 3.1.3, pages 3.1-21 and 3.1-24). The applicant's tree retention/tree planting proposal is summarized in Final EIS Table 1.7-1 (pages 1-26 and 1-27 of this document).

SCHOOLS

Was the School District consulted?

The Mukilteo School District is currently overcrowded and has maximized use of portables at Picnic Point Elementary.

Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary are at maximum capacity now. Additional students from the proposed development would stretch the financial limits of the Mukilteo School District and unnecessarily burden taxpayers.

Response to General Comments regarding Schools: Impacts to schools from growth, including from residential development of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site, are considered in the Mukilteo School District Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The School District updates their CFP every two years.
PICNIC POINT PARK

- *The project would cause a negative impact to the vital recreational resource of Picnic Point County Park.*

**Response to General Comments regarding Picnic Point Park:** Public park issues are outside the scope of this EIS. The availability of County parks and open space was considered during Growth Management Act (GMA) planning within the County, and evaluated in the programmatic EIS prepared for the Snohomish County 2005 GMA Comprehensive Plan. The County's GMA Comprehensive Plan and programmatic EIS are currently being updated (expected date of issue: summer 2015). The 2015 update is anticipated to include a new Parks and Recreation Element component of the Comprehensive Plan.

PICNIC POINT WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

- *The recent new improved sewer system [Alderwood Water and Wastewater District] would be unable to deal with the effluent. It already smells bad.*

- *Concerned about the effect on the wastewater treatment plant in South Gulch [Alderwood Water and Wastewater District] from which untreated sewage is currently being trucked to another location for treatment.*

- *Sewer pipes are maxing out their ability to handle runoff, resulting in flooding.*

**Response to General Comments regarding Picnic Point Wastewater Treatment Plant:** The provision of public sewer service to the proposed Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates development is discussed in Draft EIS Section 2.4.7.4 (Draft EIS pages 2-19 through 2-20). The Alderwood Water and Wastewater District issued certificates of sewer and water availability to the owner in August 2005, at the time the application was deemed by Snohomish County to be complete. Subsequently, there was a temporary moratorium on sewer hookups in the Picnic Point area pending completion of a Picnic Point Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade. The moratorium was lifted effective April 4, 2011 as a result of completion of the work at the treatment plant. Snohomish County regulations prohibit connection of stormwater discharges to the wastewater collection/treatment/disposal system.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

- *There is a lack of road and transportation infrastructure to safely handle the increased number of vehicles.*

- *There will be a significant traffic hazard for school children and pedestrians.*

- *60th Avenue W is a narrow street that was the scene of a child hit by a car in 2001. No improvements are planned for the street, unless at the expense of Snohomish County.*

- *60th Avenue W is not very wide and does not have markings like a center line or fog line. There is a sidewalk on only one side. Parking is allowed only on the south side. When a car is parked there, traffic is limited to one lane.*

- *There will be near catastrophic traffic safety hazards.*

- *The Snohomish County Sheriff's Department does not "police" the area to write speeding tickets, reckless driving, accidents; they only respond to 911 calls.*
• There are two schools on 140th Street SW. This road is the only way out of the Picnic Point community. Additional traffic would make 140th Street SW impassable.

• There is high traffic on 140th Street SW with significant back-ups as general commuters, parents and buses all try to share the roadway that does not have parking lanes, school or bus pick-up lanes, or turning lanes.

• There are no alternative access roads for the increased traffic.

• Fix current road and drainage problems before considering the possible addition of another 122 homes.

• Road construction and repairs in the area have been atrocious, and road drainage problems remain unfixed.

• In 1995, Snohomish County paid over a million dollars to repair a road that was immediately adjacent to this proposed development. The soil is the same and without the root structure of trees, what can the public expect?

• Picnic Point Road and 140th Street SW are nowhere ready to absorb the additional daily car trips that would result from an additional 100+ homes being built behind Picnic Point Elementary School.

• A resident who lives in the Wingate community and uses the 54th Avenue W entrance to access Picnic Point Road comments that this intersection is currently overwhelmed by daily traffic and poor sight distance due to the sloping roadway. An additional 1,150 cars per day will exacerbate the problem.

• We pay high taxes and have a beautiful development. We should expect to be able to drive Picnic Point Road without additional stress that it already has. Please do not permit this development to further impact our transportation issues.

• Picnic Point Road (140th Street SW) is the main access road for the Picnic Point, Woodsound, and Windsong neighborhoods; it is often congested now. Additional vehicles from the proposed development will only increase this gridlock. A natural or man-made disaster will limit emergency vehicles from accessing these neighborhoods.

• Picnic Point Road is already congested beyond capacity during peak commute times and during school hours. In 2012, the commentor requested that a 3-way stop be placed at the intersection of Picnic Point Road/52nd Street to ease traffic. This request was never taken into consideration by the County.

• There are limited bike lanes and no transit facilities nearby to help relieve car trips.

Response to General Comments regarding Traffic and the Transportation System: Traffic and sidewalk improvements are outside the scope of this EIS. These issues were addressed in a programmatic EIS for the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan in December 2005, and will be updated in the forthcoming programmatic EIS for the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update (expected date of issue: summer 2015).

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF LIFE

• This is a huge development. It will not fit in with the existing neighborhoods.

• Building will adversely affect our living standards: too many people, too much traffic.
• Every aspect of our quality of life will be worse if this project is allowed to proceed.

• Picnic Point cannot absorb more housing, more people. There are no jobs to employ these people. Moving them here will increase the crime rate and lower the quality of the schools, eventually turning into a slum. There is already gang sign on the stop signs.

• Please consider the consequences of over population.

• "Kids of Picnic Point Road" expressed concern about bullies coming as a result of this development, neighborhood fights, and getting hurt by cars.

• No fiscal demographic information has been provided to determine if it is plausible for the Homeowners Association to support itself.

• The owners of the property don't maintain it now, let alone during the construction period. It is an eyesore of unkept property affecting our home values, and a breeding ground for critters and dumping.

• The site is inappropriate for development of this size and density. The land owner has long had the option to build-out the property with R-8400 and R-9600 sized lots that would not net as much profit. The proposal pushes the land use code beyond its intended protections: massive site coverage with impermeable surface; an 8-fold increase in traffic with no mitigation improvements required; drainage problems and in intense runoff for Picnic Point County Park; overcrowding in elementary schools.

• There are no other developments in the area with a similar number of homes on such a small area of land. Consideration is needed to reduce the size of the development to aesthetically fit in with neighboring homes.

• There is already a surplus of newly-build homes and apartments in the surrounding areas that are still empty and/or not completed. The surrounding areas are already over-impacted, making this a less desirable place to live.

• This kind of development is in no one's interest other than wealthy developers, and comes at an immense cost to homeowners and the community.

• Please consider the desirability of a variety of housing options rather than just all high density and urban in nature.

• Concern was expressed about the density and magnitude of development: bad idea for the environment, local residents, and Picnic Point Elementary School.

• Hope that less dense development could be contemplated with an assured greenbelt between the school and the development.

• Hopes the County will see this area as unfit for development and do what is necessary to protect the people of Snohomish County and the environment.

• Why must we continue to expand and destroy natural habitat that can never be replaced?

• Please allow this beautiful land to remain a peacefull habitat, our streets to remain quiet, and our homes to stay safe.

• Is there any way that we can buy back what should never have been for sale?

• Overall, the project as currently designed is not appropriate for this location (geology, infrastructure). Would support more traditional development (larger home sites).
• Existing grocery stores, quality restaurants, and the closest existing mall (Alderwood) do not adequately support the current area residents, yet there are already a number of new residential properties being developed in the area (e.g., Azi Lee Estates and the new condominium complex on Mukilteo Speedway).

• The project has no potential upside for our neighborhood and has many serious downsides: additional traffic, additional crowding in local schools, and destruction of the natural environment.

• The quality of life for everyone in the community will be unpleasant due to changes in the environment caused by storm runoff slides and transportation problems.

• Development on a steep bank that replaces 23 acres of forest next to a salmon-bearing creek is of great concern. At a minimum, the scope of the proposal must be scaled back.

• As a 16-year resident of Woodsound, I have seen every lot and every available older single family home replaced by as many buildings as can be crammed on a single space, yet the roads remain 2-lane, and no additional parks or school facilities are forthcoming. The devastation to the natural-growth timber is heart-breaking.

• One commentor stated that he does not believe the environmental damage this development would cause can be sufficiently mitigated to the extent that it would not have a severe negative impact on the community.

• This is a very dangerous and crazy plan. If you live here for only a few days, you will know immediately what I mean. Snohomish County should cancel this dangerous plan.

• Concern was expressed about noise associated with the additional development.

• Will a permit be allowed if construction has the potential to drastically affect adjacent homeowners?

• Do we have a voice in the proposed construction?

• The community you serve wants this development stopped.

• We elected you to look out for us.

Response to General Comments regarding Neighborhood Character and Quality of Life: Neighborhood character and quality of life issues are outside the scope of this EIS. These issues were considered during designation of Urban Growth Areas and programmatic environmental review of the Snohomish County GMA Comprehensive Plan in December 2005. The County's GMA Comprehensive Plan and programmatic EIS are currently being updated (expected date of issue: summer 2015). The site is within the Southwest Snohomish County Urban Growth Area. By designating Urban Growth Areas, the County identified locations where development of the type and density proposed in the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates application is preferred, rather than further out in the County where urban-level services are not available.

CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

• The developer has not addressed any aspects of dust, mud, noise or traffic mitigation during construction in their application.

Response to General Comments regarding Construction Impacts: Draft EIS Chapter 3, Sections 3.1 Earth and 3.2 Water Resources, includes a description of potential impacts during construction under each subheading within these sections. Noise, dust and off-site hauling trips during construction, and...
mitigation measures for these impacts are discussed in Section 3.1.2 Geology and Soils (Draft EIS pages 3.1-15 through 3.1-19). Soil management and runoff control during construction are discussed under Mitigation Measures in Section 3.1.3 Erosion (Draft EIS pages 3.1-21 through 3.1-25). Information provided in the Geology/Soils and Erosion sections of the Draft EIS is summarized in Final EIS Table 1.7-1 (pages 1-20 through 1-27 of this document). Potential impacts during construction will be regulated by conditions imposed through Snohomish County Construction Plan Approvals and the Land Disturbing Activity Permit required for site development.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

- The cumulative impact of this project along with all other development in the area must be considered: traffic, utilities, and aesthetics.

**Response to General Comments regarding Cumulative Impacts:** See the first paragraph of Lake Forest Park Stream Keepers Comment #6 and the response to that comment in Final EIS Section 2.2.

**REFERENCES**

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
David Allais

Contact Email
Davida@pathguide.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
Having reviewed to Environmental Impact Statement I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative". Developing steep wooded sites exacerbates drainage issues and invites landslide. The proposed massive amount of grading and complicated drainage are just inappropriate for this natural land above Picnic Point Park.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
14916 72nd Ave W.

City State Zip
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The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: David
Last Name: Allais
Contact Email: Davida@pathguide.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork

Comment Field: Having reviewed to Environmental Impact Statement I strongly favor the "No Action Alternative". Developing steep wooded sites exacerbates drainage issues and invites landslide. The proposed massive amount of grading and complicated drainage are just inappropriate for this natural land above Picnic Point Park.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address: 14916 72nd Ave W.
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 425-742-8406

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/8/2014 3:50:50 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 206.135.183.18
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
August 1, 2014

Paul MacCready
 Snohomish County PDS
 3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
 Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Diana Akopyan
Vrezh Akopyan
13723 58th PL W Edmonds WA 98026
<Date>

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

<Your Name & Address Here>

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
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Mr. MacCready,

Please include me as a ‘Party Of Record’ in regards to the Frognal Estates planned development.

I would also like to express my concern about this project. What kind of traffic study has been done? There are two schools that seriously cause delays on 140th/Picnic Point Road during the start of school and when the kids are being released to go home. The proposed Frognal Estates will increase daily traffic by approx. 1150 vehicles. What impact is that going to have on the safety of the children?
And what about the Beverly Park Road stoplight that becomes seriously backed up in front of Serene Lake Elementary School? When children are released from the mentioned school, buses and cars are already fighting for position to get through the light. Has this situation been evaluated with the increase of traffic caused by Frognal Estates? Do angry and frustrated drivers that have to wait 4 to 6 light changes become a possible danger to our children when they are rushing to beat a stoplight during school release?

And what about sidewalks and curbs to provide more safety when the kids are walking to and from school? The stretch of road between Picnic Point Elementary School and Serene Lake Elementary School, has children walking alongside the road where in some parts there are no sidewalks or curbs. Has the County taken note of that? Traffic backup, children, frustrated drivers, school buses, and sections of road without curbs and sidewalks, does that create cause for 140th St SW and Picnic Point Road to be thoroughly examined for safety issues? I hope so.

That is one of many concerns that myself and my neighbors have in regards to this development.

You will hear from me a lot more.

Respectfully,

James Angiuli
13517 64th Ave West
Edmonds, WA 98026
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

August 4, 2014

Dear Mr. MacCready:

As a relative newcomer to the area, (taking care of my parents who have lived here 30 years) I have been impressed with the more progressive concern for the environment than in other states I have lived. However, after reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Froginal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about the density and magnitude of this development plan, especially in the aftermath of the terrible tragedy at Oso.

If you haven't already, I encourage you to come here and see the area for yourself.

My Concerns:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are significant. Earthquake also poses a threat in the light of “the Big One” that we have been cautioned to be prepared for in the last few years.

- Increased storm water runoff will impact the creek, which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have serious consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. Perhaps some aspects of the Snohomish County Code regarding Critical Area Regulations and Land Disturbing Activity may apply here.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. The odor would be awful for the people living in the estates, were they to be built, possibly discouraging people from living there.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. It takes the responsibility and liability off both the developer and the county and places it in the hands of a shifting population of homeowners, passing both onto future generations with no accountability.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. 60th is also a very narrow road to start with. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school would be escalated.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. The safety and education of our children is paramount.

- This forest enriches us all by providing a green space and protection to endangered wildlife. I have spoken to two neighbors who saw coyotes in the recent weeks, as well as owls, beaver and deer. Removing their habitat is a cause for wild animals to become urban pests.

Thank you for your consideration of these very important concerns.

Sincerely,

Mary Batzowski
6200 137th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 4, 2014

Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr.Z.F. Baczewski
6200 137th Pl SW
Edmonds WA 98026
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com  
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 4:19 PM  
To: PDS Major Projects  
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  
Lauren  

Last Name*  
Balisky  

Contact Email  
lbalisky@awwd.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*  
[ ] Stormwater drainage  
[ ] Grading/Earthwork  
[X] Other

Comment Field  
Due to the nearby location of the treatment plant, we suggest as many trees as possible on the terraced area to minimize visual and odor impacts on the future residents.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*  
() Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.  
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request
SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Lauren

Last Name: Balisky

Contact Email: lbalisky@awwd.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Other

Comment Field: Due to the nearby location of the treatment plant, we suggest as many trees as possible on the terraced area to minimize visual and odor impacts on the future residents.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 4:19:03 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 74.94.76.97
Referrer Page: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
August 18, 2014

Paul MacCreany
t Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCreany,

We have reviewed the Draft-Environmental Impact Statement for Frogna Estates, 05-123050-SD and
would like to submit our names to become a party of record. Although the developer has gone to great
lengths to address the many environmental issues of building on these sections, we have concerns about
the effect of a development of this size and magnitude.

Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area and it seems quite obvious that, despite sound engineering it is
sure to leave the area with greater exposure to landslide risk.

Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing.
This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would
have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that
degrade rather than support it.

This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned
odor releases of the Alderwood Water Treatment plant.

The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the
Homeowners Associations. At best, this is a fragile, costly idea for the long term.

The roads – Picnic Point Rd, 60th W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of
traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd, sloping
and curving, is an ice nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people
at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Rd increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school.
Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks.

The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at
maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at
this time.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the current residents. Please place our names as a party of
record.

Karen and David Baserman
kdb@baserman.com
6324 143rd St SW.
Edmonds, WA 98026
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As someone that will be affected by the proposed development, I would like to be a *Party of Record*. I am opposed to the development for many reasons as I'm sure you've already heard from others opposed to it.

Fred Beavon
6302 138TH PL SW
Edmonds, WA  98026-3242
**From:** support@civicplus.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 06, 2014 7:46 PM  
**To:** PDS Major Projects  
**Subject:** Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

**Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request**

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT**

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

**First Name**  
Lori

**Last Name**  
Bell

**Contact Email**  
lorileebell@comcast.net

**What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?**

- [X] Traffic impacts  
- [X] Tree Canopy  
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater

**Comment Field**

I oppose the building of Frognal Estates. It is such a large development (112 houses) and all the surrounding neighborhoods are smaller. A huge development of this size squeezed onto this land will not fit in with the existing neighborhoods. The forested land is currently home to many animals and birds. It is on the hill coming up from the sewage treatment. As a long-time member of this neighborhood since 1985, I can tell you that it is only in the last couple of years on hot summer days that I have noticed the sewage odor. I fear without the trees on the slope, and more sewage from new homes, it will often be stinky. Please make a wise decision that is in the best interest of Picnic Point and limit the building in this fragile area. There have already been landslides in the area. We don't want another Oso. Sincerely, Lori Bell

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

**Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?**

(□) No  
(□) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

---

Bell, L
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No

Mailing Address 1
6314 136th Pl. SW

City: Edmonds  State: WA  Zip: 98026

Phone Number:
206 930 2355

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Lori
Last Name: Bell
Contact Email: lorileebell@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: I oppose the building of Frognal Estates. It is such a large development (112 houses) and all the surrounding neighborhoods are smaller. A huge development of this size squeezed onto this land will not fit in with the existing neighborhoods.

The forested land is currently home to many animals and birds. It is on the hill coming up from the sewage treatment. As a long-time member of this neighborhood since 1985, I can tell you that it is only in the last couple of years on hot summer days that I have noticed the sewage odor. I fear without the trees on the slope, and more sewage from new homes, it will often be stinky.

Please make a wise decision that is in the best interest of Picnic Point and limit the building in this fragile area. There have already been landslides in the area. We don’t want another Oso.

Sincerely, Lori Bell

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 6314 136th Pl. SW

City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 206 930 2355

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/6/2014 7:45:34 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 67.160.34.64
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready:

I am writing to you on behalf of my family. We live just around the corner from the proposed development at Frognal Estates. I know you have probably received many emails and letters from concerned citizens who live in our neighborhood about slide prone slopes, storm water runoff, odor from the water treatment plant, increased traffic and all of the associated dangers, overburdening the local schools, and loss of habitat for wildlife.

As a family, we agree that all of those considerations are important and ask that you enter our names as Parties of Record.

However there is one concern that we share that has not been addressed above. Our four children spend a good deal of time in the forest. There they have watched the trees sway in the wind and listened to woodpeckers. They have picked blackberries and opined on the inhabitants of holes and dens. They have explored those woods weekly for nearly three years.

In a suburban neighborhood it is rare to have a little pocket of wilderness in the backyard. This space is also habitat for kids and provides a welcome respite from our crazy, busy, hectic lives. There is really no way to quantify how meaningful it is to have that space for everyone to use. There is no dollar amount that would make it worth losing. There is a lot of housing development happening right now in this neighborhood and we all really need this small and incredibly important green space.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Maren, Reagen, Max, Sam, Leo, and Scout
Paul McCready
Snohomish County PDS,
Administration Building East, 2nd Floor
3000 Rockefeller
Everett, WA 98201

July 11, 2014

Dear Mr. McCready:

Our area, Picnic Point, cannot absorb more housing, more people, for several reasons.

There are not more jobs to employ these people, and so housing them here just raises the crime rate, lowers the quality of schools, and eventually will turn it into a slum.

We already have gang signs on the stop signs that it is our responsibility, according to the government, to remove, yet yet government is moving the gangs in by its decisions.

When there is overly dense housing for the environment, there are runoff problems from water. Moving wetlands “UPHILL” to accommodate tennis courts, for example – gravity is no respecter of persons. Water always flows downhill no matter what the paperwork says. And the people with the least money get the water in their crawl spaces and lower level apartments.

Houses safely built near the water are going to slide downhill if you remove the forest, as currently planned. This is no joke. I have a Master’s in Fisheries from the University of Washington, and a bachelor’s related to Human Ecology.

We are simply creating crime by moving in more houses without the infrastructure to support the people in those houses.

We don’t have room for the TRAFFIC, the desks in the schools, the room in the lunchrooms, and the staff to maintain control and learning in the higher density classrooms you are planning to dump on us.

Already there are gang signs appearing in our neighborhoods, which we are responsible for the cost of removing, according to the government.

Already the climax ecosystem has been removed. How long do you think the climax species (homo sapiens, human beings) can exist with any health or standard of living if you removed the last of the second growth and perhaps a first growth tree or two that remains near Picnic Point?

This is not a joke. The air quality and is much worse here than it is in Marblemount, Wa, even without as strict environmental laws – because there is more forest to deal with human out-gassing! Slides like Oso are about to become commonplace in Picnic Point area if we continue along this vein.

We cannot make apples fall uphill, or ignore the laws of physics and human behavior for short term profit without very expensive long term outfall.

Sincerely, William L. Benson and Sharon E. Downey 141st ST SW, Edmonds. 98026
ben1son1@hotmail.com

WLBenson
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave, W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Hans D. Berkenhoff
6410-139th Place S.W.
Edmonds, Washington 98026
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-5D, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. Increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Mary K. Berkenhoff

Mary K. Berkenhoff
6410-139th Place S.W.
Edmonds, Washington 98026
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 12:52 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Vincenzo
Last Name* Bianco
Contact Email vxh7e7@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?
[X] Traffic impacts
[X] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character
[X] Other

Comment Field
Can we not leave some trees? The community is already developed enough. The impact on schools, traffic and delays due to construction and infrastructure would be too much.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Vincenzo
Last Name: Bianco
Contact Email: vxb7e7@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character. Other

Comment Field: Can we not leave some trees? The community is already developed enough. The impact on schools, traffic and delays due to construction and infrastructure would be too much.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 12:51:33 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 66.87.138.96
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Bouraia Espinoza, M

MacCready, Paul

From: Marina Bouraia Espinoza <marinka74@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 4:34 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD

August 21, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St.SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Marina Espinoza
15439 86th AVE NE
Kenmore, WA 98028
Mr. Paul MacCready  
PDS Project Manager  
Snohomish County  
Planning and Development Services  

Dear Mr. MacCready,

I have read the DEIS for the proposed Frognal Estates development and wish to make a couple of observations.

Obviously, a lot of effort and time has gone into preparing the DEIS and the proposal. I am not an expert in reviewing such statements as you are but am concerned with some aspects.

1. The impact on the immediate neighborhood, including the school, was not seriously considered. People are naturally skeptical and suspicious of a proposed change to their environment. The DEIS was woefully short on how these added 112 homes and their occupants would impact the school and the neighborhood. Was the School District consulted on whether the District could accommodate the additional students? Was the safety and security of school children a consideration when planning the roads, sidewalks, etc?

2. Although the DEIS addresses the issues of runoff and stormwater, I am very concerned (as a 17 year resident of the area) that slides could occur and the runoff could cause downstream flooding as happened in 1997.

3. I would also hope that a less dense development could be contemplated with an assured greenbelt between the school and the development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Boyd  
13402 67th Ave W  
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 20th, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
300 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor Everett, WA 98201.

Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Frongal Estates, 05-123050-SD. please add my name as a party of record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specially the following:

1. Picnic point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of the building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. Last summer my house was almost hit by a huge tree, it landed on my neighbors 2 cars and destroyed them both. That summer night there was no wind, no rain in days or weeks and a huge tree came down and hit my neighbors 2 cars. That wooded area is highly slide prone area, I will be scared, because I don't want another OSO land slide and taking out my home and my 4 children.

2. The two elementary schools which Picnic Point and Serene Lake are at maximum loads. My son and daughter both go to Picnic Point and they are incredibly full and crowded. I couldn't imagine adding more children to those schools which are at maximum capacity.

3. The forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife. I've seen owls, bats, woodpeckers, coyotes, and many other wildlife in these woods. My kids love going to the woods and looking at all the wildlife. It will be very sad to see this little animal and there home being destroyed.

4. The back of my house faces Picnic Point road, there is already a lot of traffic on this road due to the beach and such, this road cannot handle large volumes of traffic then it already has.

Sincerely,

George and Natalie Brediger
13705 58th Pl W
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record.

I am concerned about a development of this density due to both Picnic Point and Serene Lake Elementary are already at capacity. Is the developer willing to foot the bill for another elementary school? We both know the answer to that. The number of additional vehicle trips is unacceptable. Traffic in our area is already a nightmare. We do not need over a thousand more trips per day. At what point do we say we have all the housing that our infrastructure and schools can handle? When we are as dense as Los Angeles or New York City. This is a rural area and we're going to see that it stays that way. Every additional household demands more in services than they pay in taxes. That is proven. Our taxes are already high enough. Lastly, there are many species of animals that call this forest home, among them owls, deer, and coyotes. We do not need most of this forest clear cut for a mega housing development that no one in this area wants, except for greedy developers and politicians.

George Briggs
6523 136th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

425-741-1003
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 7:16 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Sara Bueren

Contact Email
scacats@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
I can not believe this development is back on the table for consideration, after all the reports and local push back to building in the Picnic Point green zone years ago. I live on 136th St SW and feel the building will adversely affect our living standards. Too many people, too much traffic and I believe the forested area is needed to keep the new sewage plant smell down. Please say no to building below us to keep Picnic Point Park clean and green. Sara Bueren

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
6208 136th Place SW
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Sara
Last Name: Bueren
Contact Email: seacats@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: I can not believe this development is back on the table for consideration, after all the reports and local push back to building in the Picnic Point green zone years ago. I live on 136th St SW and feel the building will adversely affect our living standards. Too many people, too much traffic and I believe the forested area is needed to keep the new sewage plant smell down. Please say no to building below us to to keep Picnic Point Park clean and green.
Sara Bueren

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 6208 136th Place SW
City: Edmonds
State: wa
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 4257435759

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 7/29/2014 7:16:23 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 98.203.212.9
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Aug 11, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I have owned two homes for 20 years in the immediate area (Picnic Point and WoodSound) and I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. The County is currently spending hundreds of thousands of dollars tearing up the roads around the area to expand the already overstraining sewer system and causing traffic nightmares.
• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Chris Burdett

Chris Burdett | Senior Vice President
Investment Properties | CBRE Hotels
CBRE | Capital Markets
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1700 | Seattle, WA 98101-2384
T 206 292 6070 | F 206 292 6033 | C 206 715 9910
chris.burdett@cbre.com | www.cbrehotels.com

This email may contain information that is confidential or attorney-client privileged and may constitute inside information. The contents of this email are intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are directed not to read, disclose, distribute or otherwise use this transmission. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the transmission. Delivery of this message is not intended to waive any applicable privileges.
Dear Mr MacCready,

Please add my name as a Party of Record for file#05-123050-SD Frognal Estates/Horsemans' Trail.

I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude. It's a bad idea for the environment, local residents, and Picnic Point Elementary school. I'm particularly concerned about the safety of kids going to and from school on an existing undersized road that would have significantly increased traffic with 112 additional homes. The Mukilteo school district is currently overcrowded and has already maximized the use of portables at Picnic Point Elementary. This development will be a significant burden on an already overcrowded school district.

This project is a bad idea.

Sincerely,
Kristine Calawa
On Aug 11, 2014, at 9:11 AM, "MacCready, Paul" <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

From: kcalawa . [mailto:kcalawa@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 7:50 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: DEIS Frognal Estates

Dear Mr MacCready,

Please add my name as a Party of Record for file#05-123050-SD Frognal Estates/Horsemans' Trail.

I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude. It's a bad idea for the environment, local residents, and Picnic Point Elementary school. I'm particularly concerned about the safety of kids going to and from school on an existing undersized road that would have significantly increased traffic with 112 additional homes. The Mukilteo school district is currently overcrowded and has already maximized the use of portables at Picnic Point Elementary. This development will be a significant burden on an already overcrowded school district.

This project is a bad idea.

Sincerely,
Kristine Calawa
Dear Mr. MacCready,

Having read the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates (aka Horseman’s Trail), 50-123050-SD, I am writing to ask that I be added as a party of record.

My primary concern has to do with storm water runoff and the associated pollution of local streams and Puget Sound. This is a steep, wet, north-facing slope currently covered with a dense stand of mature trees. Walking anywhere near that area, even now in late summer, shows the trees thickly covered in moss. The site is simply inappropriate for a development of this size and density. The land owners have long had the option of building out this property with R-8400 and R-9600 sized lots similar to those surrounding the area on every side. But that simply doesn’t net as much profit. The high density proposal will cover a massive portion of this acreage with impermeable surface and greatly increase the number of cars and car trips per day. There will be drainage problems and intense runoff for Picnic Point County Park and the homeowners downhill and possibly stability problems for the owners of these new ‘cottage homes’. It pushes the land use code beyond its intended protections and should not be allowed.

I have many other concerns including overcrowding of the local elementary schools and massively increased traffic with absolutely no mitigating improvements being required.

This lot could support some responsible development. But the county should not allow this developer to degrade our neighborhood, increase traffic 8-fold, increase pollution, and put a large burden on overcrowded school simply in order to maximize profits. Snohomish has been my home for 20 years. This is not the responsible choice for our county.

Sincerely,

Richard (Rick) Calawa
13828 60th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
425-359-2693
MacCready, Paul

From: fjcari1@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2014 3:23 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Frognal Estates 05-123050SD

Please add my name as a Party of Record against Frognal-Estates 05-123050-SD 123050-SD Development!
Frank J. Carstedt
13812 61st Ave W
Edmonds WA 98026
Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

13812 - 61st Ave W  
Edmonds, WA 98026
From: Frank Carlstedt <fjcar@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 18, 2014 5:14 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Frognal Estates 05-123050-SD

Please add my name as a Party of Record against Frognal Estates 05-123050-SD Development!

Sincerely,

Mary L Carlstedt
13812 61st Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about the development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,  

Mary Carlstedt  
13812 61st Ave. W.  
Edmonds, WA 98026
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:22 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Lilia

Last Name* Chernysheva

Contact Email lc_8811@yahoo.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

- [ ] Traffic impacts
- [X] Tree Canopy
- [ ] Neighborhood Character
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Other

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Lilia
Last Name: Chemycheva

Contact Email: le_8811@yahoo.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/12/2014 9:21:51 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 98.203.240.170
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
August 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2014

Paul MacCready  
Snohomish Country PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60\textsuperscript{th} W. and 140\textsuperscript{th} St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Andy and Karen Christensen
5325 139th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

---

Want to place your ad here?
Advertise on United Online
www.adsonar.com
August 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish Country PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
  \item Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park.
\end{itemize}
○ This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

○ The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

○ Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

○ Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

○ The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

○ This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Andy and Karen Christensen
5325 139th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

Want to place your ad here?
Advertise on United Online
www.adsonar.com
August 9, 2014

Paul MacCready

Snohomish County PDS

3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor

Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Jill Clark
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the road, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools — Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary — are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
PICNIC POINT IS IN DANGER!

SEND AN EMAIL OR LETTER BY AUGUST 22ND

- Frognal Estates, formerly known as Horseman’s Trail, is back with a proposal for 112 homes on Picnic Point Rd. that are tightly packed onto terraced terrain with a thoroughfare of 60th Ave. W. = 1150 more car trips daily on our local roads!
- The welfare of the environment and residents, especially children, who live in the Picnic Point area is at risk.
- 75% of the 22 acre forest located north & northwest of Picnic Point Elementary School will be clear-cut and our community changed forever. We can save it, but we need everyone’s help.

PLEASE write to Paul MacCready via email or letter or both:
Pual.Maccready@co.snohomish.wa.us and/or
Paul MacCready, Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller, Admin.
Bldg. East, 2nd Floor, Everett, WA 98201
Info page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/Frognal-Estates

Request to be “Party of Record” and express your concerns!!

*** Please see sample letter on back or on our Facebook page. ***

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Claudia
Last Name* D’Allegrì

Contact Email runbadancer09@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?
[X] Traffic impacts
[X] Drainage/Stormwater

Comment Field
After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: • Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. • Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. • This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. • The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. • Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. • Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. • The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary –
are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. • This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
13769 67ave w.

City State Zip
Edmonds WA 98026

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Claudia

Last Name: D'Allegri

Contact Email: rumbadancer09@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
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• This group of conifers currently protects a school and upslope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools—Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary—are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13769 67ave w.

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98026

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/17/2014 4:34:36 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.143.212
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Saturday, August 02, 2014 5:31 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Davis

Contact Email
Saleen720@hotmail.com

What component(s) of the project are your comments generally related to?

- [X] Traffic impacts
- [X] Tree Canopy
- [X] Neighborhood Character
- [X] Noise
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater
- [ ] Other

Comment Field
08/02/2014 Paul MacCready Snohomish County PDS 3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor Everett, WA 98201 Dear Mr. MacCready: After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: •Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. •Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. •This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. •The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. •Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd, sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. •Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School.
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and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. *The two elementary schools — Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary — are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. *This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all. Sincerely, Michael Davis and Darcey Caraco 5801 133rd PL SW Edmonds, WA 98026

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

*Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

**Organization**

PICNIC POINT PRESERVATION COMMITTEE, Joan Smith

Please include the name of the entity, group or agency that you are the designated spokesperson for, if any.

**Mailing Address 1**

5801 133rd PL SW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>Wa</td>
<td>98026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. *(Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)*

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Davis

Contact Email: Saleen720@hotmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: 08/02/2014
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Michael Davis and Darcey Caraco

5801 133rd PL SW

Edmonds, Wa 98026

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Organization: Picnic Point Preservation Committee, Joan Smith

Mailing Address 1: 5801 133rd PL SW

City: Edmonds

State: Wa

Zip: 98026

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/2/2014 5:31:09 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 173.160.232.129
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
MacCready, Paul

From: Knight, Howard
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 8:15 AM
To: 'mdavis@performanceki.com'
Cc: MacCready, Paul
Subject: RE: Request to be a party of record

I have cc'd the project manager who is the project manager.

Howard Knight
Permitting Supervisor
Planning and Development Services

From: mdavis@performanceki.com [mailto:mdavis@performanceki.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 02, 2014 5:14 PM
To: Knight, Howard
Subject: FW: Request to be a party of record

08/02/2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frogmal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as
are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,
Michael Davis and Darcey Caraco
5801 133rd PL SW
Edmonds, Wa 98026
08/04/2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg. East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Sincerely,
Robert M. Davis
14204 64 Ave West Edmonds, WA 98026

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*  
Alan  DeJager

Contact Email  
progfreak0623@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?  
[X] Traffic Impacts  [X] Noise  
[ ] Tree Canopy  [X] Drainage/Stormwater  
[X] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: • Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. • Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. • This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. • The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. • Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. • Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. • The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary –
are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. • This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

**Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?**

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

**Mailing Address 1**

13769 67th Ave W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Alan

Last Name: DeJager

Contact Email: progfreak0623@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13769 67th Ave W

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98026

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/17/2014 4:39:10 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.143.212
Referrer Page: http://snohomyishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSParticipants-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomyishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSParticipants-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Mart & Liliana Evanger  
6017 136th PL SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026  

August 8, 2014  

Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201  

Dear Mr. MacCready:  

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude. Some specific concerns are as follows:  

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are of great concern and monumental.  
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.  
- This Group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.  
- The Proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections and the Homeowner’s Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.  
- Picnic Point Road, 60th W. and 140th Street SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Road., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter months as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school would be escalated.  
- Opening up 60th Ave West to Picnic Point Road increases the degree of traffic around the elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.  
- The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district.  
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, which enriches all of us.  

In closing I would like to thank you in advance for your attention and consideration to this matter.  

Sincerely,  

Liliana Evanger  
Residing @ 6017 136th PL SW Edmonds, WA 98026  
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August 19, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg. East, 2nd for
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

1. Picnic Point is historically a highly slide prone area. I feel that building this development could trigger a monumental slide.

2. Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek, which is salmon bearing. I believe this would eventually endanger Picnic Park County Park. This proposed development would have severe consequences for the safety and health of the Puget Sound.

3. This group of trees currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

4. The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections on the Homeowners Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

5. Picnic Point Rd, 60th W. and 140th St. SW are designed to handle the large volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd, with its slopes and curves, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The county currently does not sand or plow these roads. The number of people, who would be at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the children going to and from school, would be escalated.

6. Opening up the 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Rd, severely increases the amount of traffic around the elementary school. Many of these roads do not even had sidewalks, let alone traffic lights.
7. The two elementary schools, Picnic Point and Serene Lake Elementary, are already at MAXIMUM load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

8. This forested area provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife.

Sincerely,

Darcie Feijo

6020 136th Pl SW

Edmonds WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready,

I understand another developer is trying to plop 112 homes on Picnic Point Road. I please ask you to carefully consider all the options before allowing this project to proceed:

- This project is being proposed over a very steep hill. There have been several lessons learned from the landslide in Darrington. One of them being, that over development and over de-forestation has a tremendous amount of consequences.

- Picnic point Road, 60th Ave. W, and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the amount of traffic this new development will create. Furthermore, 60th Ave West runs alongside a middle school with children running on the streets at all hours of the day and weekends. These additional vehicles will cause serious problems on this region, in addition to likely endangering children's lives. Construction alone could cause serious problems. Where would the constructions vehicles access the site? This will likely happen, through the flattest road to the region, 60th Ave. West - the street of the middle school.

- Storm water runoff can only increase, and will have serious impacts on the creek below the development - which is salmon bearing. Not to mention the endangerment of Picnic Point County Park further down the slope.

- Picnic point is an area highly prone to land slides. Trains are often blocked during the fall months between Edmonds and Everett, this populous density will intensify the probability of land slides.

- The residents of this area take great pride in living among a beautiful 22 acre forest. You are about to destroy the home of wildlife, and likely endangered species that enrich all of us.

I please ask you to consider the consequences of over population. Profit and home development, can and should, go hand in hand with balanced environmental planning.

I ask you to please consider the impact that this development will have in this area, and make the right decision for all of us.

Sincerely,

Mark Feijo
Resident: 6020 136th Pl. SW, Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready,

As a homeowner in Lynnwood, I object to the proposed Development of Frognal Estates 05-123056-SD in the Picnic Point Area. Please add my name as a PARTY OF RECORD.

I am a resident in Lynnwood for 20 years and strongly believe this development:

- Would cause considerable negative impact to the environment by clearing trees, grading the terrain resulting in additional mudslides along the Burlington Corridor
- Increase traffic in and out of the area to the freeway access tremendously as there are no alternative access roads
- Negatively impact a vital recreational source which is Picnic Point County Park.

Sincerely,

Christa Fields-Howser
4302 148th St SW
Lynnwood WA 98087
Mr. MacCready,

I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the Frognal Estates development in Southwest Snohomish County. I have lived in the Picnic Point area for 25 years and have seen many episodes of landslides due to the slope and soil makeup of the area. I have also seen how a developer can hire an engineering firm to say whatever they want them to say about the feasibility of development on steep unstable slopes. It often defies common sense as it does in this case. Recent events in Snohomish County should cause decision makers such as yourself to err on the side of caution, public safety and fiscal responsibility. I believe this development poses severe problems for our community and for Snohomish County.

My concerns are not limited to the just the stability of the hillside. I believe this development will have a negative effect on the environment and the Eco-system in as far as it will destroy a substantial amount of wildlife habitat and will have a significant impact on the salmon spawning stream flowing right below it. The impact of the additional traffic associated with this many new residences will be near catastrophic on the neighborhood leading into it and will dramatically increase the likelihood of serious injury accidents as the roads are not built to handle that many vehicles and people.

Please note my opposition to the project as currently proposed and make me a party of record. Thank you for considering my input.

Joe Gaddy
7004 136th St SW
Edmonds, Wa. 98026
Wednesday, August 6, 2014

Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chirook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and its weirs are in a failing state.* This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.
• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

• Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Stefphan Gambill

6009 137th pl sw

Edmonds, WA 98026
From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 1:14 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Darlene
Last Name* Geyer

Contact Email Geyer.jjmdarlene@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts
[ ] Tree Canopy
[X] Neighborhood Character

[X] Noise
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[ ] Other

Comment Field
To add another 122 homes, in an already congested area, with insufficient roads, or drainage, seems ludicrous. We have spent the entire summer waiting in traffic delays, trying to repair a drainage system that is inadequate, and with only one road in and out of the area, it has been a nightmare. We DO NOT need another 122 homes added to the mix, until the county can add more roads, and solve the current drainage problems. Fix the current problems, and ONLY then, consider other impacts of the possible addition of more homes.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT. Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Darlene

Last Name: Geyer

Contact Email: Geyer.jimdarlene@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater. Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: To add another 122 homes, in an already congested area, with insufficient roads, or drainage, seems ludicrous. We have spent the entire summer waiting in traffic delays, trying to repair a drainage system that is inadequate, and with only one road in and out of the area, it has been a nightmare. We DO NOT need another 122 homes added to the mix, until the county can add more roads, and solve the current drainage problems. Fix the current problems, and ONLY then, consider other impacts of the possible addition of more homes.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/13/2014 1:13:32 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 98.247.177.243
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Willoughby-Oakes, Leilal

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 13, 2014 10:59 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  
Marvin

Last Name*  
Glazer

Contact Email
mglazer@inbox.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  
[ ] Noise

[X] Tree Canopy  
[X] Drainage/Stormwater

[ ] Neighborhood Character  
[ ] Other

Comment Field

There are two schools on 140th Street. During school hours with school speed limits at 20 mph, 140th street which is the only way out of the Picnic Point community. This would make 140th street impassable. We would be stuck in bumper to bumper traffic. The trees remove pollution from the air. The trees allow groundwater to be slowly absorbed. The recent new improved sewer system would be unable to deal with the effluent. Already it smells bad.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

Organization
mglazer@inbox.com
Please include the name of the entity, group or agency that you are the designated spokesperson for, if any.

**Mailing Address 1**
13921 64th Pl W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phone Number**
206 290 8835

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Marvin

Last Name: Glazer

Contact Email: mglazer@inbox.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater

Comment Field: There are two schools on 140th Street. During school hours with school speed limits at 20 mph. 140th street which is the only way out of the Picnic Point community. This would make 140th street impassable. We would be stuck in bumper to bumper traffic.

The trees remove pollution from the air.

The trees allow groundwater to be slowly absorbed.

The recent new improved sewer system would be unable to deal with the effluent. Already it smells bad.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD:** Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Organization: mglazer@inbox.com

Mailing Address 1: 13921 64th Pl W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 206 290 8835

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/13/2014 10:59:23 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.143.214
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Aug. 5 2014
Mr. Paul MJacCready
Sno County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Administration Building E 2nd Fl
Everett, Wa 98201

Mr. MacCready:

Please add my name to the party of record re the environmental impact statement for Frognal Estates. (# 05-123050-SD).

Picnic Point Road and 140 St SW are nowhere ready to absorb the additional daily car trips which would result from an additional 100+ homes being built behind Picnic Point Elementary School. Let alone the havoc which would be created directly on Picnic Point Road.

Thank you.

Michael and Nancy Gold
7019 136 ST SW
Edmonds, Wa 98026
Mr. MacCready

Please see the attached comments regarding Frognal Estates. This kind of development is in no one’s interest other than wealthy developers and comes at an immense cost to homeowners and the community. We implore you to use your public office in service to the community.

Sincerely,

Brian Gregory
4813 50th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98118
brian.j.gregory@gmail.com
August 4, 2014

Sn homish County PDS
300 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it’s weirs are in a failing state.* This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

- Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Brian Gregory
4813 50th Ave S
Seattle, WA 98118
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From: Ron Grippe <ronaldgrippe3396@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 12:37 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Planned Development at Picnic Point

6313 Chennault Beach Drive
Mukilteo, WA 98275

August 29, 2014

Mr Paul MacCready
Project Manager
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Administration Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr MacCready,

My wife and I have lived in Mukilteo since 1979 and have come to value the park at Picnic Point for its natural beauty and serenity. We have spent many good times there. Therefore, after reading Joan Smith’s letter in the August 13th edition of the *Mukilteo Beacon*, I feel I must join her in opposing plans to build 112 homes in this precious region in the name of “development.” If this plan goes forward, the more accurate word would be “despoliation.” I’m convinced that his area is too fragile for this kind of land use. Haven’t we learned anything about land use following the Oso mudslide on March 22, 2013? This plan to build 112 homes at Picnic Point is yet another example of how corporations, in general, and developers, in particular, privatize the profits and socialize the risks.

Despite all the erudite articles written about the mudslide, I have arrived at a simplified explanation concerning what happened in Oso. In essence, the record-breaking rainfall in February and March caused a steep hillside to collapse under the weight of all that water, and people living below the hill at Steelhead Haven were buried alive because they built homes where building permits should never have been issued. Why those building permits were issued is a much more complicated story, and it is here where we keep learning more. Evidently, although the area was known by geologists to be vulnerable to slides, all the experts say they never imagined the magnitude of any slide to be as large as the one on March 22nd. Then too, this shortfall in the understanding of the problem made it very difficult for county or state officials to make a case for the denial of a building permit. Finally, all these state and county officials are elected or appointed, and none of them wants to make an enemy of a well-heeled developer who wants to build homes. This is the story as it stands today. Contributing factors include the clear cutting of timber on top of the hill and the dredging of the North Fork Stillaguamish near Oso to allow larger boats to navigate further upriver. In hindsight, all this is now seen as probably unwise meddling with Mother Nature.

Concerning the costs involved after the Oso mudslide, it is instructive to note what Herald reported Noah Haglund wrote in *The Herald* on August 18th:
“The initial mudslide blocked the Stilly to the east, forming what some people dubbed ‘lake Oso.’"

“To ease the blockage, workers in the early stages of the recovery used heavy equipment to encourage the river to form a new channel downstream, Terwilleger said. The lake soon disappeared.”

“We’ve already seen a tremendous amount of change in terms of what the river looks like since we started our effort,’ she said. ‘There’s a lot of concern about areas that are seeing more sediment, that are seeing more debris accumulate.’

“The county and the Army Corps of Engineers have studied ways to dig emergency channels to lessen upstream flooding. They’re also looking to stage machinery and sandbags where they’re likely to be needed most if the river rises to dangerous levels.”

“There’s unlikely to be enough data to prepare for long-term flood dangers until next year, Terwilleger said.”

“The county is using devices to measure movements on the slope.”

“The hillside itself hasn’t moved, but ‘chunks off the edge have sloughed off,’ public works director Steve Thomsen said.”

“The hillside has slid several times in the past, including a major event in 2006 that blocked the river and which scientists concluded was the root of this year’s catastrophe.”

“Meanwhile, cleanup work presses ahead in the mile-wide disaster zone.”

“Contractors are about a month ahead of schedule in screening and hauling away dirt and debris that emergency crews moved during the search for the dead, solid waste director Matt Zymbas said. The bulk of that work is expected to be finished by the end of August. The county in June awarded three contracts for the work totaling more than $12 million.” (Italics mine)

“The county is actively exploring a buyout of about 80 private landowners in the slide area.” (Italics mine)

“At least 75 percent of those contacted said they want to learn more about the buyout process, said Gary Haakenson, a county executive director overseeing recovery efforts.”

“The county sent the Federal Emergency Management Agency an application seeking grant money for the buyouts on Thursday, Haakenson said.”

“State transportation contractors are working to rebuild Highway 530 through the slide zone by October.” (Italics mine)

“Separately, an independent commission plans to convene Friday to examine the emergency response and land-use decisions related to the March 22 Oso mudslide. The group is tasked with delivering a report to the highest state and county officials in December.”

Based on the above, it is clear that the cost of dealing with the aftermath of this disaster will be well in excess of $12 million.

Sorry about the overly long quote, but my question to you, Mr MacCready is: How much of this cost will be borne by the so-called developers of Steelhead Haven? Of course, this question is merely rhetorical, because we both know that the answer is zero. Once again developers have played this game and won.

Ironically, if we had foreknowledge of these events, the county could have taken the developers completely out of the picture and simply awarded each of the 49 homeowners who lost their home in the mudslide $250,000 to live elsewhere; a total cost of $12.25 million. And, they would still be alive!

Please, consider the above facts before decided what to do concerning Picnic Point.

Respectfully

Ronald Gripppe
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 1:28 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Raymond
Last Name* Guerra

Contact Email rguerre46@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X]Traffic impacts
[ ]Noise
[ ]Tree Canopy
[X]Drainage/Stormwater
[ ]Neighborhood Character
[ ]Other

Comment Field

Dear Sir, I would like to express my concerns and reservations about the Frognal Estates Project. I live in the Wingate community and use the 54th Ave W. entrance to access the Picnic Point road. This intersection is just a few feet from the intersection of 140th St. SW. and Picnic Point road. The combination and close proximity of these three intersections at the present, is close to being overwhelmed by daily traffic. Leaving Wingate at the 54th Ave W. intersection and turning onto Picnic Point road is difficult at best due to the sloping nature of the road. Making it difficult to see west bound cars approaching. The steady flow of east bound cars leaving 140th intersection combined with those leaving Picnic Point road intersection, one after the other, makes for a rather lengthy wait for a clear and safe window to leave Wingate. Adding an additional 1150 more cars a day, in my opinion, will only exacerbate the problem. Making it at the very least a 'Road Rage' combination of intersections or possible a higher risk of 'Accidents waiting to Happen'. Neither of these scenarios are desirable for maintaining the character and safety of our neighborhood and community if the Frognal Estates Project is built. I am also concerned about the effect this project will have on the Secondary treatment plant, down the hill from us in the South Gulch. This plant is not really fully up and running at the moment nor will be for the foreseeable future. According to a recent article from Sno. Waste Management, they are trucking the untreated sewage to another location. Because of the increase in buildings around the community, neighborhood like Lake Serene (who's sewer and water runoff also drain into the treatment plant) have been
experiencing more flooding. The sewer pipes are maxing out in their ability to handling the runoff. It seems only a matter of time before the treatment plant will be over flowing and spilling into Puget Sound and this even without the Frognal Estates Project being built. I hope you will take this into consideration before approving the Frognal Estates Project. I am not against building projects, just building very large complexes in areas that have the potential of overwhelming the community and the quality of life we enjoy.
Sincerely Raymond Guerra

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

File Upload

Uploaded: Wingate community.png
Please login to view the uploaded file.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?
( )Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X)No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Raymond
Last Name: Guerra
Contact Email: rguerra46@concast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: Dear Sir,
I would like to express my concerns and reservations about the Frognal Estates Project. I live in the Wingate community and use the 54th Ave W. entrance to access the Picnic Point road. This intersection is just a few feet from the intersection of 140th St. SW. and Picnic Point road. The combination and close proximity of these three intersections at the present, is close to being overwhelmed by daily traffic. Leaving Wingate at the 54th Ave W. intersection and turning onto Picnic Point road is difficult at best due to the sloping nature of the road.
It is difficult to see west bound cars approaching. The steady flow of east bound cars leaving 140th intersection combined with those leaving Picnic Point road intersection, one after the other, makes for a rather lengthy wait for a clear and safe window to leave Wingate.

Adding an additional 1150 more cars a day, in my opinion, will only exacerbate the problem. Making it at the very least a 'Road Rage' combination of intersections or possible a higher risk of 'Accidents waiting to Happen'. Neither of these scenarios are desirable for maintaining the character and safety of our neighborhood and community if the Frognal Estates Project is built.

I am also concerned about the effect this project will have on the Secondary treatment plant, down the hill from us in the South Gulch. This plant is not really fully up and running at the moment nor will be for the foreseeable future. According to a recent article from Sno. Waste Management, they are trucking the untreated sewage to another location. Because of the increase in buildings around the community, neighborhood like Lake Serene (who's sewer and water runoff also drain into the treatment plant) have been experiencing more flooding. The sewer pipes are maxing out in their ability to handling the runoff. It seems only a matter of time before the treatment plant will be over flowing and spilling into Puget Sound and this even without the Frognal Estates Project being built.

I hope you will take this into consideration before approving the Frognal Estates Project. I am not against building projects, just building very large complexes in areas that have the potential of overwhelming the community and the quality of life we enjoy.

Sincerely
Raymond Guerra

File Upload: Wingate community.png

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/4/2014 1:27:59 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 98.203.209.191
Referrer Page: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Sir,

I would like to express my concerns and reservations about the Frognal Estates Project. I live in the Wingate community and use the 54th Ave W. entrance to access the Picnic Point road. This intersection is just a few feet from the intersection of 140th St. SW. and Picnic Point road. The combination and close proximity of these three intersections at the present, is close to being overwhelmed by daily traffic. Leaving Wingate at the 54th Ave W. intersection and turning onto Picnic Point road is difficult at best due to the sloping nature of the road. Making it difficult to see west bound cars approaching. The steady flow of east bound cars leaving 140th intersection combined with those leaving Picnic Point road intersection, one after the other, makes for a rather lengthy wait for a clear and safe window to leave Wingate.

Adding an additional 1150 more cars a day, in my opinion, will only exacerbate the problem. Making it at the very least a Road Rage combination of intersections or possible a higher risk of Accidents waiting to Happen. Neither of these scenarios are desirable for maintaining the character and safety of our neighborhood and community if the Frognal Estates Project is built.

I am also concerned about the effect this project will have on the Secondary treatment plant, down the hill from us in the South Gulch. This plant is not really fully up and running at the moment nor will be for the foreseeable future. According to a recent article from Sno. Waste Management, they are trucking the untreated sewage to another location. Because of the increase in buildings around the community, neighborhood like Lake Serene (who's sewer and water runoff also drain into the treatment plant) have been experiencing more flooding. The sewer pipes were maxing out in their ability to handling the runoff. It seems only a matter of time before the treatment plant will be over flowing and spilling into Puget Sound and this even without the Frognal Estates Project being built.

I hope you will take this into consideration before approving the Frognal Estates Project. I am not against building projects, just building very large complexes in areas that have the potential of overwhelming the community and the quality of life we enjoy.

Frognal Estates DEIS
Electronic Submission
Submitted to – http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/Frognal-Estates
August 8, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognl Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Kyung Ha and Jong Ju Rhyu
6702 139th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
MacCready, Paul

From: Noah Haglund <nhaglund@heraldnet.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 3:24 PM
To: MacCready, Paul; Noah Haglund
Subject: request to add as a party of record

Mr. MacCready --

Please add me as a party of record for the three following projects:

- Bakerview (Go East) - 10-101204-000-00-SD
- Seabrook Heights - 10-107194-000-00-SD/ 05-121365-000-00-SD
- Frognal Estates (Horsemans Trail) - 05-123050 SD

I also left a voice mail. Please don't hesitate to contact me for any clarification of this request.

Best regards,

--

Noah Haglund
Reporter
The Daily Herald | 1800 41st Street, S-300 | Everett, WA 98203
425-339-3465 | 20-5080 | www.heraldnet.com

Please note: The Everett Daily Herald has moved its office. Come see us at 1800 41st Street, S-300, Everett, WA 98203.
Please look for an Open House announcement in the summer of 2014.
Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project? (X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Type in or paste your comments related to the project above (1000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

I am concerned about the potential impact on Picnic Point Elementary as well as traffic on the roadway.

Comment Field

Type in or paste your comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.

Contact Email

hansen1966@msn.com

Ed Hansen

First Name*

Ed

Last Name*

Hansen

City

Edmonds

State

WA

Zip

98026

Mailing Address 1

15922 64th Pl W

 Submitted a General Comment

Submit a General Comment related to the Frugnal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

From:

support@cityofedmonds.com

Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2014 4:01 PM

To:

PDJ Major Projects

Subject: Frugnal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Ed
Last Name: Hansen
Contact Email: hansen1966@msn.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character, Other

Comment Field: I am concerned about the potential impact on Picnic Point Elementary as well as traffic and forest removal.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13922 64th pl w
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 9/10/2014 4:01:00 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.170.104.99
Referrer Page: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, I request my name be added as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of the density and magnitude of Frognal Estates, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Road, 60th West and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Avenue West to Picnic Point Road increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Clyde Harman
SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Robert
Last Name* Harvison

Contact Email theharvisons@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts
[X] Tree Canopy
[X] Neighborhood Character

[X] Noise
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Other

Comment Field

Re: Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have serious concerns about the following: • Clear-cutting 17.5 acres of second-growth trees, excavating 285,000 cubic yards of fill dirt (the equivalent of 390 railroad coal cars) for this development, quoting from the Planning and Development Services (PDS) review, it is determined “Proposed Action had the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts”. Picnic Point is historically a slide-prone area. The PDS recognizes that as fact and clearly states this proposed development has the very real potential to cause natural or man-made destructive ecological damage. • For the Picnic Point, Woodsound, and Windsong neighborhoods, Picnic Point Road (or 140th St. SW) is the main access road. Picnic Point Road is often in traffic congestion now. The additional vehicles from the proposed development will only increase this gridlock. A natural or man-made disaster will limit emergency vehicles from accessing these neighborhoods via this main access road. • Picnic Point and Serene Lake Elementary schools are at maximum student capacity now. Both schools are utilizing portable classrooms (remodeled mobile home trailers). The additional students from the proposed development would stretch the Mukilteo School district to the financial limits, and unnecessarily burden taxpayers.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.
BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Robert
Last Name: Harvison
Contact Email: theharvisons@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character, Other

Comment Field: Re: Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD
After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I have serious concerns about the following:
• Clear-cutting 17.5 acres of second-growth trees, excavating 285,000 cubic yards of fill dirt (the equivalent of 390 railroad coal cars) for this development, quoting from the Planning and Development Services (PDS) review, it is determined “Proposed Action had the potential to cause significant adverse environmental impacts”. Picnic Point is historically a slide-prone area. The PDS recognizes that as fact and clearly states this proposed development has the very real potential to cause natural or man-made destructive ecological damage.
• For the Picnic Point, Woodsound, and Windsong neighborhoods, Picnic Point Road (or 140th St. SW) is the main access road. Picnic Point Road is often in traffic congestion now. The additional vehicles from the proposed development will only increase this gridlock. A natural or man-made disaster will limit emergency vehicles from accessing these neighborhoods via this main access road.
• Picnic Point and Serene Lake Elementary schools are at maximum student capacity now. Both schools are utilizing portable classrooms (remodeled mobile home trailers). The additional students from the proposed development would stretch the Mukilteo School district to the financial limits, and unnecessarily burden taxpayers.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Paula Hatfield
13623 Puget Sound Blvd.
Edmonds, WA 98026
Aug. 6, 2014
Dear Mr. MacCready,

I am extremely concerned about the proposed development of 112 homes on Picnic Point Road. In my 16 years as a resident of Woodsound, I have seen every lot and older single home available replaced by as many buildings as could be crammed on a single space. The new development on Lincoln Road is a prime example. Yet the roads remain 2-lane, and no additional parks or school facilities are forthcoming. The devastation to the natural growth timber is heart-breaking.

Please place my name as a Party of Record opposing this enormous incursion into an already bursting-at-the-seams community. Thank you for your careful consideration of this matter.

Arthur T. Hegvik
6313 142nd St. SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

thegvik@aol.com
Dear Mr. MacCready:

As I review the Draft-Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, I would like to submit my name to become a party of record. Although the developer has gone to lengths to address the many environmental issues of building on these sections, I have concerns that persist about a development of this density and magnitude:

- Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Associations. At best, this is a fragile, costly idea for the long term.

- The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an ice nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools –Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns. Please place my name as a party of record.

Viki Hennessy  
6814 141st St. SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 3, 2014

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Fronal Estates, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude in the Picnic Point area which is a slide prone area and could become another Oso in which case the county would be sued and therefore the taxpayers. I am strongly opposed to such a development.

Sincerely,
Ann Herman
13905- 61st Ave. W.
Edmonds, 98026
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Saturday, August 23, 2014 3:15 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Last Name*
Stephen Hill

Contact Email
steve@briancampbellhill.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic Impacts
[X] Tree Canopy
[X] Neighborhood Character

[ ] Noise
[ ] Drainage/Stormwater

Other

Comment Field
I am concerned about the impact on our community of 1/2 new dwellings and a very significant regrade of a slide-prone natural growth area. The project has no potential upside for our neighborhood and has many serious downsides. The additional traffic volume through our neighborhood, additional crowding in the local schools, and destruction of the natural environment make this project a real disaster for the neighborhood. I urge you to select the "No Action Alternative."

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
13910 64th PL W

2 - 219
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Stephen
Last Name: Hill
Contact Email: steve@bonniecampbellhill.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: I am concerned about the impact on our community of 112 new dwellings and a very significant regrade of a slide-prone natural growth area. The project has no potential upside for our neighborhood and has many serious downsides. The additional traffic volume through our neighborhood, additional crowding in the local schools, and destruction of the natural environment make this project a real disaster for the neighborhood. I urge you to select the "No Action Alternative."

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13910 64th PL W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 425-742-7110

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/23/2014 3:14:37 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 67.170.22.222
Referee Page: http://snohomishountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
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Hi Paul,

Are you able to provide a response regarding the concerns I identified in my earlier email?

Scott Houghtaling

On Mon, Aug 11, 2014 at 2:21 PM, Scott Houghtaling <s.houghtaling32@gmail.com> wrote:
My Address is:

13719 - 58th PL W
Edmonds, WA 98026

On Mon, Aug 11, 2014 at 2:20 PM, MacCready, Paul <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)
Dear Mr. MacCready,

I am writing in response to the planned Frognal Estates (aka Horseman’s Trails) development. I reside at 13719 – 58th PL W and am one of the original residents in Regatta Estates dating back to 1998. Over the years I have witnessed falling trees in my neighborhood as well as serious car crashes down Picnic Point Road. One falling tree in particular came down on a neighboring house so hard and with such force that it lifted the home off its foundation. In addition, the tree branches penetrated the roof in so many spots, that if someone had been home and upstairs at the time the tree hit, they would have likely been impaled. I’m aware these accidents can and will happen over time regardless of any new building or development, however, my concern is overdeveloping in a topographically challenged area where the frequency and seriousness of these incidences could increase and put existing residents at greater risk.

I often look at the slope of the hillside from our house up to Picnic Point Elementary School and wonder if the land might let go if most of the trees and ground covering were removed. Additionally, I wonder if our home would be at greater risk of falling trees if much of the adjacent hillside was cleared. After the tragedy that occurred in Oso earlier this year, I certainly hope Snohomish County would take a much closer look at the potential for landslides and falling trees in residential areas with significant ravines and steep slopes. In many cases, these planned developments should be declined.

I have seen far too many accidents down Picnic Point Road over the years, and added traffic volume will only increase the frequency of these occurrences. Given the current speed limit and the lack of sidewalks, local residents and pedestrians would also be put at much greater risk.

So in summary, my concerns are as follows:

1) Stability of the hillside for the proposed development and the greater potential for landslides.
2) Potential for more falling trees by thinning or removing significant numbers of existing woodlands and ground cover.
3) Traffic and safety concerns for local residents and their children resulting from increased traffic volume.

I am interested in hearing your response to my concerns in addition to the time frame for this project and the likelihood of it all coming to fruition.

Thank you for your time.
Scott Houghtaling
To: Mr Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin.  
Bldg. East 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201  

Dear Mr MacCready,

Thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns regarding the proposed development by Frugal Estates in the Picnic Point neighborhood on Picnic Point Road, at 60th Avenue W, at 140th Street S.W.

Today I walked the forest between the dead-end (northbound) of 60th Ave W, on down to Picnic Point road, an area of heavy northwest cedar and Douglas firs with many fallen trees. (a difficult walk!) To open the road from 60th Ave to Picnic Point Road would require removing around one-hundred fifty to two hundred important trees, for the road alone. This corridor has
signage advising that it is a protected zone and is off-limits to the public in order to protect the watershed and stream which runs down to Picnic Point Park on the sound.

I feel that this corridor should be protected from further development to secure the uplands and watershed and stream for salmon passage and stabilization of the slope leading down to the railroad tracks used by BNSF, Amtrak and the Sounder Commuter trains.

Whatever happens on this slope/hillside will directly impact the park and the safety of the railroad traffic that passes just above the Picnic Point Beach, along strand of important recreational fishing, boating and beach activity.

The current residents around the two elementary schools already have to deal with planned and
accidental odor releases from the recently expanded Alderwood Water and Wastewater treatment plant located on the northeast side of Picnic Point road after the Wriggate Apartment projects. The forest where Frogsal plans to build absorbe part of these by-products of waste water treatment and mollifies the undesirable effects of same on the locals.

I realize that Lushomish County is in the cross-hairs of many eager developers and that, with a rebounding economy and home construction industry, there are many temptations to cast aside environmental considerations in the process of providing more habitation.

I encourage you to weigh all these factors, pros and cons, and thank you for a job well-done.

Respectfully,
Daniel R. Jensen
5429 125 Th Place SW
Mukilteo, WA 98275

On Monday, August 11, 2014 9:14 AM, "MacCready, Paul" wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

Dear Sir:

Please add my name as a Party of Record protesting the proposed development in Picnic Point. This development proposes to remove over 16 acres of trees on a hillside and replace them with 112 homes.

The impact of storm water runoff from this project is of special concern because of its effects on the increase of contamination in Puget Sound, on a salmon run in Picnic Point Creek, and on the negative effects it will have on ground water replenishment.

The streets and driveways supporting 112 homes will collect contamination from automobiles which includes oil, asbestos, and heavy metals. Adding these additional contaminants to Puget Sound is opposed to the process underway to reduce Puget Sound contamination. The coming legislature will be considering a bill to reduce the level of contamination in Puget Sound to protect the health of all those who eat...
salmon. Industrial waste has received much attention in the past, but in the future storm water runoff will be receiving increased scrutiny.

In addition to the contaminants from automobiles, the storm water runoff from 112 homes will also contain pesticides and herbicides used on lawns and gardens and soap used to wash cars. The half-life of these contaminants is, as yet, unknown, but may continue to adversely affect marine life for years.

The nutrients contained in lawn and plant fertilizer is inevitably contained in storm water runoff. When it enters a salmon bearing stream such as Picnic Point Creek, it causes rapid growth of algae which then soon dies off and as it decays, it uses up all of the oxygen in the stream water. As a result, the tiny young salmon cannot obtain oxygen from the water and suffocate.

Presently, there are 22 acres of trees in the proposed project location. One of the functions these trees provides is the retention of rainwater in such a way it replenishes the underground water supply. Removing over 16 acres of these trees and replacing them with impervious surfaces: roads, sidewalks, patios, roofs, and lawns, reduces the natural replenishment of the ground water.

Protecting Puget Sound from contamination, protecting salmon runs, and maintaining ground water supply are the hallmarks of good stewardship of the environment all of us value. We depend on our government resources to provide this good stewardship. Accordingly, this Picnic Point project should not be allowed to go forward.

Yours truly,

Daniel Jensen, Chairman
Conservation Stewards/Garden Life Group
Pointe of Grace Lutheran Church
Mukilteo, WA 98275

danielr.jensen@frontier.com
Sorry Paul.

Lisa and Jeff Johnson
13705 68th ave west
Edmonds, Wa 98026

On Mon, Aug 11, 2014 at 9:10 AM, MacCready, Paul <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2243

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely, Lisa and Jeff Johnson
Paul MacCready,
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Administration Building East, 2nd floor
Everett, WA 98201
July 30, 2014

RE: EIS Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD

Dear Mr MacCready,

I am concerned about development in the prone slide area of Picnic Point. The County is already financially challenged by the OSO disaster. Expenses are expected to increase as future court cases about OSO are decided.

Building on the Picnic Point site sets up the possibility of similar slide disaster in that area with loss of life and great expense. These slide problems would affect rail transportation which will experience increased delays and losses of both people and cargo. All of these problems will increase expenses of the county. Now is the time to limit those potential problems by not approving the proposed development.

Existing roads in the area will need to be expanded to accommodate the residents of the proposed housing. Without transportation improvements the existing roads would be dangerous for children going to and from school and anyone using the road.

There are two existing schools currently serve that area and both are at maximum occupancy. These proposed homes will challenge the school district.

The quality of life for everyone in the community will be unpleasant due to the changes in the environment caused by storm runoff slides and the transportation problems.

Please place my name as a party of record.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Margaret Johnson
7804 238th Street SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Put me down for one NO.

Appreciate the time and information. :)

Reed

This project is very controversial. Timelines for controversial projects are very difficult to predict. This project will still require a hearing after the EIS is issued, which may be appealed, etc. It may require redesign, which will then need to be reviewed and that decision then could also be appealed. I don’t see this project being ready for ground breaking in 6 months.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

Again, thanks for the info Paul. When you say far from being approved, if everything went without any problems, does far mean six months, a year, two years.....?

Reed

Yes, this is just the proposal. Even though it’s been around for a while, it is far from being approved.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
From: Reed Johnson [mailto:321reed@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 3:04 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: RE: File # 05-123050-SD

Paul,

Yes thank you. That shows me the area. Question, is that a street they are planning to put in that starts at 140th St SW, around where Picnic Point Road starts, and then runs parallel to Picnic Point Road and behind Picnic Point Elementary School?

Do you know the time frame as to when they could actually break ground? Is this just the proposal and now they need to get approval?

Thanks again,

Reed Johnson

From: MacCready, Paul [mailto:paul.Maccready@co.snohomish.wa.us]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 2:35 PM
To: 'Reed Johnson'
Subject: RE: File # 05-123050-SD

Reed:

There are three parcels:
00473300002701
00853500000100
00473300002800

I don’t really have a map to e-mail you, but if you go to:
http://gis.snoco.org/maps/permits/index.htm,
you can put in the three parcel numbers separately and see which ones they are.

Let me know if that works for you.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)
Hi Paul,

Is there a map available that specifically pin points the land in question for this proposed development? I looked on the web site but uncertain what I was looking at and the specific area that was in the proposed development.

Thank you,

Reed Johnson
425-582-2050
Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*: Stacey
Last Name*: Kaas

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts
[X] Noise
[ ] Tree Canopy
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character
[X] Other

Comment Field

I have concerns about a development of this density and magnitude in the particular location, (during and post construction): PUBLIC SAFETY: This section of the Picnic Point area is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are significant and can adversely the public safety in surrounding neighborhoods, including mine (picnic point). The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around Picnic Point elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks - over the past few years, there have been several "near miss" incidents between kids and vehicles, and at least one where the child was actually hit. WATER QUALITY: This proposal (location and density) could have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. Storm water runoff from a site this close to the stream, even when managed per current code, may have a negative impact endangered species (salmon and Orca). QUALITY OF LIFE - GREENSPACE This forst currently protects a school and up-slope residents from airport and road noise, as well as the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant. (The new plant seems to stink just as bad as the old one). CUMULATIVE IMPACT Overall, this project as currently designed is not appropriate for this location (geology, infrastructure). I would be supportive of a project which was more traditional in nature (larger home-sites).
BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

Mailing Address 1
13702 65th PL W

City  State  Zip
Edmonds  WA  98026

Phone Number
4257870321

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Stacey

Last Name: Kaas

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character, Other

Comment Field: I have concerns about a development of this density and magnitude in the particular location, (during and post construction):

PUBLIC SAFETY: This section of the Picnic Point area is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are significant and can adversely the public safety in surrounding neighborhoods, including mine (picnic point).

The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around Picnic Point elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks - over the past few years, there have been several "near miss" incidents between kids and vehicles, and at least one where the child was actually hit.

WATER QUALITY: This proposal (location and density) could have severe consequences for the safety and
health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. Storm water runoff from a site this close to the stream, even when managed per current code, may have a negative impact endangered species (salmon and Orca).

QUALITY OF LIFE - GREENSPACE
This forest currently protects a school and up-slope residents from airport and road noise, as well as the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant. (The new plant seems to stink just as bad as the old one).

CUMULATIVE IMPACT
Overall, this project as currently designed is not appropriate for this location (geology, infrastructure). I would be supportive of a project which was more traditional in nature (larger home-sites).

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13702 65th PL W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 4257870321

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/6/2014 2:29:25 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 69.46.34.58
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 1:39 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Christine  Karlsen

Contact Email
hoodsfjord69@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [ ] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy  [X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
A development on a steep bank that replaces 23 acres of forest next to a salmon bearing creek is of great concern, at a minimum the scope of the proposal must be scaled back. With recent landslide events in mind, and history of active landslides in the area, it is unconscionable to build on this scale.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
14021 Densmore Ave N

City  State  Zip
Seattle  WA  98133

2 - 238
Phone Number
206-368-7659

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Christine

Last Name: Karlsen

Contact Email: hoodsfjord60@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: A development on a steep bank that replaces 23 acres of forest next to a salmon bearing creek is of great concern, at a minimum the scope of the proposal must be scaled back. With recent landslide events in mind, and history of active landslides in the area, it is unconscionable to build on this scale.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 14021 Densmore Ave N

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip: 98133

Phone Number: 206-368-7659

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/6/2014 1:38:53 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 76.121.0.217
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 8:50 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Sten  Karlsen

Contact Email
sten.karlsen@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [ ] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy  [X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
Grading and Drainage: The amount of grading that is needed on this steep 23 acre lot to accommodate 112 homes will create new and unanticipated drainage issues that could have a significant and damaging impact on the neighboring homes and environment including Picnic Point Creek. The size of the project should be limited to minimize potential unanticipated permanent damage in the area. Landslide potential: There has been a history of landslide activity in the area. The amount of grading and disruption of existing drainage will likely have a permanent damaging impact on the neighboring homes and environment. Traffic: Traffic at the intersection of Picnic Point Road and Beverly Park Road already backs up past Sevne Lake elementary at drop off and pick up times, creating huge safety issues for the children. How will an additional 1000+ car trips on local roads affect traffic and safety during rush hour and drop-off and pick-up times at the two elementary schools? The road capacity of 60th Ave W and Picnic Point Road also needs to be further studied. There are few sidewalks on Picnic Point Road and there are two elementary schools located on the road to Frognal Estates. Also there are limited bike lanes and no transit facilities nearby to help relieve car trips needed. Aesthetics: 112 homes is too many. There are no other developments in the area that are similar in the number of homes on such a small area of land. The aesthetics for the neighbors and for the county need to be considered. Consideration needs to be taken to reduce the size of the development to aesthetically fit in with the neighboring homes. Cumulative Impact: The cumulative impact this project along with all other development in the area must be
considered. The scope of this project will take many areas to the breaking point, for example the intersection of Lincoln Way and Beverly Park Road. A full review of the traffic, utilities, aesthetics must include all the neighboring development projects as well.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?

(X)Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( )No

Mailing Address 1
13704 68th Ave W

City
Edmonds

State
WA

Zip
98026

Phone Number
4257426698

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project.
(Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Sten

Last Name: Karlsen

Contact Email: sten.karlsen@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field:
Grading and Drainage: The amount of grading that is needed on this steep 23 acre lot to accommodate 112 homes will create new and unanticipated drainage issues that could have a significant and damaging impact on the neighboring homes and environment including Picnic Point Creek. The size of the project should be limited to minimize potential unanticipated permanent damage in the area.

Landslide potential: There has been a history of landslide activity in the area. The amount of grading and disruption of existing drainage will likely have a permanent damaging impact on the neighboring homes and environment.

Traffic: Traffic at the intersection of Picnic Point Road and Beverly Park Road already backs up past Serene
Lake elementary at drop off and pick up times, creating huge safety issues for the children. How will an additional 1000+ car trips on local roads affect traffic and safety during rush hour and drop-off and pick-up times at the two elementary schools? The road capacity of 60th Ave W and Picnic Point Road also needs to be further studied. There are few sidewalks on Picnic Point Road and there are two elementary schools located on the road to Frognal Estates. Also there are limited bike lanes and no transit facilities nearby to help relieve car trips needed.

Aesthetics: 112 homes is too many. There are no other developments in the area that are similar in the number of homes on such a small area of land. The aesthetics for the neighbors and for the county need to be considered. Consideration needs to be taken to reduce the size of the development to aesthetically fit in with the neighboring homes.

Cumulative Impact: The cumulative impact this project along with all other development in the area must be considered. The scope of this project will take many areas to the breaking point, for example the intersection of Lincoln Way and Beverly Park Road. A full review of the traffic, utilities, aesthetics must include all the neighboring development projects as well.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13704 68th Ave W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 4257426698

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/6/2014 8:49:46 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 24.17.68.187
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
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Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:29 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Lisa         M. Kavas

Contact Email
lmkavas@yahoo.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [X] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy    [X] Drainage/Stormwater
[ ] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
Dear Mr. MacCready, I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: 1. Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. 2. Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek, which is salmon-bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park, as well as all wildlife that depend on the fish and surrounding ecology of an unspoiled watershed. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. 3. This group of conifers currently protects a school and up-slope residents from both the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater Treatment plant. 4. The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky and costly idea for the long term, both for the community and for the potential homeowners, who may not understand the full physical and economic risks to their property. 5. Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW, and not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that would be created by the number of proposed vehicles. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter, as are each one of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as, risk to children going to and from school, would be immeasurably escalated. 6. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of
these roads do not have sidewalks, which would make safety a much larger issue for
local school children. 7. The two elementary schools serving the current population-
Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load.
The number of new students proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at
this time. 8. This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife,
enriching us all. 9. Building Frognal Estates will not help with housing availability in the
area. There is already a surplus of newly-built homes and apartments in the surrounding
areas that are still empty and/or not completed. The surrounding areas are already over-
impacted making this a less-desirable place to live already. This lowers the property
values of the existing homes and communities, as would building a surplus of homes that
stand empty for years as wildlife dies and traffic and pollution of all types increases.
Please don’t sell out the public interest to developers! Thank you!

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a
document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of
Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project.
(Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Lisa
Last Name: M. Kavas
Contact Email: lmkavas@yahoo.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree
Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater

Comment Field: Dear. Mr. MacCready,

I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

1. Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that
may be triggered are monumental.
2. Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek, which is salmon-bearing. This
would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park, as well as all wildlife that depend on the fish and surrounding ecology of an unspoiled watershed. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

3. This group of conifers currently protects a school and up-slope residents from both the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater Treatment plant.

4. The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky and costly idea for the long term, both for the community and for the potential homeowners, who may not understand the full physical and economic risks to their property.

5. Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW, and not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that would be created by the number of proposed vehicles. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter, as are each one of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as, risk to children going to and from school, would be immeasurably escalated.

6. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks, which would make safety a much larger issue for local school children.

7. The two elementary schools serving the current population - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new students proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

8. This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

9. Building Frognal Estates will not help with housing availability in the area. There is already a surplus of newly-built homes and apartments in the surrounding areas that are still empty and/or not completed. The surrounding areas are already over-impacted making this a less-desirable place to live already. This lowers the property values of the existing homes and communities, as would building a surplus of homes that stand empty for years as wildlife dies and traffic and pollution of all types increases.

Please don't sell out the public interest to developers!

Thank you!

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/12/2014 3:29:22 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.129.225
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

1. Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

2. Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek, which is salmon-bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park, as well as all wildlife that depend on the fish and surrounding ecology of an unspoiled watershed. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

3. This group of conifers currently protects a school and up-slope residents from both the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater Treatment plant.

4. The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky and costly idea for the long term, both for the community and for the potential homeowners, who may not understand the full physical and economic risks to their property.

5. Picnic Point Rd., 60th W, and 140th St. SW, and not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that would be created by the number of proposed vehicles. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter, as are each one of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as, risk to children going to and from school, would be immeasurably escalated.

6. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks, which would make safety a much larger issue for local school children.

7. The two elementary schools serving the current population - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new students proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

8. This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

9. Building Frognal Estates will not help with housing availability in the area. There is already a surplus of newly-built homes and apartments in the surrounding areas that are still empty and/or not completed. The surrounding areas are already over-impacted making this a less-desirable place to live already. This lowers the property values of the existing homes and communities, as would
building a surplus of homes that stand empty for years as wildlife dies and traffic and pollution of all types increases.

Please don’t sell out the public interest to developers!

Sincerely,

Lisa Mintz Kavas
2011 142nd Pl. SW
Lynnwood, WA 98087
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 9:29 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Susan Keacher

Contact Email
good_day@isomedia.co

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
I have one word that sums up this whole project and it is.......................OSO And a song title sung by Snohomish County Planning and Land Use: "Oops, I did it again............."

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request
SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Keacher

Contact Email: good.day@isomedia.co

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: I have one word that sums up this whole project and it is..........................OSO And a song title sung by Snohomish County Planning and Land Use: "Oops, I did it again............"

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/7/2014 9:29:20 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 206.124.151.161
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Julie Keenan

Contact Email
Juliejewel0508@hotmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [ ] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy  [X] Drainage/Stormwater
[ ] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
I strongly oppose the development of Picnic Point and 60th Pl. Clearcutting this area to put homes that we don't have rooms in our schools for would be very short sided. Besides the schooling issue have we learned nothing from OSO, that whole area is a cliff. Plus there's also the fact of preserving our natural lands and streams. Oh, and lets not forget just how narrow 60th is. How will that issue be resolved? Why is the development even being considered? Who is the moron that thinks any part of this would benefit our community? Sincerely strongly opposing the development of Picnic Point and 60th, Julie Keenan

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit) or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

Organization
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Keenan
Contact Email: Juliejewel0508@hotmail.com
What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater

Comment Field: I strongly oppose the development of Picnic Point and 60th Pl. Clearcutting this area to put homes that we don't have rooms in our schools for would be very short sided. Besides the schooling issue have we learned nothing from OSO, that whole area is a cliff. Plus there's also the fact of preserving our natural lands and streams. Oh, and lets not forget just how narrow 60th is. How will that issue be resolved? Why is the development even being considered? Who is the moron that thinks any part of this would benefit our community?

Sincerely strongly opposing the development of Picnic Point and 60th,

Julie Keenan

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.
Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No
Organization: U

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/13/2014 10:40:54 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.99.1
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I would like to add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about the magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area, and landslides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its development, and it is salmon bearing. This would lead to further degradation. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE implications for the habitat of the Sound, adding to the elements that degrade the ecosystem.
- This group of conifers currently protects a sensitive and highly valued ecosystem, and the proposal could lead to their removal, which would be detrimental.

Please consider these points in your decision-making process.

Sincerely,

Koreis, Kevin
Kevin Koreis
6417 143rd st sw
Edmonds, WA 98026
kkoreis@msn.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information protected by law. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

Possible Landslides, our house is at the bottom of a hill adjacent to the development.

The trees that will be cut down are over a hundred years old and offer a natural block to odors released from the water treatment plant. Of course these trees can be replaced, but it will take a hundred years. Maybe our great, great grand-children will see them.

The increase of traffic is not supported by the existing roads. already there are many accidents from the icy road conditions.

Behind our house and extending into Fognal is a natural habitat for a family of rare Mountain Beavers...this development would destroy their homes.

Sincerely,
Andrew Kosla
6006 133rd pl sw
Edmonds, WA

Sent from Windows Mail
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

Please add my name as a Party of Record for Frognal Estates. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,  
Alex Kotov  
6003 136th Pl SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 8, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact for Fringal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude.

Some specific concerns are as follows:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are of great concern and monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is small. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The Group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The Proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells, and residential connections and the homeowner’s Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Road, 60th W. and 140th Street SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Road, sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter months as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave West to Picnic Point Road increases the degree of traffic around the elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, which enriches all of us.

In closing I would like to thank you in advance for your attention and consideration to this matter.

Sincerely,

Marta Kuhr
Residing in Picnic Point
From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 1:59 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Miranda
Last Name* LaJudice

Contact Email mciajudice@yahoo.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

- [X] Stormwater drainage
- [X] Grading/Earthwork
- [X] Other

Comment Field

Mr. MacCready: The Frognal Estates Project for 112 homes on Picnic Point Road is a natural and human disaster. The site is currently a 22-acre heavily wooded forest located on steep slopes above Puget Sound in the landslide-prone Picnic Point area of Snohomish County. The neighbors of this proposed clear cut, regrade, and development of densely packed homes are fearful of the environmental impacts and safety. The potential negative impacts on storm water drainage and grading/earthwork are astounding. Pinpilings must be required at least. The trees in this region also provide the existing homes with a buffer for the smells released from the Wastewater Treatment Center. The proposed secondary access road, 60th Ave W, has inadequate road conditions for providing access for over 1,000 more car trips per day. The roadway passes by an elementary school, which is already overcrowded and will be more so when 112 families buy homes. The community you serve wants this development stopped.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1
13903 57th Pl W

City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026

Phone Number
206-491-2296

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Miranda
Last Name: LaJudice
Contact Email: mclajudice@yahoo.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: Mr. MacCready: The Frognal Estates Project for 112 homes on Picnic Point Road is a natural and human disaster. The site is currently a 22-acre heavily wooded forest located on steep slopes above Puget Sound in the landslide-prone Picnic Point area of Snohomish County. The neighbors of this proposed clear cut, regrade, and development of densely packed homes are fearful of the environmental impacts and safety. The potential negative impacts on storm water drainage and grading/earthwork are astounding. Pin pilings must be required at least.
The trees in this region also provide the existing homes with a buffer for the smells released from the Wastewater Treatment Center. The proposed secondary access road, 60th Ave W, has inadequate road conditions for providing access for over 1,000 more car trips per day. The roadway passes by an elementary school, which is already overcrowded and will be more so when 112 families buy homes. The community you serve wants this development stopped.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13903 57th Pl W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 206-491-2296

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 9/3/2014 1:59:20 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.137.74
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:28 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Robert LaJudice

Contact Email
lajudicel@hotmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
My wife and I purchased our home at 13903 57th Pl W which backs to Picnic Point Elementary and the buffer zone above Regatta Estates in 2012. We gave birth to twin boys that fall. It has come to a shock to us that our home and children's livelihood is in danger due to the proposed clear cut of the old growth trees and development of 112 homes on tiny lots below us on the steep ravine. My wife has had nightmares of our home becoming part of a landslide akin to the disaster of the Oso mudslide. Can you provide our neighborhood assurance this will not happen? Or is the tax money worth the risk to citizens and nature? Shame on Snohomish County for proposing a change to Ordinance #14-070 which will allow developers to more easily remove the old growth trees without replacement. The proposed change to the area into an urban growth zone must be reverted to protect this last pristine area upstream from Puget Sound.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for
this project.

Mailing Address 1
13903 57th Pl W

City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026

Phone Number: 206-210-0821

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Robert
Last Name: LaJudice

Contact Email: lajudice1@hotmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: My wife and I purchased our home at 13903 57th Pl W which backs to Picnic Point Elementary and the buffer zone above Regatta Estates in 2012. We gave birth to twin boys that fall. It has come to a shock to us that our home and children’s livelihood is in danger due to the proposed clear cut of the old growth trees and development of 112 homes on tiny lots below us on the steep ravine. My wife has had nightmares of our home becoming part of a landslide akin to the disaster of the Oso mudslide. Can you provide our neighborhood assurance this will not happen? Or is the tax money worth the risk to citizens and nature? Shame on Snohomish County for proposing a change to Ordinance #14-070 which will allow developers to more easily remove the old growth trees without replacement. The proposed change to the area into an urban growth zone must be reverted to protect this last pristine area upstream from Puget Sound.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 13903 57th Pl W
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 206-210-0821

2 - 261
Please see attached document.

Thank you for your time.

Cody
Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it's weirs are in a failing state. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

- Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

- The two elementary schools — Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary — are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Cody Lane
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

August 22nd, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:
o Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

o Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park.

o This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

o The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

o Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

o Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

o The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

o This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Sincerely,

Anne Lauterbach
5732 143rd St SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

Want to place your ad here?
Advertise on United Online
www.adsonar.com
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Friday, August 01, 2014 4:59 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.
First Name* Last Name*
Debra Ledford

Contact Email
smzuluz7@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
See attached file

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

File Upload

Upload a document from your computer (PDF or MS Word file type preferred).

Uploaded: Snohomish County PDS.docx
Please login to view the uploaded file.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Organization
Homeowner in Regatta Estates Subdivision of Picnic Point

Please include the name of the entity, group or agency that you are the designated spokesperson for, if any.

**Mailing Address 1**
13726 58th Pl W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phone Number**
425-743-9963

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A COMMENT:** Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Debra

Last Name: Ledford

Contact Email: szuluz7@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: See attached file

File Upload: Snohomish County PDS.docx

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD:** Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Organization: Homeowner in Regatta Estates Subdivision of Picnic Point

**Mailing Address 1:** 13726 58th Pl W

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98206

Phone Number: 425-743-9963
Snohomish County PDS

Attn: Paul MacReady

RE: Filing 2541 – Frgnal Estates in Picnic Point

I, as a Regatta Estates HOA homeowner, would like to be a Party of Record and severely oppose the build out of the Frgnal Estates. My home is at 13726 58th Pl W and abuts the proposed parties property next to the staircase to the school. The county arborist due to problems I have had with water drainage and trees failing told me years ago no one ever should have been allowed to build my home on this property as it is below all the mass of shallow root trees and the homes above. Severe rainstorms take a toll on the hillside so I have to keep massive ground cover on all the land or it can slide. I was also told at the time I bought this property this land was preserved for greenspace by the county and would never be built on. Then the school district sold it and you changed the provisions. I honestly don’t know what the county was ever thinking allowing Regatta Estates to be built in this layout, then allowing the plan to be set for building on the back access highly sloped hillside greenbelt. Think about OSO...of a smaller magnitude.

The owners of this property don’t maintain it now when costs are low, let alone during construction period. I have to pay to maintain the property next to me and the HOA and me share maintenance of the staircase area which the school district should maintain as it is a fire hazard and eye sore, not to mention danger to children and joggers that use the staircase to access the school or come down to picnic point for exercise.

To build on this property, especially 112 cracker box homes you would have to clear-cut the entire space and if they tried to build on the piece abutting me it would be impossible to access without major damage to the staircase and my property. I already have huge problems with weak trees and the alders on their lots has damaged many homes in our HOA during windstorms because they won’t maintain it even when put on written notice. It is an eye-sore of unkept property affecting our home values and a breeding ground for critters and dumping. It is not safe for kids to go on it and my grandson almost fell 12 feet from one of the rockwalls that is very loose and loses rocks periodically. He would have been seriously hurt at 5 yo as one of the fallen rocks was right below where he was hanging off the edge by holding on to roots until we could rescue him. He fell because of the steep incline and large holes from erosion, trees falling along with burrowing mountain beavers and other animals.

To build on this property it would only be safe with much fewer larger properties that sit closer to ground level with our subdivision and leave the rear hillside open natural land as my proper is. I thought about building on my .67 ac lot and was told it was too dangerous to build so why different for them? In addition this would be the only way to preserve some of the esthetics of Picnic Point area. I specifically purchased this property due to the protected green lands in the area.

I oppose the build-out of this subdivision of Frgnal Estates for the additional following reasons:

1. The road construction in the area has been atrocious and still has not fixed the runoff water drainage as I pointed out to the crews that have been here 2 years now. When it rains severely the water fills up and you hear it rushing then it comes up out of the street vents shooting up next to the school staircase and on Picnic Point Rd causing driving and people danger.

2. The roadwork in this area has caused damage to the esthetics of Picnic Point as the crews are extremely sloppy in upkeep of areas, securing equipment and material a danger to children, joggers, etc., and have done horrible jobs at road repair. The last time they flushed the new drains last week my house had major issues that sounded like the pipes were going to burst, emptied all water out of my toilets with a rush and I think the pressure has now damaged a pipe upstairs but I will have to break into a wall to tell for sure. More
run off would have to be absorbed by pipes in our subdivision and they aren't upgrading those. More runoff would be channeled to the creek below causing further erosion and instability of hillsides by Picnic Point Park. We have landslides 2-3 times a year down there which stop the train traffic and homes could be lost.

3. Streets are not wide enough to support the additional traffic and there is only one way out of area for that many added families would risk lives if there was ever a fire in the area, such as on 4th of July. The only other way out is to go up the back hillside through Harbour Pointe. People would be trapped due to the rush of traffic. In addition, it would cause traffic jams during rush hours trying to get people in and out, more bus traffic for schools, and pose a sever danger to children in the area with 112 more families in the area. I have heard this will result in 1200 more trips up/down the road each day. 2 cars can't even get down the street at the same time on 56th and people have to park on street due to hillside conditions in some cases such as my house. I park on slope but it takes a toll on vehicle braking system, but due to such a severe slope other cars cannot handle it. They also slow down the driveway in severe rain and ice. What would this subdivision do with such small lots and steep slopes there will be lots of cars on the street with little to no front yards, they would slide right down into our subdivision. There are accidents every winter due to severe black ice on picnic point road decline down to beach park near the eastern side of our subdivision. Fences have had to be replaced at least 3 times due to crashes.

4. Further rock terracing of the hillside and packing down land I believe would cause an unstable hillside especially without the natural ground cover rooting to hold it in place. Boulders fall now as it is and trees fall all year round, but especially in Dec-Feb time period of severe windstorms. I know one of the trees from my hillside wiped out my neighbors entire second floor and would have killed the family that Super Bowl Sunday morning if they had not just left for church. I have lost over 30 trees on my property alone. If the builder plans to leave a few in place for esthetics, they will be severely weaken and easy to topple. My trees will be heavily impacted by destroying the root system along the hillside. If they fell on my house which sits below them we could be killed.

5. Protection of wildlife – there are protective signs posted all over this area in respect to endangered bird species living in these trees. Is the county going to say it is now ok to kill them? It would destroy the eco-habitat I the area by clear cutting this area which houses many bird varieties, including robins, woodpeckers, and eagles. There are raccoons, possums, mountain beavers and rats. If you clear cut that area they are going to look for life in any remaining open area and the first place they will reach is my property. There will be no remaining berries and other food sources for them. I already have a huge problem with some of these rodents which costs me a lot to keep up preventative maintenance and pay for removal of rats and such that get into my home from the hillside. I'm going to be selling my home soon and this would be a major impact on my ability to sell my home as I would have to disclose the plans.

6. Pollution – No greenery to absorb the odors from the waste water facility down the road will create potentially toxic fumes in the area, plus the additional carbs from 3x the traffic volume. More garbage sitting out and garbage trucks in area which can barely maneuver now.

7. Schools – there is not enough school space to house that many more children in the educational system in the elementary school and commutes via bus to Harbor Pointe schools will create burden on the families. This is an unincorporated area of Edmonds that basically is ignored by the city and county for improvements. There are no sidewalks in most of the area on Picnic Point road forcing children to walk or ride their bikes in the road which already has visibility issues. Is the county committing to widening of streets and putting in sidewalks? We have no land to give up for this in our subdivision.

8. Construction – I was told by the arborist for the county and the private one that the quality of roads put in this area would not sustain big logging trucks to remove all the trees wiped out. I couldn’t even bring one in to take trees I had to remove for safety reasons and the county told me I was prevented from clear cutting any trees and removing them, they had to be left where they fell for regrowth. Now why is this different from what rules the new proposed subdivision has to follow? Without new improved roads in place first, it would be a nightmare living in this area during 2+ years of construction. We would not be able to get in and out of our streets, have excess debris, high noise volumes, unsightly demo, etc., and most of all crime would be
raised in our community and I have already been robbed 2x and prevented 2 other attempts. These will be
cottage homes with bargain construction so grading or building soundly won’t be a concern to this builder.
They will want quick build/sale and run off with profits while they leave us to deal with the fall out of their
poor design and construction.

9. Before any consideration of any building starting the county should force this builder to meet with all
concerned residents of the Picnic Point area and answer questions a prove out they are qualified to do such
a build out safely with low impact to the community. I think anything above 40 or so homes would be awful
and that will even cause major problems in the area to deal with. I propose leaving it as protected greenbelt
as I was told it was and possibly making the school district buy some of it back to save for building out
additional growth of the schools vs. making our children commute 3-5 miles to school as kids are getting
older in the area and there is not enough middle or high school space in Mukilteo for them with all the
additional build-out in the city and bussing them even further to Edmonds, Meadowdale or Lynnwood isn’t
feasible either.

Respectfully, I request the county deny further consideration of the Frognal Estates and in addition make them
clean up the property area now. If they want to further downscale the building as long as other necessary
supporting aspects are taken care of by county I would consider not opposing it.

Regards,

Debra Ledford
13726 58th Pl W.
Edmonds, Wa 98026
425-743-9953
Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impacts Statement for Frogmal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record.

I am very concerned about a development of this density and MAGNITUDE, specifically the following.

Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. There is no guarantee that something like Oso mudslide would not happen here. If that happens, whoever proposed and proceeded this project without reviewing the potential hazardous impact will NOT BE FREE from being criticized and responsible.

As you know, there are many residents in Picnic Point Area who live on the edges of the cliff.

The mass deforestation of this area and construction development will only increase disastrous environmental impact and consequences.

For example, this group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

Storm water runoff can only increases with its subsequent impacts on the creek. This will endanger safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create.

The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time and the safety of the children.

In my opinion, this is a very dangerous and crazy plan. If you live here for only a few days, you will know immediately what I mean. Snohomish County should cancel this dangerous plan.

Sincerely,

Sun Lee

6710 135th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

PS. Please let me know if you have read my message and counted my name as a Party of Record.
MacCready, Paul

From: george lemeshko <golomko@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 6:10 AM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Frognal Estates, Request for inclusion as Party of Record
Attachments: Frognal Estates, Request to become Party of Record.docx

Please see enclosed letter.

Thank you,
George Lemeshko
13923 57 Place West
Edmonds, WA 98020
Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA  98201

September 5, 2014  
Mr. MacCready:

Please add my name as a Party of Record {Draft Environmental Impact Statement}.

Regarding the Frognal Estates development (05-123050-SD), besides reaffirming the concerns of the Picnic Point Preservation Committee, I would like to also ask that, should the project go forward, the developer provide for the Parcel 00569000000100 to be acquired eventually/immediately to be zone converted to a forest preservation/wetland/greenspace area. This parcel is located just south of the junction between 140 Street SW and Picnic Point Road. This would be a reasonable part of any compromise that would be worked out.

The following arguments, for a re-zone of the above mentioned parcel, are, I believe, quite important.

• Children attending Picnic Point Elementary School walk along the road adjacent to this property each school day. Traffic complexity, if increased, would decrease safety.

• In my view, it would be very important to keep traffic congestion low and drivers focused on passing through this intersection in a safe, but timely manner.

Finally, the development is not contiguous with this junction but the effects of the development will surely be felt here. It is hoped that compromise aimed at retaining some decent residential “quality of life” can be arrived at.

Thank you,

George Lemeshko  
13923  57 Place West  
Edmonds, WA  98020

George Lemeshko  9/5/2014
Dear Paul MacCready, Project Manager,

Please see my attached Letter in opposition to the Frognal Estates.

Thank you,

Carolyn Leptich
14203 64th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
425.967.5617
August 1, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Leptich

Carolyn Leptich & Robert Leptich – 14203 64th Ave W., Edmonds, WA 98026
8/6/2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Steve Letchworth
14119 Puget Sound Blvd
Edmonds WA 98026
AUGUST 19, 2014

PAUL MACCREADY
SNOHOMISH COUNTY PDS
3000 ROCKEFELLER, ADMIN BLDG EAST, 3RD FLOOR
EVERETT, WA 98201

DEAR MR. MACCREADY:

I WISH TO EXPRESS MY GREAT CONCERN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT STATED IN THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR FROGNAK ESTATES, OS-123050-SD.

THIS IS OBVIOUSLY AN AREA THAT IS SLIDE PRONE EVEN WITH THE EXISTING VEGETATION.

STORM WATER RUNOFF FROM EVEN A PARTIALLY PEKKED HILLSIDE WOULD NEGATIVELY AFFECT THE CREEK AND ITS AQUATIC LIFE.

VEHICULAR TRAFFIC ON 140TH ST. SW IS VERY CONGESTED NOW DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR AND ANY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC THERE AND ON 60TH AVE. SW WOULD BE DELETERIOUS TO THE SCHOOL CHILDREN ATTENDING PICNIC POINT ELEMENTARY AND SERENE LAKE ELEMENTARY.

DEVELOPING THIS FOREST LAND WHICH ACTS AS A BUFFER FOR THE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT AND A CORRIDOR FOR THE DECREASING ENDANGERED WILDLIFE AS WELL AS IT'S ROLE IN AIR QUALITY WOULD BE A DISERVICE.

SINCERELY,

JOHN & MARY LUCAS
6408 137th PL SW
EDMONDS, WA 98026
Dear Mr MacCready:

I am concerned about a development of this density and magnitude in the Picnic Point Creek ravine (Frognal Estates). I don't believe the environmental damage this development would cause, can be sufficiently mitigated to the extent that it would not have a severe negative impact on our community.

Sincerely,

Gregg M Lundgren
14023 64th Pl W
Edmonds, WA 98026
09-05-14

Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2d Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park, ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifer currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60s W. and 140th st. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 80th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,  

[Signature]

13907 57th PL W  
Edmonds WA 98026
From: sveta lutsik <svetaseattle@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 12:24 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Picnic Point / Horseman’s Trail concerns letter
Attachments: Scan1.PDF
09/03/2014

Paul MacCreary
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2d Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCreary:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Fregnal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park, ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifer currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Aldenwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60s W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 30th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Svetlana Lutsik

13907 57th PL W

Edmonds WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready:

I cannot tell you how upset we are at the prospect of the Frognal Estates development being built in our neighborhood in Picnic Point. We bought our house here a year ago and one of the attractions was the green space that would be used for this area. For health reasons, we need to be in an area with lots of trees which means cleaner air. In addition, the roads are already incredibly congested and the schools are jam packed. After the tragedy of Oso, how anyone of good conscience can propose to build in a slide prone area is beyond me. It is an outrage!

Please stop this!

Sincerely,

Dorian McGlannan

Dorian McGlannan
6217 137th Pl. SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
5016 136th St. SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)
I'm sure by now you are more than ever, aware of the concerns of our community in the Picnic Point neighborhood and the jeopardy it is now in due to the proposed Frognal Estates land development.

I'm a 'born and bread' Seattle area person and strongly believe in the outdoors and I know what it means to grow up in an area that has trees and trails to walk and explore which teaches respect for the environment and extremely thankful we live in this beautiful county.

My wife and I've been living and raising our family in Wingate for 14 years. We moved here from Ballard to be close to my children's grandparents who have lived in Wingate since 1975.

I want to share my DEEP CONCERN along with all of my fellow neighbors in regard to this irreversible land scarring that is under consideration. I'd like to know, how SnoHo County can even consider this project when our schools (Picnic Point Elementary is already max'd out and cannot add anymore portables and where can Lake Serene Elem add onto?), roads (traffic congestion - will I be able to ever turn left out of Wingate?), public utilities are already at maximum occupancy and load?

This particular area just can't support the proposed 112 new homes and I'm asking you and SnoHo PDS to stop this senseless proposal and allow this area to stay the way it is and enjoy the beauty and environmentally positive area.

I'd like to have my grandchildren enjoy what my wife enjoyed when she was a child and our children have all these years.

Regards,

Tom Merisko

425.741.6540
August 2, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add our names as a Party of Record. We are very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

John & Bobbi Miller
6196 136th Place SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg. East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready,

I’ve reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. Please add my name as a Party of Record. As a long term resident, I am very concerned about this development due to the density of the development, slope of the terrain and limitations of the road access. Specifically I am concerned about the following:

The area is historically prone to slide due the slope. A development of this nature would increase risk to residents below.

The development would remove all of the vegetation from the steep hillside, creating a significant risk of mud flow, both during and after construction.

The roadways in the area are congested, carrying far more traffic than they were designed for. Addition of high density housing would present a significant hazard and decreased air quality due to the added construction and residential traffic.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Richard A. Mochow
5809 135th Pl. SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg. East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready,

I’ve reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. Please add my name as a Party of Record. As a long term resident, I am very concerned about this development due to the density of the development, slope of the terrain and limitations of the road access and adverse impact to residents during construction. Specifically I am concerned about the following:

The slope of the development may be prone to slide. A development of this nature would increase risk to residents below.

The development would remove all of the vegetation from the steep hillside, creating a significant risk of mud flow, both during and after construction.
Additionally, the developer does not address any aspect of dust, mud, noise or traffic mitigation during the construction phase in their application.
These failures will certainly have an adverse impact on residents and vehicular traffic, using the local roads.

The roadways in the area are already congested, carrying far more traffic than they were originally designed for. Addition of high density housing would present a significant safety hazard, as well as decreased air quality -- due to the added traffic. These effects would be immediate and lasting, since the developer does not address traffic impacts during construction or after residents take occupancy.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important issue. We who live in the Picnic Point area are hopeful that you will make the right decision, in order to maintain the quality of life for our community.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Painter Mochow
5809 135th Pl. SW
Edmonds, WA 98026-3251
Dear Mr. MacCready,

I am very concerned about the development, high density, terraced terrain, traffic problems on small local roads.

Traffic out of Wingate is now 5 to 10 minutes.

Green spaces are gone.

Storm water runoff is a problem at Wingate. I worked for one year to improve the runoff on my lot. I am only 73 years old.

The high slide areas are a serious problem on the whole of Picnic Point Rd. Another development is not possible.

My wife volunteers at the schools. There is already serious overcrowding. How will we handle this?

I include the sample letter. It does a better job in listing all the problems.

Truly Yours,

Hans Mortelmans
Mr. McCready,

I would hate for you to carry the burden of destruction and loss on your heart and mind. Please help us save Picnic Point!

A landslide could result if we allow others to build ... it would be too much for you to bear, not to mention the potential loss of life.

We need to keep our green spaces green, preserve wildlife. This is why we moved here this month.

See my attached letter.

Gary and Heidi Munson
6522 142nd Pl. SW
Edmonds WA
August 1, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Gary & Heidi Munson. 6522 142nd PL SW, Edmonds WA 98026
Tax Parcel: 00373002301601  QTR-Sec-Twp-Rng: NE 24 T27N R04E

Location Information: 47°48'48.62" N, 122°14'15.43" W

Disclaimer: All maps, data, and information set forth herein ("Data"), are for illustrative purposes only and are not to be considered an official citation to, or representation of, the Snohomish County Code. Amendments and updates to the Data, together with other applicable County Code provisions, may apply which are not depicted herein. Snohomish County makes no representation or warranty concerning the content, accuracy, currency, completeness or quality of the Data contained herein and expressly disclaims any warranty of merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose. All persons accessing or otherwise using this Data assume all responsibility for use thereof and agree to hold Snohomish County harmless from and against any damages, loss, claim or liability arising out of any error, defect, or omission contained within said Data. Washington State Law, Ch. 42.56 RCW, prohibits state and local agencies from providing access to lists of individuals intended for use for commercial purposes and, thus, no commercial use may be made of any Data comprising lists of individuals contained herein.

Property Attributes

Note: n/a = Valid result, "no data found", GIS query complete; No data = Invalid result, GIS-dataset incomplete

Jurisdiction, Designation and Zoning Attributes
1- Jurisdiction: Snohomish County
2- Zoning: LDMR
3- Zoning Description: Low Density Multiple Residential
4- Future Land Use (FLU): UMDR
5- FLU Description: Urban Medium Density Residential
6- Urban Growth Area (UGA): Southwest County UGA
7- Municipal UGA: BOTHELL MUGA
8- Proposed Annexation: No data
9- Proposed Annexation - City: No data
10- Tribal Lands Status: n/a
11- Tribal Lands Name: n/a
12- Road Atlas Page: No data
13- Tax Parcel: 00373002301601
14- QTR-Sec-Twp-Rng: NE 24 T27N R04E
15- Site Address: 20314 S DANVERS RD
16- City: LYNNWOOD
17- Zip: 98036-7277
18- Owner Name: COON RICHARD L/COON IRENE M
19- Taxpayer of Record: COON RICHARD L & IRENE M
(maintained by Treasurer)
20- Gross Size (ac.): 0.50
21- Use Code: 111 Single Family Residence - Detached
22- Improvement Value: $45,400
23- Land Value: $141,000
Total Value: $186,400
Tax Year: 2014
24- Assessment Date: 1/1/3015
25- Council District: County Council District 4
26- Diking District: n/a
27- Drainage District: n/a
28- Fire Authority: Not in a Fire Authority area
29- Fire District: Fire District 01
30- Flood Control District: n/a
31- Park District: Not in a park district
32- Park Service Area: Nakeeta Beach
33- Sewer District: Not in a sewer district
34- School District: Edmonds School District 15
35- Water District: Alderwood Water And Wastewater District
36- Water Provider (CWSP): Alderwood Water and Wastewater District

Other Planning Attributes
37- Building Inspector District: No data
38- Lot Status: n/a
39- Mineral Resource Type: n/a
40- Mineral Resource Name: n/a
41- No-Shooting Area: Inside a No-shooting Area (SCC 10.12)
42- Shoreline Management Area: Not in a Shoreline Management Area

43- SMP Potential Assoc. Wetlands: No data
44- Snow Load Factor: 0.0490
45- Snow Load: No data
46- Transportation Services Area: F
47- Transportation LA: No data
48- TDR Receiving Area: n/a
49- TDR Sending Area: n/a

Notice Attributes
50- Agriculture Notification Area: n/a
51- Paine Field Airport: n/a
52- Airpark: n/a
53- Commercial Forest n/a
54- Mineral Resource Notice n/a
      (2000ft):
55- Lahar Volcanic Notice (200 ft): n/a
56- Minimum Lot Size: n/a

Critical and Physical Area Attributes
57- Aquifer Sensitivity: Low Aquifer Sensitivity
58- Sole Source Aquifer: n/a
59- Critical Aquifer Recharge Area: n/a
60- Elevation (approximate ft): 466.00
61- Floodplain 100yr: n/a
62- Flood Hazard Area: Parcel is outside the flood hazard area
63- Geology (erodible surface): n/a
64- Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA): 8
65- Basin Name: Cedar-Sammamish

66- Watershed Name: Cedar-Sammamish
67- Sub-basin Name: North Creek
68- Hydric Soils: n/a
69- Levees source: n/a
70- Levees: n/a
71- Pipelines: n/a
72- Soil Type: ALDERWOOD-URBAN LAND COMPLEX- 2 TO 8 PERCENT SLOPES
73- Steep Slopes: n/a
74- Mine Hazard: n/a
75- National Wetlands Inventory: n/a
76- Wetland's (SnoCo): n/a
77- Wetlands last edited: n/a
78- Data Compiled On: 09/26/2014
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: John Murphy <john@newhetrends.com>
Sent: Monday, September 08, 2014 2:16 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Frognal Estates - party of record request

Hello,

I'd like to be added as a party of record for the proposed Frognal Estates project for informational purposes only.

My contact information:

John Murphy
4314 148th St SE
Bothell, WA 98012

Let me know if you need anything else from me.

Thank you,

John Murphy
Director of Operations
New Home Trends, Inc.
425-953-4719
15819 NE LEARY WAY
redmond, wa 98052

Thank you,

Melissa

On Aug 11, 2014, at 11:13 AM, "MacCready, Paul" <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

8/14/14

Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and
found that this creek is at capacity and it's weirs are in a failing state. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

- Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. It was the intention of the county when they blocked out the USA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Mydynski
Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude. Specifically the following:

-Picnic Point is historically a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
-Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. This proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the health and safety of Puget Sound.
-This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
-The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowner's Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. Our Homeowner's Association fee is already VERY VERY HIGH!!!
-Picnic Point RD., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving is an icy nightmare during winter and is a public safety concern and would endanger many, including school children going to school in the morning.
-Opening up 60th Ave. W to Picnic Point RD. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
-The two elementary schools- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents would be a huge burden to the school district potentially lowering the quality of education.
-This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,
Nick Nam
5809 133rd PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Saturday, August 09, 2014 9:13 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT
Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Diana Noble

Contact Email
diana.noble@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[] Stormwater drainage
[] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
I want to keep South Snohomish Counter a little greener and not develop every last piece of ground within the urban boundary. I am also concerned about the traffic impacts on the local homeowners and potential landslides.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
14708 65 Ave W

City State Zip
Edmonds WA 98026

2 - 300
Phone Number
425-742-0707

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Diana

Last Name: Noble

Contact Email: diana.noble@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Other

Comment Field: I want to keep South Snohomish Counter a little greener and not develop every last piece of ground within the urban boundary. I am also concerned about the traffic impacts on the local homeowners and potential landslides.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 14708 65 Ave W

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98026

Phone Number: 425-742-0707

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/9/2014 9:12:40 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.132.81.158
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
I was just reviewing the information about the proposed development known as The Frognal Estates Planned Residential Development. Seeing that it's proposal includes 112 homes near Picnic Point Road I became quite alarmed. I am a resident of this area and know the area quite well. I am fully supportive of reasonable building proposals, but the magnitude of this development in a geographically restricted area which is already struggling with congested roadways and schools is quite concerning.

I urge the County to consider the full impact of this proposal on the quality of life for those living in and around this area. This just doesn't make much sense to me.

Thank you,

Kevin
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Fronval Estates, 05-123650-SD, please add my name as a party of Record. I’m very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences of the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- The forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Phuong Nguyen H.
14011 55th Ave W.
Edmonds, WA 98026
Paul MacCready,  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller  
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

I am concerned about the development of the Frognal Estates near Picnic Point. Although the developer has gone to lengths to address the many environmental issues of building on these sections, I have concerns that persist about a development of this density and magnitude:

- Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Associations. At best, this is a fragile, costly idea for the long term.

- The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an ice nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools—Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary— are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Peggy Nystrom  
6510 141st ST SW  
Edmonds, WA 98026
Hi Paul,

I'm normally not a NIMBY type of guy, people need places to live, but the proposed development of Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD is a really bad idea.

Have you personally been down there? It is steep, heavily forested, and has one road in and out. Developing this area will lead to erosion and mudslides that the county will be on the hook for repairs for years to come.

In addition, the traffic will overload any already strained infrastructure and max out the already maxed out elementary schools.

Please consider these issues before you approve development.

Sincerely,

Brian O'Hea
5414 135th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026

Please add my name as a party of record
MacCready, Paul

From: Greg Oliver <greqdwg89@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 8:26 PM
To: MacCready, Paul
Subject: Party of Record request re: 05-123050-SD

6 August, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2ND Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

As a long time Picnic Point resident I am deeply concerned about the proposed new "Frognal Estates" development, 05-123050-SD, and so I request that you please add my name as a Party of Record in opposition. Specifically, I have serious concerns about traffic & environmental impacts to this area.

The existing roads are simply not up to the task of handling the spike in traffic that this proposed development would entail. Congestion, traffic noise, pollution and accidents would surely follow a project of this size being forced upon these existing narrow, relatively-quiet roads.

From an environmental standpoint, this area is extremely steep, prone to slides & has frequent storm-related tree falls, and the runoff created by this new development would spew directly into Puget Sound. This would also have a deleterious effect on the native salmon as well as Picnic Point Park directly below the proposed development.

In my opinion this is simply the wrong place to allow such a large, sprawling development. It would have serious, negative impacts to all who live around it. I urge your office to consider all these factors.

Sincerely,

Gregory Oliver
6309 138th Place SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Paul MacCready,

We the kids of Picnic Point Road, are determined to stop the Frognal Estates to cut down the tree in front of our homes. We are trying to save the lives of the creatures that live in the 22 acre forest. Such as gofers, woodpeckers, humming birds, bats, wolfs, squirrels, birds, trees and more. We are also afraid of bullies coming, and neighborhood fights. And that one of us might get hurt by a car.

From,

coeyn, Kristina, Peter, Nothing
P.S. : We do not want the younger ones to remember houses everywhere; we want them to remember beautiful trees.

P.S.S. : If you could, give this letter to the Fragnal Estates to read, so that they get a piece of our minds!!!

THANKS

I love ♡

i ️'s
Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  Last Name*  Melissa Osborn

Contact Email  melissorborn@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
I am absolutely appalled that this land could even be considered for anything but a protected habitat. By the simple lay-of-the-land it is obviously prone to slides. Considering the devastation just months ago of Oso, how can more individuals be put at risk for the sake of development? The fact that this land is next to two elementary schools and that children frequent the now quiet streets should be enough to keep developers away. Adding 112 single family homes would intrude on the privacy and safety of the per-existing homes. I have also emailed a formal letter, but please allow this beautiful land to remain a peaceful habitat, our streets to remain quiet, and our homes to stay safe.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

() No
The following form was submitted via your website: Fronal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Fronal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Melissa

Last Name: Osborn

Contact Email: melissar.osborn@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: I am absolutely appalled that this land could even be considered for anything but a protected habitat. By the simple lay-of-the-land it is obviously prone to slides. Considering the devastation just months ago of Oso, how can more individuals be put at risk for the sake of development?

The fact that this land is next to two elementary schools and that children frequent the now quiet streets should be enough to keep developers away.

Adding 112 single family homes would intrude on the privacy and safety of the per-existing homes.

I have also emailed a formal letter, but please allow this beautiful land to remain a peaceful habitat, our streets to remain quiet, and our homes to stay safe.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Fronal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 1001 Ross Ave #337

City: Dallas

State: tx

Zip: 75202

Phone Number: 2064982009
Ok, thank you for letting me know;

1001 Ross Ave #337 Dallas, tx 75202

On Aug 11, 2014, at 11:13 AM, "MacCready, Paul" <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner  
Planning & Development Services  
Snohomish County  
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.55)

From: Melissa Osborn  
Sent: Monday, August 04, 2014 4:10 PM  
To: MacCready, Paul  
Subject: Frognal Estates

8/4/14

Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller  
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:
I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this year's earlier events at Oso.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it's weirs are in a failing state. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

- Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots.
and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Osborn

206.488.2009
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 12, 2014 9:24 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Last Name*
Mary Kay Perrigo

Contact Email
Marykayp@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic Impacts
[X] Noise
[ ] Tree Canopy
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character
[ ] Other

Comment Field
The Picnic Point neighborhood and roads are not equipped properly to deal with this volume of new traffic. The elementary schools are already full and a project this size would require the school district to redraw boundary lines or build another school—are there funds to do this? I am concerned about the salmon bearing creek that runs down along side the PP road to the beach. How can a development of this size not have a negative impact on the environment? Much of this development will be on a steep hillside. We all know Picnic Point is prone to slides. This is a project that will have a huge negative impact on the existing communities.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Mary Kay
Last Name: Perrigo
Contact Email: Marykayp@gmail.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: The Picnic Point neighborhood and roads are not equipped properly to deal with this volume of new traffic. The elementary schools are already full and a project this size would require the school district to redraw boundary lines or build another school—are there funds to do this? I am concerned about the salmon bearing creek that runs down along side the PP road to the beach. How can a development of this size not have a negative impact on the environment? Much of this development will be on a steep hillside. We all know Picnic Point is prone to slides. This is a project that will have a huge negative impact on the existing communities.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/12/2014 9:23:57 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.46.139.18
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
August 21, 2014

Paul MacCready

Snohomish County PDS

3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor

Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, I request my name be added as a Party of Record. I am, unfortunately, too well aware of the problems caused by the lack of adequate planning that went into the development of Forest Landing and the homes to the north and west in Picnic Point. I am very concerned about a development of the density and magnitude of Frognal Estates, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Road, 60th West and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Avenue West to Picnic Point Road increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Pieroni
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 7:27 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  Last Name*
Dave  Pischerc

Contact Email
davepische@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
Why is the DEIS not available in electronic format for downloading.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
5101 136th St SW

City  State  Zip
Edmonds  WA  98026

Phone Number
206-550-5426  2 - 319
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Dave

Last Name: Pischer

Contact Email: davepischer@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: Why is the DEIS not available in electronic format for downloading.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 5101 136th St SW

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98026

Phone Number: 206-550-5426

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 7/30/2014 7:27:24 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 67.170.122.231
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
From: Nataliya Polishchuk <natali.polishchuk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 10:19 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Frognal Estates

8/11/2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their veh. Joint Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Nataliya Polishchuk

6420 143rd St SW
Edmonds, WA
98026
Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record.

I am very concerned about the new Frognal Estates development of 112 homes that has been proposed to be built in the Picnic Point area.

Firstly this would mean cutting down 75% of the 22-acre forest that contains Picnic Point Creek, located North and Northwest of Picnic Point Elementary school. Picnic Point Creek is home to species of salmon which are currently threatened or endangered, and destroying their habitat to build these houses would only weaken the livelihood of these already vulnerable species. Additionally, storm runoff would flow into these creeks, further harming the precious and fragile endangered salmon. The forest that is proposed to be cut down for Frognal Estates also protects a school and nearby up-slope residents from odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. To not have this odor protection would be a large inconvenience for many in Picnic Point.

Another issue that bothers me and many other community members of the Picnic Point area is that this building of estates would impact the children of the area in a most negative way. For one, with more houses in the area, population in Picnic Point would increase, and therefore, the student population at Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary would increase. These schools are already at a maximum student load, and it would be a large issue for the school district at this point to accommodate room accordingly for the new students who have moved into a Frognal Estates house.

Furthermore, roads around Picnic Point are already not safe enough. The streets where the Frognal Estates houses are being proposed to be developed (Picnic Point Road, 60th W., and 140th St. SW) are not built to handle the large population that the development proposes to bring to this area. Picnic Point Road is already a very winding, sloping path that is very dangerous during the wintertime, when covered in ice. The amount of injuries in Picnic Point would increase if population, ergo traffic volume, increased. Plus, there are many road sections in Picnic Point that do not have sidewalks, so the issue of traffic safety would not be a mere seasonal issue, but an all-around problem for us all.

Finally, it must be noted with great caution that Picnic Point is highly subject to landslides. To start a development in this area has a very high risk of triggering a slide.

All in all, it really does not seem to be worth the time or money to build Frognal Estate's 112 proposed homes in the Picnic Point area. I and many other local residents strongly believe it is against the best interest for us all.

Sincerely,
Natalie Ann Rand
If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT
Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Charlene
Last Name* Rawson

Contact Email
Charlene.rawson@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[ ] Stormwater drainage
[ ] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
Protect Picnic Point from desecration and the public from the tragedy that we know all too well can occur when unstable/ sensitive land is used for housing development. The proposed development at that site is a terrible idea. Please say "NO."

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD
Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
3011 Nassau Street

City
Everett

State
WA

Zip
98201
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Charlene

Last Name: Rawson

Contact Email: Charlene.rawson@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Other

Comment Field: Protect Picnic Point from desecration and the public from the tragedy that we know all too well can occur when unstable/ sensitive land is used for housing development.

The proposed development at that site is a terrible idea. Please say "NO."

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 3011 Nassau Street

City: Everett

State: WA

Zip: 98201

Phone Number: 4253504178

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/6/2014 12:49:10 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 166.137.209.161
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, August 05, 2014 8:35 AM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name*  Last Name*  
Jessica  Reynolds

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*

[ ] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
I have concerns regarding the stability of the acreage as well as the traffic this development will create for the community; safety is my main concern for all that may be affected by this development. Surely there is a better location elsewhere.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.
First Name: Jessica
Last Name: Reynolds

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: I have concerns regarding the stability of the acreage as well as the traffic this development will create for the community; safety is my main concern for all that may be affected by this development. Surely there is a better location elsewhere.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/5/2014 8:34:42 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 209.33.3.47
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Dear Mr. MacCready:

As I review the Draft- Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, I would like to submit my name to become a party of record. Although the developer has gone to lengths to address the many environmental issues of building on these sections, I have concerns that persist about a development of this density and magnitude:

- Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Associations. At best, this is a fragile, costly idea for the long term.

- The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an ice nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools -Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns. Please place my name as a party of record.

Mary J. Rieck
twolake100@gmail.com
14106 64th Ave. W.
Edmonds, WA 98026
SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Daniel  Rizzuto

Contact Email
danandpam1@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [X] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy  [X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
There has been nothing explained to us yet, however there is water run off problems that first come to mind. Which way are they planning on taking the drainage? If it’s westerly then are they planning on upgrading the entire system. If the Dunn off goes westerly, are they willing to pay their fair share for cleaning out the pond area in Picnic Point. Do them ready have an enviromental statement and can we get that sent to us? What about traffic planning?

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No

Organization
PPHOA
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Daniel
Last Name: Rizzuto
Contact Email: danaandpam1@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: There has been nothing explained to us yet, however there is water run off problems that first come to mind. Which way are they planning on taking the drainage? If it's westerly then are they planning on upgrading the entire system. If the Dunn off goes westerly, are they willing to pay their fair share for cleaning out the pond area in Picnic Point. Do them ready have an enviromental statement and can we get that sent to us? What about traffic planning?

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Organization: PPHOA

Mailing Address 1: 6413 137th Pl SW th pPl SW
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 425-412-3657
August 13, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bidg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

Picnic Point Rd is already congested beyond capacity during peak commute times and during school hours. In 2012, I requested, that a 3 way stop be placed at the intersection of Picnic Point Rd and 52nd street to ease traffic. This request was never even taken into consideration by the county.

During the past 10 years, Picnic Point Rd has had numerous slides. Some have been minor inconveniences of mud and debris across the roadway. Some slides have closed Picnic Point Rd for days. Clear-cutting the hillside for development will only add to the problem. This area has the potential to be the next OSO.

Sincerely,

Deanna Sanders
5018 138th St. SW
Edmonds WA 98026-3442
Aug 18, 2014

To: Paul McCready,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed development by Frugal Estates at Picnic Point.

I am again concerned with the environment, the safety of building on such gully-type land. One is a good example of the dangers involved. Add to that is the density of the proposal! The streets will not support the number of cars moving out onto 60 Ave, past the elementary school. Traffic out to Hwy 99 is already crowded making movement slow & dangerous. Add cars from 112 new homes seems ridiculous.

Please reconsider. We elected you to look out for us.

Jane Sanders
0109-13.00-4.00
Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Last Name*
Rene Sauser

Contact Email
keesondi@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[X] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[X] Other

Comment Field
Please see the uploaded attached letter.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

File Upload

Upload a document from your computer (PDF or MS Word file type preferred).

Uploaded: Frognal Estates.docx
Please login to view the uploaded file.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

() No
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Rene
Last Name: Sauser
Contact Email: keeshond@comcast.net

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork, Other

Comment Field: Please see the uploaded attached letter.

File Upload: Frognal Estates.docx

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 6329 136th Place SW
City: Edmonds
State: WA
Zip: 98026
Phone Number: 425-582-2648

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 9:16:35 AM
Submitted from IP Address: 130.76.32.50
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frogna Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am extremely concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, and its potential impact to soil erosion, slope stability, redirection of water runoff, sediment deposits and pesticides or other pollutants in Picnic Point Creek negatively impacting salmon reproduction and salmonid survival rates, additional burden to waste management resources, loss of critical wildlife habitat, increased volume of traffic on existing through fares and potential threat to pedestrians and young elementary school children, negative impact to property values of existing homes in the area, potential increase in crime rates and noise, and overall quality of life impact to the area’s existing residents.

While the existing plan attempts to address some of these concerns and proposes the use of best practices and techniques intended to mitigate some of these concerns, I feel the area’s location, current grade, and environmental significance poses too high of a risk, and the plan fails to address potential impacts if the weather fails to cooperate during development, before the various mitigations can actually be put in place.

The plan also does not address the amount of dust and other pollutants in the air, or increased noise that will impact current residents during the construction phase. The plan does not address the potential for odor releases from the waste treatment plant affecting area residents when the majority of conifers serving as a buffer are removed.

In addition, the plan fails to fully address the concerns for increased traffic in the area’s main arteries. Picnic Point road has been a difficult area to get through during the current sewer pipe project. I’ve seen traffic backed up all the way to Bev Park road at times with up to a 15 minute wait. Adding another 120 homes, each with an average of two or more drivers, will negatively impact wait times during construction projects or when school is let out each day, increase danger for pedestrians, especially young children attending the two schools in the immediate area, and increase the number of accidents. These roads are especially difficult and prone to heavy icing during the winter months. Currently there is only one way in and out of the Picnic Point complex and the proposed plan does not help that situation.
Existing area grocery stores, quality restaurants and the closest existing mall (Alderwood) do not adequately support the current area residents, yet there are already a number of new residential properties being developed in the area, e.g. Azi Lee Estates, and the new condo complex on Mukilteo Speedway.

I enjoy the peace and quiet, the low crime rate, quality water, clean air, natural beauty and local wildlife (owls, bald eagles, raccoons, possums, squirrels, salmon, and deer) that call this area their home. Frankly, nothing in the plan to add an additional, tightly bunched, 120 new single family residences offers value to the existing residents in the area. As far as we can tell, the only benefit would be to the developer, those people wanting a new home in this area, and a potential increase in tax revenue that will more than likely be offset by the increased spending the city will need to incur to maintain or improve infrastructure to handle the additional burden. Aren’t there already enough developed areas and homes for sale? Why must we continue to expand and destroy natural habitat that can never be replaced?

Respectfully,

Rene Sauser
6329 136th Place SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd floor
Everett, WA 98201

Reg: Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD

Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates please add my name as a Party of Record. I am concerned about the negative impact a development of this density will have on the existing neighborhoods and wildlife specifically the following:

Picnic Point Elementary school is already at capacity, adding upwards of 100 plus more students would be a huge burden on a school district already unable to cope with these increasing numbers. The result will be to squeeze in more portables to “temporarily” house students, increase numbers of students per classroom or to bus students around to different parts of the district where space can be found. This results in a negative impact on the quality of education offered and a disconnected neighborhood.

Opening up 60th Ave W. to Picnic Point Rd will also increase traffic around the elementary school and local neighborhoods. Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic such a development would create. The area is not served by reasonable alternate routes so all traffic would be directed through what are truly residential areas.

The proposed plan places the maintenance of the area’s green spaces, wells and residential connections on the future Homeowner’s Association. The residents serving on this future board are likely to be unfamiliar with how to handle future issues regarding storm water run off, environmental endangerment and maintenance of slide-prone areas.

The forest that will be removed for this development serves as a home to local wildlife, as well as a buffer to the odor release from the wastewater treatment plant. There is long-term purpose and value to maintaining these small amounts of green space in our communities.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sophia Schoop
6428 136th Pl SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready,

Pursuant to your request, my full mailing address is:

13618 67th Av W, Edmonds WA 98026.

Thank you,
Patricia Scott

On Aug 11, 2014, at 9:09 AM, MacCready, Paul <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56).

August 8, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:
• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,
Patricia Scott
Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Fronval Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a PARTY OF RECORD. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the sides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the element that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of confires currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowner's Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be exacerbated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools – Picnic Pointe Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden on the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Caroline Scull
Resident

6302 136th Place SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very upset about a development of this magnitude. In addition to the items mentioned below, I'd like to address this issue from the perspective of a 4th grade teacher in the Mukilteo School District. The impact this development would have on Picnic Point Elementary would be tremendous. The school is already overcrowded and class sizes are at their limit. As you know, there are no plans or funds to remodel and update the area schools that are old, too small, and outdated. As a result, our kids will be the ones to suffer and feel it the most with overcrowded classrooms. Please make sure to add my name to the list of people not happy about this project.

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools — Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary — are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

M. Joak Shiau  
6224 142 St. SW, Edmonds, WA 98026

For more Information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee  
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com  
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
PICNIC POINT IS IN DANGER!

SEND AN EMAIL OR LETTER BY AUGUST 22ND

- Frognal Estates, formerly known as Horseman’s Trail, is back with a proposal for 112 homes on Picnic Point Rd. that are tightly packed onto terraced terrain with a thoroughfare of 60th Ave. W. = 1150 more car trips daily on our local roads!
- The welfare of the environment and residents, especially children, who live in the Picnic Point area is at risk.
- 75% of the 22 acre forest located north & northwest of Picnic Point Elementary School will be clear-cut and our community changed forever. We can save it, but we need everyone’s help.

PLEASE write to Paul MacCready via email or letter or both:
Paul.Maccready@co.snohomish.wa.us and/or
Paul MacCready, Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller, Admin. Bldg. East, 2nd Floor, Everett, WA 98201
Info page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/Frognal-Estates

Request to be “Party of Record” and express your concerns!!

*** Please see sample letter on back or on our Facebook page. ***

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 7:23 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name*  Last Name*
Behzad Shirinzadeh

Contact Email
behzads@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic impacts  [X] Noise
[ ] Tree Canopy  [ ] Drainage/Stormwater
[ ] Neighborhood Character  [ ] Other

Comment Field
Paul MacCready Snohomish County PDS 3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd floor Everett, WA 98201 Dear Mr. MacCready: After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: • Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental. • Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. • This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. • The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term. • Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. • Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many
sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. • The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. • This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all. Sincerely, Behzad Shirinzadeh

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Behzad
Last Name: Shirinzadeh
Contact Email: behzads@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise

Comment Field:
Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,
Behzad Shirinzadeh

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 7:23:21 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.125.75.102
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add our names as a Party of Record. We are very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude for the following reasons:

The Picnic Point area is already slide prone so building 112 more houses is a real concern.

This area is also a corridor for various wildlife. We recently had 2 young bucks in our yard and we worry what will happen to these and other wild animals when encroached upon. The salmon stream will also be impacted from storm water runoff and could also have an impact on Picnic Point Park.

The elementary schools in the area will be overloaded and there are not enough sidewalks to support this increase. Also the roads are dangerous in the winter and could put more people and kids in harms way.

We just wonder why this proposal has resurfaced.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jack & Susan Shouse
14011 Puget Sound Blvd.
Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are disastrous.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impact on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents' vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. Is the county willing to spend millions of dollars eventually to widen the road?

- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary are already at maximum capacity. Already new students from the low income housing across from Albertsons on Mukilteo Speedway will have to be placed in Mukilteo schools. It's my understanding that 150 new kids are expected and the housing development hasn't opened yet. How many more students can the district accommodate? Are the builders willing to subsidize our schools?

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. Increases traffic around the elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all. The wildlife protection signs that were in this area have been removed by the county already. How many more promises will the county break? We fought this development for years. Does the county honestly think that because a few years have gone by that residents in this area will forget. I hope not!

Sincerely,

Linda and Larry Simoneaux
13813 61st Ave. W.
Howard Slauson
9/1/2014
(No Party of Record Request)

Please add my voice and vote to abstain from building developments this close to Puget sound and the creeks that flow into it.

This development is shortsighted and not conducive to protecting salmon and wildlife habitat.
Kudos to city for buying property

Thank you for writing about land use policy concerning development above south Snohomish County saltwater beaches. (Aug. 14 article, "$7 million to save land.") I appreciate the efforts of the city of Lynnwood to buy property abutting Lund's Gulch for the use of future generations of people, fish and animals. Mukilteo should also be commended for plans to save Japanese Gulch from development.

As a frequent hiker/explorer of these areas, as well other smaller gulches and uplands I've enjoyed the beauty and solitude of nature, and only minutes from home. I've seen the degradation caused by development and the ensuing water runoff/mudslides. The creeks fill in and start to smell polluted.

I agree with the comments of letter writer Joan Smith on mudslides, 'Patching' bluffs ignores real issues," that we, the residents of this beautiful area, must speak out with presence and pocketbook. Remember, once developed, the forest habitat is gone forever. In the late 1800s, old growth tall stately trees marched right down to saltwater. How cool that would've been to see! Most were cut down in the name of progress. I recommend two books on the history of the area; "Picnic Point Pathways" and "Angels To The Rear." Let's not keep repeating misguided development policies dictated by those only interested in profits.

Howard Slauson
Lynnwood

© 2013 The Daily Herald Co., Everett, WA
From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, September 01, 2014 10:28 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* howard
Last Name* slauson

Contact Email
howardslauson@comcaast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

- [ ] Traffic impacts
- [X] Tree Canopy
- [X] Neighborhood Character
- [ ] Noise
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater
- [ ] Other

Comment Field
Please add my voice and vote to abstain from building developments this close to Puget sound and the creeks that flow into it. This development is shortsighted and not conducive to protecting salmon and wildlife habitat.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

File Upload

Uploaded: Lunds Galch letter.pdf
Please login to view the uploaded file.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: howard
Last Name: slauson
Contact Email: howardslauson@comcaast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: Please add my voice and vote to abstain from building developments this close to Puget sound and the creeks that flow into it.
This development is shortsighted and not conducive to protecting salmon and wildlife habitat.

File Upload: Lunds Gulch letter.pdf

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 9/1/2014 10:28:00 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.132.127.69
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
I would very much like to see the results of the Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. I would also like to view the plan for the new development as the acreage has increased. I hope that you have contacted the Homeowners’ Associations of this area as well as the residents.

My concerns remain about a development of this density magnitude:

Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are huge.

Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek and endangerment to the County park.

This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the odor releases of the water treatment plant - twice weekly- usually Wed. and Sat.

The roads are not designed to handle the degree of traffic increase that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. That particular road is also an ice nightmare during the winter. The number of people at risk for injury on the road, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. (if still part of the plan) also increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school.

The two elementary schools are already at max load. This number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Joan Smith,
(425) 745-2576
14106 64th Ave. W.,
Edmonds, WA 98026
July 22, 2013

Paul MacCready,  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller  
Admin Bldg East  
2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

I would very much like to see the results of the Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. I would also like to view the plan for the new development as the acreage has increased. I hope that you have contacted the Homeowners' Associations of this area as well as the residents.

My concerns remain about a development of this density and magnitude:

- Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are huge.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing and endangerment to the County Park. This also has consequences for the long term health of Puget Sound.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the odor releases of the water treatment plant-twice weekly- usually Wed. and Sat.
- The roads are not designed to handle the increased degree of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. That particular road is also an ice nightmare during the winter. The number of people at risk for injury on the road, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. (if still part of the plan) also increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school.
- The two elementary schools are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Joan Smith  
joan.a.smith@gmail.com  
14106 64th Ave. W.  
Edmonds, WA 98026
Thanks for your response. This is different information than what was published on the card that I received. That stated the Draft EIS was available. However, I will wait until next week to come into view the statement. Should I call ahead or will you send a corrected notice as to when it is complete?

I asked about an appointment, so that I could get questions answered at the time I come down. That saves on a great deal of unnecessary confusion. I realize how busy your office can get at this time of year. However, I can possibly find someone else in the office willing to explain... Joan

On Tue, Jul 22, 2014 at 4:11 PM, MacCready, Paul <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

Thank you for your comments. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is not complete and is not available as yet. There have not been any revisions depicting redesign of the plat submitted by the applicant. There has not been any proposal by the applicant to increase the acreage of the original proposal. You do not need an appointment to come to the Records Room to view the file; however, it may be premature for you to come in to review the file because there are no new documents to review. If the Homeowners’ Associations have requested to be parties of record, they will be notified.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)
I would very much like to see the results of the Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. I would also like to view the plan for the new development as the acreage has increased. I hope that you have contacted the Homeowners' Associations of this area as well as the residents.

My concerns remain about a development of this density magnitude:

Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area. The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are huge.

Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing and endangerment to the County park.

This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the odor releases of the water treatment plant - twice weekly - usually Wed. and Sat.

The roads are not designed to handle the degree of traffic increase that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. That particular road is also an ice nightmare during the winter. The number of people at risk for injury on the road, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated. Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. (if still part of the plan) also increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school.

The two elementary schools are already at max load. This number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering these concerns.

Joan Smith,

(425) 745-2576

14106 64th Ave. W.,

Edmonds, WA 98026
Dear Council Members:

A Draft EIS proposal for the slopes of Picnic Point Rd. includes 112 homes on 22.4 acres. Right now the comment period ends on August 22nd. I contacted Mukilteo School District officials but they are on vacation until next week. Is it possible to get an extension on the comment period for sometime into September when parents of Picnic Point School will have returned from vacation as well as the school district officials?

I have asked to be a party of record for this project, but I have long had reservations about the planning for the Southwest corridor as the high density slated for this UGA region does not address the huge environmental issues at stake when projects of this size and type are permitted. I would like to you to personally visit some of the site proposals: Possession Lane with 40 homes platted on septic, Seabrook Heights that would inundate Meadowdale Park, and now Frognal Estates on Picnic Point. Earlier planners knew the inherent fragility of this area and that is why forested land remained.

More must be done in the realm of conservation and preservation for this area. I am not only committed to fight against this type of project for our community, but I am also committed to fight for action that will protect and preserve the creeks and slide prone steep ravines and high bluffs that lead to Puget Sound. We must act as guardians now and into the future or we will have no healthy future for those who follow us. Is there any way that we can buy back what should never have been available for sale?

I have already contacted Paul MacCready, project manager, with my concerns:

- **Picnic Point is a highly slide prone area.** The risks of building in this area and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- **Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing.** This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- **This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Water treatment plant.**

- **The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners Associations.** At best, this is a fragile, costly idea for the long term.

- **The roads- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W, and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create.** Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an ice nightmare during the winter as are each of the
intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be elevated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many parts of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools –Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Thank you for considering my concerns and my request for an extension of the comment deadline to September.

Sincerely,
Joan Smith
14106 64th Ave. W.,
Edmonds, WA 98026
joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Mr. MacCready,
Please see the attached letter about my concern regarding the development of Frognal Estates.

Sincerely,
Jennifer McGivern-Snofsky

jenmcg@uw.edu
August 11, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools -- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary -- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Jennifer McGivern-Snofsky
6019 137th Pl SW, Edmonds, WA 98026
Mr. MacCready,

As a local homeowner and tax payer, I am sending you this email in hopes that you may take into consideration the widespread chaos and damage the Frognal Estates would cause our local community should it be allowed to be built.

I hope you take this into consideration as you move forward in making your decision.

I would be happy to speak with you further should you wish. My phone number is 206-406-5176.

I have attached my letter of dissatisfaction with this planned community for you to file if need be.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott Snofsky
6019 137TH PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 22, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools -- Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary -- are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Scott Snofsky
6019 137th PL SW, Edmonds WA 98026
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From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 5:57 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT

Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name* Carol
Last Name* Stanford

Contact Email estanfor@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?*
[ ] Stormwater drainage
[X] Grading/Earthwork
[ ] Other

Comment Field
I am very concerned about such dense building on such steep sloped areas that are known to be volatile. I wish to be a party of record to be made aware of the proceedings. Oso was preventable.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*
(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
( ) No

Mailing Address 1
19705 64th Place NE

City Kenmore State WA Zip 98028
2 - 362
Phone Number
425 286 2951

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - SEPA Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A COMMENT: Submit a comment on the DEIS for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

First Name: Carol
Last Name: Stanford
Contact Email: cstanfor@gmail.com

What component of the project DEIS are your comments generally related to?: Stormwater drainage, Grading/Earthwork

Comment Field: I am very concerned about such dense building on such steep sloped areas that are known to be volatile. I wish to be a party of record to be made aware of the proceedings. Oso was preventable.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 19705 64th Place NE
City: Kenmore
State: WA
Zip: 98028
Phone Number: 425 286 2951

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/8/2014 5:56:31 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 67.171.49.180
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-SEPA-Comments-Pa-139
Aug 15, 2014

A NOTE FROM

Arleen Stenger

Dear Sir,

Please, please! Do not let developers continue to build on land where the slopes let seeds and debris flow into our Electoral District! I would think we should re-in the hands of all the people in charge of our Lands. Animal Extinction and Extremes Trails have no business destroying the Rivée Point.

Arleen Stenger

A NOTE FROM

Arleen Stenger

Creek and the areas around it.

I am scared and I have lived in the area for over 20 years. I shudder to think what the North will become if we don't learn from nature and what developers can do!

Thank you,

Arleen Stenger

P.O. Box 1674
Edmonds, WA 98020
Hello Paul

I’ve made probably more than a 1,000 trips down Picnic Point Rd since I moved here in 1956. I’ve taken my 13 adopted kids to Picnic Point Park, as well as numerous refugee families that we sponsored. We also used to visit friends who lived on the road north of the Park.

Removing all the trees along the roads and hills in this area would be devastating. It would ruin what we love most about this area. Please, Paul, do what you can to preserve the trees in this area.

Ed Stevens
23007 83rd Ave. W.
Edmonds, WA 98026
August 2, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- My biggest concern with this development is safety. We as a conscious citizens have to do everything possible to insure safety of people who already live here and prevent possible tragedies as we have seen with horrific OSO landslide.

- It is counties responsibility to prove that this project is safe and do in depth geological studies of the area.

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools — Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary — are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Sincerely,

Snezhana Timoshchuk
6003 136th pl sw
Edmonds, WA 98026

Sent from my iPhone
Sent from my iPhone
Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT**

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name*</th>
<th>Last Name*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact Email**

KAYATERRY@yahoo.com

**What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?**

- [X] Traffic impacts
- [ ] Noise
- [ ] Tree Canopy
- [ ] Drainage/Stormwater
- [ ] Neighborhood Character
- [ ] Other

**Comment Field**

I am a long-time homeowner in Picnic Point Development. As it is now, it is a struggle to drive down the ONLY STREET we have to highway 99 - that is: Picnic Point Road. We already have 2 schools, Picnic Point development, Woodsound and 1 other major development converging on this one street to egress daily back and forth. This proposed development will impact the automobile flow very negatively. We are very limited in our choice of route to go anywhere as it is; now with all these additional cars using our road, it will create a traffic bottleneck worse than we already experience. Also, during school year, Picnic Point Road is a nightmare since there are two schools right near each other that have parents dropping and picking up kids throughout day. Add to this the additional cars for additional children and cars from each household additionally and you have a nightmare scenario. We pay high taxes and have a beautiful development. We should expect to be able to drive Picnic Point Road without even additional stress that it already has. This road is two lane and is busy all day as it is. I can't imagine more cars on such a limited road. Please do not permit this development to further impact our transportation issues that are already not good. Thank you, Kay Terry 13902 64th Place West

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**
Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

**Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?**
( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Kay

Last Name: Terry

Contact Email: KAYATERRY@yahoo.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts

Comment Field: I am a long-time homeowner in Picnic Point Development. As it is now, it is a struggle to drive down the ONLY STREET we have to highway 99 - that is: Picnic Point Road. We already have 2 schools, Picnic Point development, Woodsound and 1 other major development converging on this one street to egress daily back and forth.

This proposed development will impact the automobile flow very negatively. We are very limited in our choice of route to go anywhere as it is; now with all these additional cars using our road, it will create a traffic bottleneck worse than we already experience.

Also, during school year, Picnic Point Road is a nightmare since there are two schools right near each other that have parents dropping and picking up kids throughout day. Add to this the additional cars for additional children and cars from each household additionally and you have a nightmare scenario.

We pay high taxes and have a beautiful development. We should expect to be able to drive Picnic Point road without even additional stress that it already has. This road is two lane and is busy all day as it is. I can’t imagine more cars on such a limited road.

Please do not permit this development to further impact our transportation issues that are already not good.

Thank you.

Kay Terry
13902 64th Place West
BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/15/2014 12:57:02 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.170.107.152
Referer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Picnic point proposal - Frognal Estates

From: jdtolfree@comcast.net

Subject: Picnic point proposal - Frognal Estates

To: PaulMacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us

I have been reading about the proposed Frognal Estates project, also known as Horseman's Trails. I believe that this is an ill-advised project.

Steep slopes, especially without the trees, are vulnerable to slides which seem to be more frequent these days. Oso was huge, but there are many other smaller ones every year all along Puget Sound and elsewhere in Snohomish County.

Stream protection, not only for clean water but also for fish runs, is an environmental priority. This can't be accomplished without trees.

Bird and wildlife habitat protection is also a priority, as we find many species diminishing. Open spaces in our increasingly urban area are to be treasured.

Traffic on Beverly Park Road is already heavy and would worsen. Schools are already crowded.

Every aspect of our current quality of life will be worse if this project is allowed to proceed.

Please save Picnic Point.

Jean Tolfree, Mukilteo

The above e-mail was rejected.

Hence, this copy by mail.
August 2, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

• My biggest concern with this development is safety. We as a conscious citizens have to do everything possible to insure safety of people who already live here and prevent possible tragedies as we have seen with horrific OSO landslide.

• It is counties responsibility to prove that this project is safe and do in depth geological studies of the area.

• Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

• The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

• Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Anna Tourovskaja
Mountlake Terrace
WA 98043

Anna
I am writing to make Snohomish County aware of my displeasure regarding the proposed Frognal Estates @ Picnic Point.
In 1995 Snohomish County paid over a million dollars to repair a road that was immediately adjacent to this proposed development. The soil is the same and without the root structure of the trees what can the public expect?
Storm water run off will impact Puget Sound.
60th Ave West is a narrow street that was the scene of a child hit by a car in 2001. No improvements are planned for the street, unless @ the expense of Snohomish County.
Add 1,500 cars a day to that road that also travels in front of two elementary schools?
This is a dangerous and bad idea.
To clear cut a forest is a disaster - 41 different kinds of birds live in those woods plus wildlife.
I would like to be a party of record.

Barbara James Tupper
6011 136th PL SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Hi Paul,

I read several documents tonight on Frognal Estates. What is the likelihood of this passing? I appreciate any information you can give me.

Kristy Uddin
Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 12, 2014, at 8:24 AM, "MacCready, Paul" <Paul.MacCready@co.snohomish.wa.us> wrote:

You need to give me your full mailing address in order to become a party of record.

Paul MacCready, Senior Planner
Planning & Development Services
Snohomish County
425-388-3311 ext. 2943

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from Snohomish County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act (RCW 42.56)

Dear Paul MacCready,

I am deeply concerned after reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SI. Please add my name as a Party of Record. This proposed development is incredibly frightening given the density and magnitude. More specifically, I would like to comment on the following which should be taken into consideration:
Our neighborhood has seen a dramatic increase in traffic with the new subdivision in wind and tide. And our picnic point beach is no longer a secret as it once was. Because we are unincorporated snohomish county, the snohomish county Sheriffs department does not "police" the area, to write speeding tickets, reckless driving, accidents, because they only respond to 911 calls. We have complained several times to the county about road noise and placing speed bumps but the amount of signatures we need to get as ourselves is ridiculous. We cannot already walk down to the beach. Drivers think the road is a freeway and absolutely do not go the posted 35 MPH speed limit. There have been Several accidents on the road and also 2 deaths in recent years add to this concern. To adding more houses will just increase the noise, the road use and more accidents.

-Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered as a result are monumental.

-Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

-This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

-The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

-Picnic Point Rd., 60th West and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Road, sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The road is also very dangerous during the summer months with constant speeding/racing up and down the road creating a substantial safety issue. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school would be significantly escalated.
Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Rd increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

The two elementary schools (Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary) are already at maximum capacity. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district.

The forest in the proposed area provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife not to mention a naturally beautiful aesthetic which enriches us all.

Kristy Uddin

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Paul MacCready,

I am deeply concerned after reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD. Please add my name as a Party of Record. This proposed development is incredibly frightening given the density and magnitude. More specifically, I would like to comment on the following which should be taken into consideration:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered as a result are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have severe consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th West and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the afflc that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Road, sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The road is also very dangerous during the summer months with constant speeding/racing up and down the road creating a substantial safety issue. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school would be significantly escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Rd increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools (Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary) are already at maximum capacity. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district.

- The forest in the proposed area provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife not to mention a naturally beautiful aesthetic which enriches us all.

I would ask that you please consider the points above and not allow the Frognal Estates development to move forward.

Sincerely,

Zia Uddin

6023 133rd PL SW

Edmonds, WA 98026
August 11, 2014

Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201  

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee  
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com  

2 - 380
Willoughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 10:52 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Khanh
Last Name* Vu

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?
[X] Traffic Impacts
[X] Noise
[X] Tree Canopy
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Neighborhood Character
[X] Other

Comment Field
• Forest located north & northwest of Picnic Point Elementary School will be clear-cut and our community changed forever. This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant. • Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. • Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. So many families tightly packed onto terraced terrain with a thoroughfare of 60th Ave. W. = 1150 more car trips daily on our local roads! • Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks. How do all people of current families in Picnic Points (and if plus the new proposed addition of 122 families) get out safely in case if there was a fire in the area? which there is only one road 140th /Picnic Point road for IN and Out of the whole area (not counting yet number of students from 2 schools: Picnic Points Elementary school and Lake Serene Elementary School). • The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the
school district at this time. • This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

*Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Khanh

Last Name: Vu

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character, Other

Comment Field:
• Forest located north & northwest of Picnic Point Elementary School will be clear-cut and our community changed forever. This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.
• Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

• Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. So many families tightly packed onto terraced terrain with a thoroughfare of 60th Ave. W. = 1150 more car trips daily on our local roads!

• Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

How do all people of current families in Picnic Points (and if plus the new proposed addition of 122 families) get out safely in case if there was a fire in the area? Which there is only one road 140th /Picnic Point road for IN
and Out of the whole area (not counting yet number of students from 2 schools: Picnic Points Elementary school and Lake Serene Elementary School).

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/20/2014 10:52:13 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 24.17.71.212
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-Local-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-Local-Comments-141
Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I want to express my concerns about this development, in particular the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated. This road has repeated slides, itself, requiring yearly repair by the county and causing regular lane closures.

- Opening up 60th Ave W to Picnic Point Road greatly increases traffic all around Picnic Point Elementary School and many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

Erin T. Wahl
12122 Marine View Drive
Edmonds WA 98026
425-743-7587
Dear Mr. MacCready -

I am VERY concerned about the Frognal Estates development for many reasons.
- High risk of slides in my neighborhood
- Even more removal of native trees that help limit the odor from the water treatment facility
- HIGHER TRAFFIC VOLUME
- Overloaded schools

My daughter attends school affected by this development. They are already overloaded and this new development would further increase this burden. We are already overdeveloped in this area and further new construction should NOT be considered.

Please consider my opinion and those of us that live in this area. We need the forested area to remain.

Sincerely,

Cindy Warren
August 2nd, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name and my wife's name (Ryan and Jenna Wasserman) as a Party of Record. We are very concerned about the development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVER consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support.
- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Waste water treatment plant.
- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowner's Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.
- Picnic Point Road, 60th Ave. W and 140th Street SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed resitdents residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Road, sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated significantly.
- Opening up 60th Ave. W to Picnic Point Road increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake elementary - are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- This Forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us as well.

Sincerely,

Ryan and Jenna Wasserman
6504 141st Street SW
Edmonds, WA 98026
Paul MacCready  
Snohomish County PDS  
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor  
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee  
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com  
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
PICNIC POINT IS IN DANGER!

SEND AN EMAIL OR LETTER BY AUGUST 22ND

- Frognal Estates, formerly known as Horseman’s Trail, is back with a proposal for 112 homes on Picnic Point Rd. that are tightly packed onto terraced terrain with a thoroughfare of 60th Ave. W. = 1150 more car trips daily on our local roads!
- The welfare of the environment and residents, especially children, who live in the Picnic Point area is at risk.
- 75% of the 22 acre forest located north & northwest of Picnic Point Elementary School will be clear-cut and our community changed forever. We can save it, but we need everyone’s help.

PLEASE write to Paul MacCready via email or letter or both:
Paul.Maccready@co.snohomish.wa.us and/or
Paul MacCready, Snohomish County PDS, 3000 Rockefeller, Admin. Bldg. East, 2nd Floor, Everett, WA 98201
Info page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/2541/Frognal-Estates

Request to be “Party of Record” and express your concerns!!

*** Please see sample letter on back or on our Facebook page. ***

For more information please contact the Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Emily Mydynski: mydynski@gmail.com or Joan Smith: joan.a.smith@gmail.com
Visit our Facebook page: Picnic Point Preservation Committee
Wiloughby-Oakes, Leila

From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:47 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

**Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request**

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT**

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Susan
Last Name* Wiggins

Contact Email wiggins345@msn.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

- [X] Traffic impacts
- [X] Tree Canopy
- [X] Drainage/Stormwater
- [ ] Neighborhood Character
- [ ] Other

Comment Field
Yes, development is inevitable but the density of the proposed plan makes no sense given the steep slope, mudslide risk and runoff to nearby Puget Sound. Also there are days when the odor from the new sewer treatment plant is present currently. The existing tree canopy helps in controlling this odor for the current homeowners. Cutting the existing trees would create more issues. Has the developer or county officials travelled on Picnic Point Road when school is in session? It's a crawl and there are limited sidewalks for the kids. Alderwood Water has tore up the existing road and one side of walking lane for the past two months. Please reconsider the density of the proposed development.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

**Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?**

(X) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( ) No
The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Wiggins

Contact Email: wiggins345@msn.com

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Tree Canopy, Drainage/Stormwater

Comment Field: Yes, development is inevitable but the density of the proposed plan makes no sense given the steep slope, mudslide risk and runoff to nearby Puget Sound. Also there are days when the odor from the new sewer treatment plant is present currently. The existing tree canopy helps in controlling this odor for the current homeowners. Cutting the existing trees would create more issues.

Has the developer or country officials travelled on Picnic Point Road when school is in session? It's a crawl and there are limited sidewalks for the kids. Alderwood Water has tore up the existing road and one side of walking lane for the past two months.

Please reconsider the density of the proposed development.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record, for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 6628 138th PL SW

City: Edmonds

State: WA

Zip: 98026

Additional Information:
SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Lauren
Last Name* Wood

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?
[X] Traffic impacts
[X] Noise
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[X] Other

Comment Field
I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following: Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso. Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it’s weirs are in a failing state.* This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it. The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land. Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides. Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not
wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk. The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time. Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Type in or paste your comments related to this project above (1,000 character limit), or attach a document (PDF or MS Word file type preferred) using the File Upload below.

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

(X)Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

( )No

**Mailing Address 1**

4257 Greenwood Ave N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>98103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT:** Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Lauren

Last Name: Wood

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

Comment Field: I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office

2 - 392
considering this years earlier events at Oso.

Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it’s weirs are in a failing state.* This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners’ Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.

Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.

Mailing Address 1: 4257 Greenwood Ave N

City: Seattle

State: WA

Zip: 98103

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 12:40:30 PM
8/17/2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- **Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area.** The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.
- **Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing.** This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.
- **This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.**
- **The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowner’s Association.** This is risky, costly idea for the long term.
- **Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create.** Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.
- **Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school.** Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.
- **The two elementary schools - Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary - are already at maximum load.** The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.
- **This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.**

Sincerely,

Ruslan and Viktoriya Yakovlev
13407 59th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
P.S. The green belt also serves as a wind breaker. When its storming and raining - huge wind gusts from the Puget Sound are breaking the power lines and the whole area is staying without light and heat. This happens occasionally, but if the forest going to be removed we will be exposed to the element much more often as the rains and winds in this area most of the time of the year.
From: support@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, August 11, 2014 2:17 PM
To: PDS Major Projects
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

If you are having problems viewing this HTML email, click to view a Text version.

**Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request**

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT**

Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name* Clyde
Last Name* Yamamoto

Contact Email
csvamamoto@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?

[X] Traffic Impacts
[X] Noise
[ ] Tree Canopy
[X] Drainage/Stormwater
[ ] Neighborhood Character
[ ] Other

**BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD**

Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?*

( ) Yes, I would like to become an official party of record for this project.
(X) No

The following form was submitted via your website: Frognal Estates Project - General Comments & Party of Record Request

**SUBMIT A GENERAL COMMENT**: Submit a general comment related to the Frognal Estates PRD project. (Note: General comments on the project are separate from those submitted as part of the SEPA process.)

First Name: Clyde
Last Name: Yamamoto

Contact Email: csyamamoto@comcast.net

What component(s) of this project are your comments generally related to?: Traffic impacts, Noise, Drainage/Stormwater, Neighborhood Character

BECOME A PARTY OF RECORD: Become a party of record for the Frognal Estates PRD project.

Would you like to become an official Party of Record for this project?: No

Additional Information:
Form Submitted on: 8/11/2014 2:16:31 PM
Submitted from IP Address: 50.135.156.38
Referrer Page: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
Form Address: http://snohomishcountywa.gov/FormCenter/PDSProject-Comments-25/Frognal-Estates-Project-General-Comments-141
August 7, 2014

Paul MacCready
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller, Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. MacCready:

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The risks of building in this sector and the slides that may be triggered are monumental.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is salmon bearing. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- This group of conifers currently protects a school and up slope residents from the accidental and planned odor releases of the Alderwood Wastewater treatment plant.

- The proposed plan places the maintenance of green spaces, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a risky, costly idea for the long term.

- Picnic Point Rd., 60th W. and 140th St. SW are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. Picnic Point Rd., sloping and curving, is an icy nightmare during the winter as are each of the intersections. The number of people at risk for injury on the roads, as well as the risk to children going to and from school, would be escalated.

- Opening up 60th Ave. W. to Picnic Point Rd. increases the degree of traffic around that elementary school. Many sections of these roads do not have sidewalks.

- The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load. The number of new residents proposed would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

- This forest provides a corridor and protection to endangered wildlife, enriching us all.
Sincerely,
Clyde Yamamoto
13419 65th Ave W
Edmonds, WA 98026
Monday, August 11, 2014

Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller
Admin Bldg East, 2nd Floor
Everett, WA 98201

Dear Mr. Paul MacCready:

I am writing with my comments for the Frognal Estates, 05-123050-SD, please add my name as a Party of Record. I am very concerned about a development of this density and magnitude, specifically the following:

- Picnic Point is historically a highly slide-prone area. The land currently secured by mature and dense trees is very steep and a part of the Picnic Point watershed basin. I do not believe the risks can be mitigated by water wells and a few large retaining walls. This should be a serious consideration for the county permit office considering this years earlier events at Oso.

- Storm water runoff can only increase with its subsequent impacts on the creek which is Chinook salmon bearing. Picnic Point Creek has had many studies done recently and found that this creek is at capacity and it’s weirs are in a failing state. This would lead to further endangerment of Picnic Point County Park. Ultimately, this proposal would have SEVERE consequences for the safety and health of Puget Sound, adding to the elements that degrade rather than support it.

- The proposed plan places the costs of the open spaces, landscaping, wells and residential connections on the Homeowners' Association. This is a costly idea that the developer has not given any indication of what the maintenance costs or emergency funds would cost over 1-5-10-20+ years. Nor has he identified the fiscal demographic this neighborhood would market to, enabling the county to determine if it is even plausible for an HOA to support itself on this land.
• Picnic Point Rd, 60th Ave W and 140th St SW, and their intersections are not designed to handle the larger volume of traffic that the number of proposed residents with their vehicles would create. The dangers of washout and maintaining these steep roads, especially in wet and icy conditions should also be seriously considered by the DOT when building into these hillsides.

• Adding up to 1120 ADT on 60th Ave W adjacent to Picnic Point Elementary School is absolutely unacceptable. This road is not wide enough, does not have turn lanes, parking lanes or sidewalk on one side. Children abound on this street, during school hours and after hours. Please do not put them at risk.

• The two elementary schools – Picnic Point Elementary and Serene Lake Elementary – are already at maximum load, and currently using several portable classrooms as there is no room in the school. The number of new residents proposed, I do not believe is accurate for the demographic these homes would attract, even if it is only 27 new students it would be a huge burden to the school district at this time.

• Lastly this forest provides a corridor and protection to lovely and protected wildlife, enriching us all. I have a hard time believing it was the intention of the county when they blocked out the UGA areas to allow developers to clear cut all trees, to use such small lots and utterly destroy the forest, the lay of the land, and the wildlife which we cannot recreate.

Sincerely,

Lauren Yoho

4257 Greenwood Ave N

Seattle, WA 98103
Chapter 2: Description of the Proposal and Alternatives

Add to Section 2.4 Land Use and Development History of the Site and Proposed Action

2.4.7.1 Land Use – Residential Density

Insert to existing paragraph on page 2-14 that currently reads as follows: As noted previously, Lot 1 of Regatta Estates PRD that was reserved for future development comprises the entire portion of the Horseman’s Trail/Frognal Estates PRD site within Sectors 22 and 23. When the final plat of Regatta Estates was recorded in 1996, the applicant had no proposed design for the future subdivision of Lot 1. The CC&Rs for Regatta Estates (Shergar Land Corporation, May 29, 1996) gave purchasers of lots within Regatta Estates notice of anticipated future development of Lot 1, and established “no right of protest or objection” to future subdivision of Lot 1 by purchasers of lots within the plat of Regatta Estates. A full copy of the Regatta Estates CC&Rs is provided in the appendix to the proposed Division of Development.

Correct Figure 2.4-3 in Section 2.4.4 (box 3 in chart on page 2-10) as follows:

Snohomish County Hearing Examiner
Review and approval of Regatta Estates PRD
preliminary plat
1991

Add new Section 2.11 Cumulative Impacts

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) identifies limited requirements for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. The SEPA Rules limit the scope of environmental review to impacts that are probable (WAC 197-11-782) and significant (WAC 197-11-794), with attention to impacts that are likely, not merely speculative (WAC 197-11-060[b]). The SEPA Rules specifically define only direct and indirect impacts, as follows: those effects resulting from growth caused by a proposal (direct impacts), and the likelihood that the present proposal will serve as a precedent for future actions (indirect impacts) (WAC 197-11-060[b][d]). Recent court cases have indicated that cumulative impacts under SEPA are those impacts of the project that, when combined with the impacts of other projects that are dependent on the proposed project or upon which the proposed project depends, are significant. A cumulative impacts analysis is prospective only (i.e., it is required under SEPA only when it is probable

1 “With the exception of Lot 1, all lots within the Plat of Regatta Estates are in the final developed size and configuration. Lot 1, however, is an over-sized lot, which the Declarant intends, at some time in the future, to subdivide. The owners of Lots in the Plat of Regatta Estates shall take ownership subject to the right of the Declarant and/or its successors to further subdivide Lot 1 pursuant to applicable rules, ordinances, and/or regulations of the governmental entity regulating development of the same. Accordingly, no lot owner shall have the right to protest and/or object to the Declarant or its successors’ efforts to subdivide said real property so long as such subdivision is being requested and/or completed consistent with the rules and regulations of the municipality regulating development at the time of such subdivision.” (Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions and Easements for Regatta Estates, Section 7.1 – Future Development/Subdivision of Lot 1.)

that the project under review will facilitate future action that will result in additional impacts). The Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates site is the last area of developable land within Harbour Point Sectors 22 and 23. Adjacent properties are developed. For this reason, the proposed development is not construed to facilitate additional growth or development.

Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Potential Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Section 3.2 Water Resources

MITIGATION MEASURES. Add footnote as follows:

Applicable Regulations. Criteria for the design of stormwater infiltration systems are defined in the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Washington Department of Ecology 2005). In particular, there is a requirement that the base of infiltration facilities are to have a separation of at least 5 feet from the seasonal high groundwater level. All developed facilities would meet this criterion.

\[1\] The February 2005 SWMMWW Volume 3, Section 3.3.7, SSC-5 states: The base of all infiltration basins or trench systems shall be ≥ 5 feet above the seasonal high-water mark, bedrock (or hardpan) or other low permeability layer. A separation down to 3 feet may be considered if the groundwater mounding analysis, volumetric receptor capacity, and the design of the overflow and/or bypass structures are judged by the site professional to be adequate to prevent overtopping and meet the site suitability criteria specified in this section. In the opinion of the Peer Review technical consultant (Anthony Burgess, Ph.D., P.E., RPG), 5 feet of separation from the seasonal high groundwater level reflects the general case requirement, and is more reflective of the siting criteria at the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates property. A mounding analysis was not necessary as the groundwater level is tens of feet below the infiltration facilities.

Chapter 4: References

Add the following citations to the Draft EIS References chapter:

Bails, Jamie. Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife Habitat Biologist. June 4, 2015. Personal communication by e-mail to Merle Ash, Land Technologies, describing current conditions based on a site visit to the two Picnic Point Creek culverts beneath the BNSF Railroad crossing.


Folkerts, Keith, WDFW Priority Habitats & Species Section Manager. March 9, 2015. Personal communication by e-mail with Vicki Morris, Vicki Morris Consulting Services, re: how the priority habitat type Biodiversity Areas and Corridors is to be used within Urban Growth Areas; e.g., to inform local jurisdictions. Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife, Olympia, WA.


---


WDFW. February 26, 2015. Priority Habitats and Species Database search results (confidential) for the NE ¼ of Section 32 and the NW ¼ of Section 33, Township 22 N, Range 4E, WM, Snohomish County, WA.

**Off Site Analysis Report Horseman's Trail PRD**

Technical Appendix C to the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD Environmental Impact Statement, Snohomish County, WA.

Add the following reference documents provided in comments submitted on the Draft EIS to the list of References in Section 6 (page 12) of the *Off Site Analysis* technical report:
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**ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS**

Notice of issuance of the Horseman's Trail/Frognal Estates PRD Final EIS has been mailed to property owners of record within 500 feet of the external boundaries of this project.
Attachment A


Response to Snohomish County PDS
Review of August 4, 2005
Preliminary Plat Application

Clarification of Provisions Related to
Lot 1 of Regatta Estates
May 25, 2006

Snohomish County
Planning and Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201

Attention:  Bob Pemberton, Project Manager
Subject:  Horseman’s Trail – PFN 05-123050 SD

Following are responses to PDS review of August 4, 2005, Preliminary Plat Application submittal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNER / ZONING COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager: Bob Pemberton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The southeasterly portion of this proposal is a re-division of two lots in Regatta Estates. When submitting the previous application for Division of Development which included Regatta Estates the applicant stated:

"The parcels comprising Sector 22 of the Harbour Pointe plan as originally adopted by Snohomish County in August 1978, contained a plan for 169 single family attached housing units with approximately 5600 feet of local streets. The proposed development as shown in the attached preliminary subdivision plat has reduced the number of dwelling units to 83 and revised the type of residential units from single family attached to single family free standing."

And,

The proposed Regatta Estates subdivision comprising the Sector 22 area of the Harbour Pointe Plan is in compliance with the sector plan and lessens the impact of development substantially by the reduction of dwelling units from the originally approved 169 units to the currently proposed 83 single family residential units. This proposal reflects the 45% open space commitment made within the approved sector plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The reference in the first paragraph in italics is to the approved Sector 22 Sector Plan, which adopted a land use pattern for this sector with a maximum of 169 dwelling units and 5600 lineal feet of local streets. The 83 dwelling units proposed in the Division of Development for Regatta Estates was ultimately reduced to 78 dwelling units on the final plat of Regatta Estates. This left 86 dwelling units as the maximum additional development potential for any future re-division of lots with Regatta Estates (Sector 22).

The current application for Division of Development and preliminary plat approval for Horseman’s Trail proposes re-division of Lots 1 and 74 of Regatta Estates. The current proposal depicts 39 dwelling units as single family detached PRD lots within the area of Lots 1 and 74 of Regatta Estates, which is well within the remaining available maximum of 86 dwelling units.
The reference to a "45% open space commitment made within the approved sector plan." is a very puzzling statement. The approved Sector Plan text has some conflicting statistics regarding the amount of open space to be provided within the Sector; however, the approved sector plan as NO reference to a commitment of 45% open space. On page 1-1, the Sector Plan indicates under Land Use that: "85% of the sector will be developed into residential building lots and 15% will be retained as common open space." With a total of 44 acres within the sector, 15% would be approximately 6.6 acres of common open space. On page 5-1 under Open Space Management, the sector plan text states, "approximately 8.0 acres within Sector 22 have designated as open space..." This would represent approximately 18% common open space, and includes both the 3.6 acres that was to be dedicated to the county as county parkland and the private common open space owned by the homeowners association. As Horsemanship's Trail is now proposed, Sector 22 will have approximately 18.45 acres of open space, approximately 41.7% of the Net Development Area in the Sector. The minimum common open space that is required by the Sector Plan approval is just that, a minimum. The Division of Development and plat stages of project review must meet that minimum, which is the case with Regatta Estates and Horsemanship's Trail. These two statements in the approved Sector 22 Sector Plan, while providing different statistics for the minimum open space required for a Division of Development and preliminary plat within Sector 22, varying from 15% to 18%, do not make a commitment of anywhere near 45%.

The Master Plan and rezon contract for Harbour Pointe establish the requirement for 10% of the Net Development Area of each residential sector to be set aside as common open space. This represents half of the then requirement for common open space of the County Code for PRD development, in recognition that 466 acres of county parkland were dedicated within the Harbour Pointe development to serve as public open space. Credit for dedicated parkland was recognized within the PRD regulations of the County. If you deduct the 3.6 acres of public open space dedicated as county parkland as part of Sector 22 in Regatta Estates, then sector plan sections quoted above result in the remaining common open space required by the sector plan of 4.4 acres, or 10% of the Net Development Area of the sector.

From the aforementioned reference to page 1-1 of the approved Sector 22 Sector Plan, if 85% of the sector was to be developed with residential units, there certainly would not be 45% of the sector remaining for open space. The only reasonable conclusion is that the staff report contained a typographical error of 45% that should have been 15%, as actually represented within the text of the sector plan.

The staff report (page 5) for the Preliminary Plat of Regatta Estates includes the following: "Lot 1 has been set aside by the developer to provide an access road to a parcel to the west of lot 1 without any assurance whatsoever that such access will be approved in the future by the county. Lot 1 is to be conditioned to restrict development such that the lot remains in an essentially natural state except for the possible development of one homesite. Any further development of lot 1 will require additional review by the Hearing Examiner and if approved will most likely add common open space to the instant plat area." (emphasis added)

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

As noted in this statement from the staff report to the Hearing Examiner on the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates, further development of Lot 1, and for that matter Lot 74 as well, was both anticipated and allowed by County Code, subject to "...additional review by the Hearing..."
Examiner..." While the development proposed within the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates at the time only proposed one dwelling unit each for Lots 1 and 74, the applicant always had represented to the staff that future subdivision of these lots was definitely contemplated. The basic fact was that future re-subdivision of these lots required a separate and new Division of Development and preliminary plat application, which is what Horseman's Trail now proposes. Several of the following quotes from various documents appear to suggest that future re-subdivision and development of Lots 1 and 74 was neither contemplated or allowed; however this portion of staff report for the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates continues to be accurate and factual – Any further development of Lot 1 will require additional review by the Hearing Examiner, and if approved will most likely add common open space to the instant plat area.

And on page 16 of the Staff Report: Recommended Conditions 13 and 12:

13. Lot 1 shall remain in an essentially natural state and is subject to the same restrictions concerning NGPAs imposed by Condition 12 above; provided that a single home site with access there to may be developed on the lot. Site development plans for the access driveway and home site shall include clearing and revegetation plans, detailed geotechnical analysis as well as limits of site disturbance as required and shall be approved by the Planning Division prior to issuance of any site development permits or any disturbance of the site.

12. All open space areas shall be designated on the final plat map as Native Growth Protection Areas (NGPAs) and shall remain in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, fence construction, or road construction of any kind shall occur within these areas; provided that underground utility lines and drainage discharge swales may cross such areas utilizing the shortest alignment possible if and only if no feasible alignment is available which would avoid such a crossing. Removal of vegetation shall be limited to that which is dead diseased or hazardous.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

Recommended Condition 13 of the staff report clearly refers to Lot 1 only, and is distinct from Condition 12, which clearly refers to the open space tracts within the proposed preliminary plat of Regatta Estates. The open space tracts were to be encumbered by permanent NGPAs. By contrast, Lot 1 was to only remain "...essentially natural state...subject to the same restrictions concerning NGPAs imposed by Condition 12...", unless and until future re-subdivision and development of Lot 1 was proposed.

Two aspects of this restriction are key. First, Condition No. 13 covers a buildable lot in the plat, not a tract. **Lots are capable of re-subdivision; tracts are not.** Second, this condition did not apply in perpetuity and specifically says that Lot 1 will be treated "essentially as a native growth protection area", not "exactly as an NGPA". This condition was applied by the Hearing Examiner because no specific development plan for this 6.4 acre lot was provided in the Regatta Estates preliminary plat, and it was evident to the Examiner that provisions for a public street right-of-way was yet being finalized when the plat of Regatta Estates was being approved. Findings 12 and 19 of the Hearing Examiner decision approving the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates dealt with this issue as follows:

"Parcel A is bordered on the south by Sector 23 of Harbour Pointe which is, like the rest of the residential portions of Harbour Pointe, zoned R-8400 with contract. A 50-foot wide-open space/ buffer strip in Sector 23 borders the entire southwest edge of the subject property. From west to east (from 60th Avenue W easterly to the Picnic Point Road intersection with 140th Street SW), Sector 23 consists of
the Mukilteo School District’s Picnic Point Elementary School, an undeveloped tract and a Public Utility District No. 1 electrical substation. (Exhibits 9 and 85) Parcel A is bordered on its west edge by an undeveloped tract containing approximately 15 acres, which has been zoned R-20,000 since in or around 1957. (Exhibit 9) The partial width r/w of 60th Avenue W. separates Parcel A from said tract. The west, north and east portions of said tract exhibit extremely steep slopes; there is an area of zero to 15% slope located in the south center of the parcel. (Exhibit 75) This same tract borders the eastern three-quarters of the south side of Parcel B. The western quarter of the south edge and all of the west edge of Parcel B borders an undeveloped portion of the Picnic Point Planned Residential Development, which has been zoned Planned Residential Development – Low Density Residential (PRD-LDMR) since in or around 1970. (Exhibit 9) The Alderwood Water District operates a major sewage treatment plant on a site on the north side of Picnic Point Road opposite the west half of Parcel B. Between the treatment plant site and the west edge of Parcel C lies a small portion of a large county park tract, which completely surrounds Parcel C. (Exhibit 78) Picnic Point Creek flows more or less through the center of said tract until it reaches the subject property. To the east of the county park tract, more or less on the upland above the creek ravine, lies the large lot Wingate residential subdivision. West of the Alderwood Water District treatment plat, also on upland overlooking the creek ravine and Puget Sound, lays the Wind and Tide residential development. (Exhibit 9)"

"The plat road in Parcel A has been designed to allow its northwesterly extension through the proposed Lot 1 (a 6.4 acre lot) to the 15-acre undeveloped tract lying adjacent to the west. The staff and applicant believe that the best most feasible means of vehicular access to said 15 acres does lie through Lot 1, even though such access would have to traverse rather steep slopes. Access to the parcel from the north is extremely difficult due to even steeper slopes and the wetland located at the base of the slopes."

These two findings describe the topographic constraints of the Horseman’s Trail property, as well as the surrounding parcels. The second finding states the need to provide a public street right-of-way through Lot 1 of Regatta Estates to provide access to the 15-acre parcel, which has now been incorporated into Horseman’s Trail. At the time that Regatta Estates was approved as a preliminary plat, there was not a design to access and develop this 15-acre parcel. There was also no design for the connection of 60th Avenue W. with the street network in Sector 22. Conclusion 31 of this Hearing Examiner decision approving the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates reads as follows:

"Adequate provision for public roads would not be present if public road access through proposed Lot 1 to the undeveloped parcel west of Parcel A is not guaranteed: the only realistically developable access to the useable portion of the parcel is through Lot 1. A public road right-of-way is needed, but the instant applicant need not construct a road therein beyond the point necessary to access each lot within Regatta Estates. The right-of-way alignment must be chosen to provide a buildable county road in the future to access the developable portion of the adjacent parcel."

This conclusion restates the Examiner’s determination that a public road needed to be provided
through Lot 1 to the 15-acre parcel. As mentioned, at the time Regatta Estates was approved, that roadway alignment had not been designed with respect to the topography of the 15-acre parcel. Condition No. G.ix. of the preliminary plat approval of Regatta Estates (Restriction No. 9 on the final plat) was imposed to temporarily prohibit full development of Lot 1 until the required roadway alignment had been designed, therefore Lot 1 was treated “essentially as a native growth protection area”, not permanently committed to an NGPA. Had the intent been to retain Lot 1 permanently as an NGPA open space parcel, its designation would have been a tract instead of a lot. Now that a comprehensive public street network has been designed to bring access to the 15-acre parcel and make the necessary connection to 60th Avenue W., the NGPA is no longer necessary.

The Hearing Examiner decision approving Regatta Estates includes the following Conditions:

G.x. “Proposed Lot 1 shall be treated essentially as a Native Growth Protection Area provided that a single home site with access thereto may be developed on said lot. Site development plans for the access driveway and housesite, including clearing and revegetation plans and detailed geotechnical analysis will be required to have received approval from the Planning Division prior to the issuance of any site development permits or any disturbance of said Lot” (Emphasis added)

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

As noted previously, the level of development provided for Lot 1 within the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates was one single-family lot and a public road to connect to the vacant 15-acre parcel lying west of Regatta Estates. Future re-subdivision and development of Lot 1 would require separate and new applications for Division of Development and preliminary plat for review and approval to remove the treatment of Lot 1 essentially as an NGPA, as hereinabove noted in both the staff report to the Hearing Examiner and the Hearing Examiner’s decision.

G.ix. All Native Growth/Wildlife Habitat Protection Areas shall be left in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, fence construction, or road construction of any kind shall occur within these areas; provided that underground utility lines and drainage discharge swales may cross such areas utilizing the shortest alignment possible if and only if no feasible alignment is available which would avoid such a crossing. Removal of vegetation shall be limited to that which is dead diseased or hazardous. No adjustment to the boundary of any such area shall occur unless first approved through the formal re-plat process.”

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

The last sentence of this condition placed by the Hearing Examiner on the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates is further evidence that the treatment of Lot 1 essentially as an NGPA could be removed at some time as application under the formal re-plat process, i.e., separate and new applications for Division of Development and preliminary plat for Lot 1. It is very important to note that this last sentence in Condition G.x. imposed by the Hearing Examiner is NOT included in recommended Condition 12 of the staff report to the Hearing Examiner. Clearly, the Hearing Examiner was preserving the option for future re-subdivision of Lot 1, if and when application for a new Division of Development and preliminary plat were submitted per 30.41A.700(2).

G.vi. A 60-foot wide public road right-of-way shall be shown for dedication through proposed Lot 1 to the west edge of said lot. The alignment of said right-of-way shall be selected so as to
provide the potential for future construction of a public road meeting county design standards. The location of said right-of-way alignment shall subject to prior Department of Public Works approval.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

A public road right-of-way through Lot 1 to the west edge of said lot is proposed as part of Horseman's Trail, with vertical and horizontal alignment design information submitted with the current application for review by DPW.

G.xi. (Includes) "Lots with slopes in excess of 25% shall have such areas depicted as Native Growth Protection Areas, except as described in Conditions G. vi and G.x above. The County Council, on appeal, included the following Condition G. xi:

"Lots with slopes in excess of 25% shall have such areas depicted as Native Growth Protection Areas, except as described in the Hearing Examiner's decision Conditions G. vi. and G. x.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

As mentioned previously, Condition G.vi. of the Hearing Examiner approval of Regatta Estates required the public road through Lot 1 to provide access to the vacant 15-acre parcel lying west of Lot 1. As also described previously, Condition G.x. required that development of Lot 1, as approved by the preliminary plat of Regatta Estates was to be limited to one single-family lot and treatment essentially as an NGPA, **unless and until future re-subdivision and development of Lot 1** was proposed in separate and new applications for Division of Development and preliminary plat as a re-plat of Lot 1. A new subdivision of any lot is subject to the zoning and land use criteria in force at time of complete application.

**Subsequently, during the review of the final plat of Regatta Estates, the applicant proposed the following language for a restriction on Lot 1:**

"Lot 1 shall be treated essentially as a Native Growth Protection Area provided that a single home site with access thereto may be developed on said lot. Site development plans for the access driveway and homesite, including clearing and revegetation plans and detailed geotechnical analysis will be required to have received approval from the Planning Division prior to the issuance of any site development permits or any disturbance of said Lot. **Lot 1 may be subdivided in the future through the formal re-plat process**" (emphasis added)

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

This wording suggested by the applicant was specifically intended to avoid the confusion that has now affected the current review of Horseman’s Trail, notwithstanding the fact that county code and the approval of Regatta Estates clearly allow for re-subdivision and development of Lot 1 with the submittal of new Division of Development and preliminary plat applications, as is the case with Horseman’s Trail.

**The Regatta Estates file shows that the county reviewer of the final plat indicated that the language about subdividing Lot 1 in the future should be removed from the final plat. The final subdivision of Regatta Estates actually contains the restriction noted above at G.**

"Lot 1 shall be treated essentially as a Native Growth Protection Area provided that a single home site with access thereto may be developed on said lot. Site development plans for the
access driveway and homesite, including clearing and revegetation plans and detailed
geotechnical analysis will be required to have received approval from the Planning Division
prior to the issuance of any site development permits or any disturbance of said Lot

Also, I see a great deal of evidence in the above information that the county (staff, hearing
examiner and council) understood that Lot 1 of Regatta Estates would not be developed for
anything other than one single family residence and that would be allowed only after more
information was received.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

The last paragraph of the above statement is inaccurate. As noted earlier, the staff report to the
Hearing Examiner (page 5) specifically stated: “Any further development of lot 1 will require
additional review by the Hearing Examiner and if approved will most likely add common open
space to the instant plat area.” Further, the Hearing Examiner, in Condition of approval No. G.
ix., added the wording that was NOT included in the corresponding recommended Condition 13
of the staff report allowing modification of the boundaries of NGPAs in Regatta Estates: “No
adjustment to the boundary of any such area shall occur unless first approved through the
formal replat process.” (emphasis added) In addition, the County Council left the wording of
Condition G.ix. intact on appeal. In fact, planning staff, the Hearing Examiner and the County
Council obviously DID intend to allow the potential for replatting of Lot 1 (and Lot 74) by: a)
creating these parcels as lots, not tracts; and b) specifically allowing replatting within Condition
No. G.ix. The lone dissenter who thought Lot 1 could never be developed for anything but a
single-family residence and the public street extended to the west boundary of Lot 1, was
the county staff reviewer of the final plat. Neither county code nor state law allows a county
final plat reviewer to take the liberty to contradict or modify the approval given by the Hearing
Examiner, confirmed on appeal by the County Council and allowed by county code.

The Sector Plan area for Harbour Pointe Sector 22 includes the established Plat of Regatta
Estates and the easterly portion of the proposed Horseman’s Trail. The Sector Plan, in the
Horseman’s Trail area, shows 6 lots in the southerly portion, an open space area in the center
and southwest portions and 8 lots in the northerly portion. This is a total of 14 lots and open
space in an area where Horseman’s Trail proposes 39 lots and about 2 acres of open space.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

The approved Sector Plan document includes a drawing 3A, entitled "Preliminary Plat of Sector
22, Parcel A". This map can only be considered a conceptual land use plan for the site, in that
the Harbour Pointe Master Plan and rezone contract specifically prohibits consideration of a
preliminary plat or any division of any sector until the Sector Plan and Division of Development
have both been approved. As a conceptual plan, drawing 3A does not provide the required
public street access to the 15 acres to the west, a requirement of the Division of Development
and Preliminary Plat of Regatta Estates. Further, 3A depicts single family lots well up into the
steeper areas of Sector 22, just as Horseman’s Trail does, except that Horseman’s Trail does
provide the road connection to the 15 acres to the west and provides a through public street
connection to 60th Avenue W, another point raised in the approval of the Division of
Development and Preliminary Plat of Regatta Estates. As the final urban infill subdivision on
this Picnic Point plateau, Horseman’s Trail provides the connected neighborhood street network
that had NOT been considered in the layout of drawing 3A in the sector plan.
Given all of the above, how is this proposal consistent with the approved Sector Plan?

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

As noted in the responses to individual previous statements, the approved Sector Plan provided for a maximum of 169 dwelling units within Sector 22. Regatta Estates approved 78 units, and an additional 39 units are proposed within that portion of Horseman’s Trail lying within Sector 22. The results in the total of 117 units proposed for development within Sector 22, or 52 units less than the maximum allowed by the approved sector plan. In addition, the approved sector plan required a minimum of 15%, or 6.6 acres (page 1-1) to 18%, or 8 acres (page 5-1) of the sector to be in permanent open space. Regatta Estates provided 16.5 acres of permanent open space. The portion of Horseman’s Trail within Sector 22 proposes to create 2 acres of permanent open space. This exceeds the minimum required open space of the approved sector plan by 20.5-23.5 acres. Therefore, Horseman’s Trail, as proposed, is consistent with the land use and open space requirements of the approved Sector Plan.

The DNS for Regatta Estates notes a 45% open space requirement. Is this being met?

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

The description in the DNS for Regatta Estates of 45% open space is obviously a typographical error, as noted hereinafter. Regatta Estates actually provided 42.2% open space. As a typographical error, inconsistent with: a) the approved Harbour Pointe Master Plan and Rezone contract; b) the approved Sector 22 Sector Plan; and c) the PRD requirements of Snohomish County Code, it is not an appropriate standard to be used to evaluate either Regatta Estates or Horseman’s Trail. In fact, the above three adopted standards are the appropriate criteria for evaluation of the minimum open space for Regatta Estates and Horseman’s Trail. By correcting the 45% typographical error to the appropriate 18% figure found on page 5-5 of the approved Sector Plan, the largest figure of the three standards adopted and approved by appropriate bodies of Snohomish County government, this standard is met by Horseman’s Trail. Specifically Horseman’s Trail provides 2 acres, which together with the developed plat of Regatta Estates that provided 16.5 acres; a total of 41.7% of the Net Development Area of the sector will be included in open space.

Neighbors have mentioned seeing bald eagles in the vicinity. I have enclosed information from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (Julie Stofel 425.379.2301). Please address this issue.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

Eagles are not an endangered species and if there were nests onsite an Eagle Management Plan would be developed by WDFW (Julie Stofel). We have further ordered a WDFW report on any species of concern in the region.

Please address the setback from the new road for the existing house issue raised by the Snezhana and Alex Kotov letter received August 30, 2005 I am enclosing.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

First solution is for the house to be moved on to their lot; it was built in the right-of-way and should not be our problem.

We have, at great sacrifice, purchased the "school" property and are re-aligning the ROW away from their house. We have fixed a problem created by others. See attached maps.
DRAINAGE COMMENTS
Reviewer: Dwayne Overholser

Targeted Drainage Plan needs to address following issues:
1) TDP shall show location of restrictor manhole and outlet pipe to discharge from restrictor.
2) It appears the detention pond needs to be larger to provide for the correction factor.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

1) The restrictor manhole structures and associated discharge pipes have been placed on the plans. See Plan Sheets C-1, C-4, C-8 and C-10. Concept drawings are all subject to construction level design review and will likely change.

2) The factor-of-safety volume is provided in the headroom above the normal storage volume. Vault heights and discharge structure heights have been increased to accommodate the necessary storage. See Page 22 of the Targeted Drainage Plan. In addition, there are many Low Impact Development techniques used in the Storm Water Management Plan and significant volumes will be managed as “recharge” to the groundwater system.

A Geotechnical report is needed to address:
1) Landslide hazards; please show on plan locations historic landslides on and off site. In the August 03, 2005; report has a section on Colluvium type of soil in exploration pit 20 (lots 14 and 15). We need more information on how the lots and trails tract 999 may be developed.

2) In section 6.0 August 03, 2005 report Seismic Hazards please check with USGS finding on the Brightwater site.
3) Have the license Geotechnical Engineer Stamp, sign and date report.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

1) Associated Earth Sciences observed no evidence of on-site landsliding. See Page 5 of supplementary report. Two areas of off-site land sliding are unrelated to the proposed development because they are a sufficient distance away and of different geologic conditions. See Page 6 of supplementary report.

2) Associated Earth Sciences’ research of the Brightwater project found no evidence to contradict earlier assessment of seismic risk as low. See Page 6 of supplementary report.

3) Geotechnical Engineer’s stamp and signature is on Page 15 of supplementary report.

BIOLOGIST COMMENTS
Reviewer: Patrick McGraner

This application remains in conformance with CAR with regards to aquatic resources and fish and wildlife habitat on the site. Please consult with the reviewing engineer regarding steep slope issues.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

There have been no wildlife issues recorded to date by WSDNR. A Priority Habitat and Species Report has been ordered from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife as backup to previous research.
PUBLIC WORKS REVIEW COMMENTS
Reviewer: Andy Smith/Dave Ostepgaard

Modified Sidewalk Deviation Conditionally Approved:
1) Public Easement is required for walkway system that will serve the public road.
2) The alternate pedestrian trail system must not have stairs
3) The pedestrian facilities must be a minimum of 5' feet wide
4) Mailboxes must be located within easy access to the pedestrian trail system, and:
5) The backs of the lots along the pedestrian trail system cannot be fenced or gates shall be provided for each lot.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

There are two trail systems throughout the project. The first serves as the primary pedestrian circulation system in lieu of on-street sidewalks ("paths" and "sidewalks"), while the second ("trails") serves as a recreational trail system built to varying standards dependent on predicted use.

1) Paths and sidewalks adjacent to lots are proposed for the purpose of providing pedestrian circulation in lieu of sidewalks. Pedestrian access easements will be provided on this pathways as a condition of Final Plat. Current configurations are subject to change through the Construction process and defining easements at this time could be wasted time.

2) Stairs have been removed from all paths that serve in lieu of sidewalks. Stairs remain on portions of the recreational trail system and on private lots.

3) All proposed pedestrian paths that serve in lieu of sidewalks are a minimum of 7-feet in width.

4) Mailbox locations will be located as directed by the Postmaster for this area with this directive in mind.

5) Gates and access routes from each lot abutting the trail system have been included as design element since inception.

Deviation on Bio-swale upstream of detention is denied, as design of bioswale does not meet minimum requirements due to steepness. Slope greater than max of 4% and minimum length is 200 feet.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE

The bioswale along 50th Avenue is designed as a series of "stepped" segments, each of which is at a slope of less than 4%. The swale's length is established to provide the required 5-minute minimum contact time. This swale length of 190 feet exceeds the 147-foot minimum required.

Similarly, the swale for the SE Basin is constructed as a 120-foot long stepped swale at 2.5%.

Please refer to page 21 of the targeted drainage plan.
**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC REVIEW**  
Reviewer: Andy Smith

*Concurrency SCC 30.66B.120:*
*The development is not concurrent at this time.*
*The applicant will need to provide a future LOS analysis on arterial Unit #285, Picnic Road, before the County can complete its concurrency evaluation. Since there are no known level of service issues on arterial unit #285, the applicant may provide a screening-level arterial unit level of service estimate in accordance with DPW 4224.070*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

See memorandum dated October 19, 2005, from Perteet Engineering. It provides information, based on the results of the screening level of service evaluation, that arterial unit No. 285 is currently operating at LOS C conditions and may deteriorate to LOS D by 2008. Both scenarios meet the County level of service standards. The arterial unit is not considered critical at this time and may be deemed concurrent under County guidelines.

(See also a supplemental memorandum dated May 2, 2006, from Perteet Engineering. Prepared in response to a public inquiry, it provides traffic distribution data on Saint Andrews Drive in Mukilteo.)

*Show how far main portion of the house is from ROW edge. An effort should be made to maximize the distance of road elements from the ROW edge.*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

See attached detail. The house is in the wrong spot and needs to be moved from inside the setbacks. The fact that someone built the house too close to the ROW should not be our problem; moving the house is the correct solution. To be accommodating to neighbors the Proponent bought the school property to move ROW away from house.

*60th Ave West does not meet EDDS for vertical curves, slope, design speed and ROW width (deviation approved for modified width).*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Deviations for Stopping Sight Distance and Roadway Slope are included in this submittal. We are also requesting that the 20 mph speed limit on 60th Avenue in front of the elementary school be extended to the northern end of the street.

*Provide Sight Distance analysis for the private roads that intersect with 60th Ave West.*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

A graphic presentation and deviation for Intersection Sight Distance is included in this submittal.

*Obtain an approved deviation for any changes to the design standards.*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**
Deviations are included that address vertical and horizontal alignment issues on 60th Avenue West.

**Dedication of Right of Way:**
1) *60th Ave West* is designated as a non-arterial on the County’s Arterial Circulation Map. This requires a right-of-way width of 30 feet on each side of the right-of-way centerline. 20 feet and 15 feet exist on the development side of the right-of-way. Therefore, 25 feet of additional right-of-way is required to make 60 feet of total right-of-way along 60th and 58th Place West.
2) Portions of 58th Place West are required to be vacated for the current proposal.
3) In addition, it appears that a portion of 60th Ave West and 136th Avenue SW within Tract 999 will need to be vacated as the tract will be part of the private development or remove the right-of-way from the tract.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

1) Per SCC 30.66B.520 a right-of-way needs to accommodate the needs of the road section. 60th will act as a local access road as its connectivity will not be conducive to non-resident through traffic. In addition, modifications per 30.42B.140 (8) and EDDS 3-03 C, had previously been requested through deviations and acknowledged as acceptable.
2) This is the John Galt ROW that was required with Regatta Estates to assure access to ‘Horsemanship’s Trail’. Part of the condition was to “prove it could be built”. Alignments were expected to be modified as needed. This is not necessarily an “abandonment” but a correction to its alignment.
3) Per conversation between Jim Miller and Gerri DeLisle, ROW Vacation process can proceed upon PDS approval of vertical and horizontal road alignment.

**State Highway Impacts:**
Voluntary offer accepted of 89 ADT at $113/ADT for total offer of $10,096.16.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

WSDOT acceptance noted.

**TDM SCC 30.66B.630:**
*TDM obligation is 5% of 117.16 PM peak hour trips x $1500, which equals $8787. A written offer for payment of this TDM obligation is required before PW can make final recommendation of approval.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

It appears that DPW did not receive/review the TDM Plan that was included in August 4 submittal. If the TDM Plan is approved, the TDM obligation would be waived and the project would receive a 5% credit to the road impact fee. Another TDM plan is provided with this submittal.

**Pedestrian Facilities:**
*No Comments back from school districts.*

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**
There are responses from the school district requesting that this Proponent improve their frontage and another traffic issue some distance from this project has since been provided. See our responses under Mukilteo School District No. 6, below.

Summary Items to be addressed for Final Recommendation from Public Works:
1. Provide future LOS analysis on arterial Unit #285
2. Provide detail showing the existing house with the proposed 60th Ave W road elements.
3. 60th Ave W and 58th Pl SW are required to meet EDDS or obtain an approved deviation.
4. Provide sight distance analysis for the private roads onto 60th Ave West.
5. Provide a public easement for trails that serve the public road.
6. Vacations of 58th Place SW and 60th Ave West is required to approve the proposed development.
7. Additional ROW is required for 60th Ave West and 58th Place SW.
8. A TDM offer is required.
10. Redesign water quality treatment to detention vault along 58th Place SW.

LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE
1. Perrett Engineering provided information in a memorandum dated October 19, 2005, based on the results of the screening level of service evaluation, that arterial unit No. 285 is currently operating at LOS C conditions and my deteriorate to LOS D by 2008. Both scenarios meet the County level of service standards. The arterial unit is not considered critical at this time and may be deemed concurrent under County guidelines.
2. The house was built in the wrong place and should be moved; fixing other private property owners problems should not be our burden. The house needs to be moved or accepted as non-conforming. With the facts stated, and in the 'spirit of cooperation' the Owner has purchased additional land from the school district at great cost and we are realigning the ROW to be 10' from the illegally placed porch and house. Detail attached showing 12' from existing edge of house to proposed ROW alignment.
3. 60th Ave W and 58th Pl SW have deviations prepared and submitted for various aspects of the deviations from EDDS. It is noted that these roads will act as Local Access Roads and are submitted as Local Access Roads within a PRD Development. As such, part of the justifications for these roads not strictly adhering to EDDS is SCC 30.42B.140 (8) “The applicant may propose alternative design elements as modifications to and justifications for deviations from EDDS....” Some deviations on these roads are needed due to challenges created by adverse terrain and Public Works desire for connectivity to Picnic Point Road from 60th Ave W. Deviations are submitted with this in the response packet.
4. Sight Distance Analysis are provided in deviation packets.
5. Public Easements will be provided for all Public Circulation Systems with final construction alignments and as a condition of final plat.
6. Per conversation between Jim Miller and Gerri DeLisle, ROW Vacation process can proceed upon PDS approval of preliminary plat plan.
7. SCC 30.66B.520 Right-of-way width. (1) “Right-of-way shall be dedicated...to provide sufficient right-of-way widths to accommodate road improvement needs.” It is our full intention to provide right-of-way needed to accommodate the needs of the roads.
8. It appears that DPW did not receive/review the TDM Plan that was included with August 4 submittal. If the TDM Plan is approved, the TDM obligation would be waived and the project would receive a 5% credit to the road impact fee. If for some reason, the project does not meet criteria for TDM credit, the TDM obligation will be paid. A new TDM plan is provided.
9. SEE RESPONSES TO MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT at the end of this response to comments. Responses were in comments packet.
10. Water Quality System is out of the right-of-way. The Bio-cell Swale has been conceptually redesigned with a step and weir system and slopes have been reduced to standards.

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY FIRE MARSHAL Reviewer: Ron Tangen

The following information is being provided for future reference only:
Fire flow and fire hydrants shall be provided in accordance with Snohomish County Code

30.53A.310. Fire hydrants serving single-family dwellings shall have a maximum lateral spacing of 600 feet with no single-family residence in excess of 300 feet from a hydrant. Hydrant locations shall be depicted on the site plan, and locations for new hydrants shall be approved by this office.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Hydrants shown per criteria.

4” storz type steamer port fittings shall be provided on new hydrants.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

To be denoted on construction plans

The tops of the hydrants shall be color coded to designate the level of service being provided. The new hydrants are required to provide 1000 GPM so the tops shall be colored green.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Color Code Chart shown on Sheet 3 and will be added to Water Extension construction plans.

Install a blue street reflector on the hydrant side of centerline to indicate hydrant location.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Note on Sheet 3 with Color Code Chart and will be added to Water Extension construction plans.

The minimum required fire flow for this project has been determined to be 1000 GPM at 20 psi for a 2-hour duration. **Prior to combustible construction the developer shall provide a final certificate of water availability indicating that all hydrants have been installed, charged and they are operational. The hydrants shall provide a minimum 1,000 gpm for a 2 hour duration at 20 psi. Hydrant locations are approved as depicted on the water plan also indicate the location on the site plan.**

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

AWWD will supply verifications. Submittal to be made to AWWD for fire flow modeling prior to finishing construction plans.
Approved numbers or addresses shall be placed on all new and existing buildings in such a position as to be plainly visible and legible from the street or road fronting the property. Numbers shall contrast with their background. Provide address signage for the panhandle lots that is visible from the public way. Each building shall have individual building address. Street signage shall be posted prior to any occupancy.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Addresses will be placed per criteria

**SNOHOMISH HEALTH DISTRICT**

Prior to Health District Final Plat review, Applicant to submit application with review fee of $134 and a letter of water/ sewer service to each lot from provider (AWWD).

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Developer Extension Agreement with AWWD is approved. Fee will be paid and water/sewer service to each lot from AWWD will be provided with Final Plat process.

**MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 6**

August 11, 2005, School District Fiscal Officer Response to Request for Review: Mitigation fees to be paid as per GMA Ordinance. Transportation comments will be mailed separately.

**LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE**

Mitigation Fees to be determined and paid with building permit.

**MUKILTEO SCHOOL DISTRICT COMMENTS**

See next page, Bill Gate’s table broke away.
September 23, 2005, memo from School District Manager of Transportation:

1. The district requests that the project install curb gutter and sidewalks on all road frontages within the project and all external on-site road frontages. In addition we request:
   a. That 60th Ave W be widened to at least 28 feet along its current length, from 136 Pl SW out to 140th Ave SW.
   b. To require installation of curb gutter and sidewalk along the off-site portion of 60th Ave W. on the east side extending south from the property approximately 1000 feet to connect with improvements at 140th St SW.

2. On 140th Street SW the parents waiting to get into the loop from the east queue along the north side (westbound of the street. This practice is starting to fail due to the volume of traffic, and sometimes does fail when a car parks near the school and interrupts the queue. When that happens traffic is blocked and even some of our buses have to wait in line for the parent queue to clear in order to enter their loading area. We request that Snohomish County Traffic investigators study and consider this issue in light of increased traffic volume from this size project. Perhaps signing this curb area as “No parking” during peak school bell times is appropriate, or perhaps there are alternative and better remedies that might be discovered.

We ask that all improvements be in place prior to the completion of any of the units.

It should be noted that due to population increases, the District’s school boundaries are in a process of reevaluation, especially with regard to new development. Therefore, by the time of completion of this project, the above information regarding the schools and bus stops may be significantly changed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND TECHNOLOGIES RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proponent is only required to provide frontage improvements along his own frontage. No Inadequate road conditions were identified by Public Works or by the Traffic Engineering report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The School District has considerable funds from the sale of a portion of its property to this proponent and will be getting GMA mitigation fees from this proponent. This proponent will also be paying Snohomish County $250,887.12 for road use impact fees. The requested offsite improvements should come from these funds, not by additional funding from this proponent.

The proponent will be providing curbs, sidewalks, and road widths along 60th as required by SC Code.

2. We would also request Snohomish County PW investigate the access problem to the school as described by the School District Manager of Transportation. I do not believe there is any link in SCC that would require this proponent to fix this problem. Mitigation fees paid for transportation and to directly to the school district are the extent of this proponent’s obligation.
Attachment B

Geotechnical Consultant Letters

Affirming Review of Their Investigations, Calculations, and Recommendations in Light of the Oso Landslide
May 28, 2014
Project No. KE050475D

Frognal Estates (formerly Horseman's Trail)
c/o Frognal Holdings, LLC
8115 Broadway, Suite 204
Everett, Washington 98203

Attention: Mr. John Lakhani

Subject: Snohomish County Additional Information Request
Frognal Estates
Snohomish County, Washington

Dear Mr. Lakhani:

In light of the Oso landslide, we have reviewed the subsurface exploration information, analytical data, and checked our modeling results and calculations with regard to the Frognal Estates/Horseman's Trail PRD site and development proposal. We affirm that our recommendations are appropriate for the existing slope conditions.

We trust this information meets your current needs. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you should have any questions or require further assistance.

Sincerely,
ASSOCIATED EARTH SCIENCES, INC.
Kirkland, Washington

Curtis J. Koger L.G., L.E.G., L.Hg.
Senior Principal Geologist/Hydrogeologist

Kurt D. Merriman, P.E.
Senior Principal Engineer

CIK/ID - KE050475D1 - ProjectID20504751KE1WP
MEMORANDUM

To: Snohomish County Planning and Development Services

From: Anthony Burgess, Anthony Burgess Consulting Inc.

Subject: Horseman's Trail / Frognal Estates

Date: May 14, 2014

In light of the Oso landslide, I have reviewed the investigation data and checked my modeling results and calculations with regard to the Horseman's Trail / Frognal Estates PRD site and development proposal. I affirm that my recommendations are appropriate for the existing slope conditions.