REVIEW COMPLETION LETTER

DATE OF LETTER: August 4, 2016
PROJECT FILE NO: 16-109244 LDA
PROJECT NAME: Paine Field Passenger Terminal
COMPLETE APPLICATION DATE: June 7, 2016

APPLICANT and CONTACT:
Mark Reichin - Propeller Airports Paine Field
9724 – 32nd Drive W
Everett, Washington 98204

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Earthwork in preparation for the construction of a 29,300 square foot passenger air service terminal.

Dear Mr. Reichin:
The information listed below is required to evaluate your proposal further. Please respond to all of the comments.

Planning/Land Use:

Project Planner: Tom Barnett, Project Manager tom.barnett@snoco.org 425-388-3311, ext 2997

1. This project is subject to the requirement for environmental review, and the requirement for a threshold determination pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and SCC 30.61.035.

2. The Stormwater Site Plan, at Step 5b, references an analysis by AECOM fueling experts regarding fuel spills. Please provide a copy of this analysis.
3. Comments received in response to the Notice of Application are attached. Please provide a written response to each comment.

4. A demolition permit will be required for the existing structure. Please provide a completed demolition permit application. The application form is available online at: [http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7460](http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7460).

5. SCC Table 30.26.030(1) requires 10 parking stalls for every 1,000 square feet of gross floor area of “waiting areas”, for air passenger terminals. Applying this ratio to the entire structure (even though only a portion of the structure will be “waiting areas”) results in a requirement for 293 stalls.

The plans show 351 new parking stalls in Parking Lot P1, with Parking Lots P3 and P4 providing an additional approximately 220 existing stalls dedicated to the proposed terminal. The parking areas shown on the plans provide parking well in excess of the zoning code requirement.

6. Please provide information regarding electrical redundancy for the stormwater pumps.

7. A plan set and the Stormwater Site Plan document have mark-ups showing requested revisions. Please be sure to return the mark-ups when resubmitting.

**Drainage/Grading/Geohazard:**

Reviewer: Randy Sleight, Chief Engineering Officer  
randy.sleight@snoco.org  425-388-3311, ext 2014

1. Please see the enclosed memo from Mr. Sleight

2. Please see mark-ups included in the Stormwater Site Plan; be sure to return the marked-up document when resubmitting for the next review.

3. Prior to issuance of the LDA permit, a Stormwater Facility Easement must be submitted, approved, and recorded with the county Auditor’s Office. The easement form is available online at: [http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/26340](http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/26340)

   Instructions for completing and filing the easement are online at: [http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7568](http://www.snohomishcountywa.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7568)

**Transportation:**

Reviewer: Mark Brown, Engineer III  
mark.brown@snoco.org  425-388-3311, ext 4536

1. Please see the enclosed memo from Mr. Brown.

**Fire:**

Reviewer: Lori Burke, Senior Fire Inspector  
lori.burke@snoco.org  425-388-3311, ext 2279
1. Please see the enclosed memo from Ms. Burke.

**Right-of-Way:**

Reviewer: Darren Hansen  
darren.hansen2@snoco.org  425-388-3311 extension 2214

1. A separate engineer’s signed and stamped cost estimate is required for the temporary erosion control measures to establish the erosion control bond amount for the entire project site per SCC 30.84. The estimate must include new impervious surface square footage with the erosion control estimate submittal, and must be stamped and signed by the project engineer. Submittal fees are based on a percentage of this square footage.

2. Please contact Shawn Toeves at 425-388-3311, extension 2208, to submit the erosion control bond or assignment of funds (using one of the enclosed forms).

3. A Certificate of Insurance must be submitted to the county’s Finance Department – please see the information brochure attached to the cover e-mail.

**Other Information Required:**

1. A cover letter that identifies the proposed change(s) cross referenced to the comments on this project is required. Be sure to include and identify any additional changes proposed as well. Please provide five (5) copies.

**RESUBMITTAL OF REQUESTED ITEMS**

Please contact the PDS Project Manager, Tom Barnett (tom.barnett@snoco.org  425-388-3311, extension 2997) to arrange for submittal of the requested information. The resubmittal package must address all changes in order to be accepted.

Please be sure to provide the following number of copies:

- Grading/Drainage Plans  5
- Other Documents  5

Review of your application will continue upon the receipt of the required information. At the conclusion of that review, you will be notified if the project is ready for a SEPA threshold determination.

Please note that your land disturbing activity application will expire on December 7, 2017, per SCC Table 30.70.140(1).

Sincerely,

Tom Barnett  
Project Manager  

cc: Snohomish County Airport
MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 29, 2016

TO: Tom Barnett, Project Manager

FROM: Randy Sleight, Chief Engineering Officer

SUBJECT: Passenger Terminal at Paine Field, 16-109244 LDA

Plan Sheets:

1. Sheet G1.0; Need to list the CESCL for the project

2. Sheet G4.0: Add flagger for haul route at location “use existing swing gate”

3. Sheet G6.0: Move pedestrian path out of parking lot P2 to a curb side sidewalk.

4. Sheet C9.0: Plans show a swing gate. Don’t think this meets TSA requirements. Needs to be 8’ plus wire tall slide gate with Access control.

5. Sheet C9.0: The plans don’t show an AOA fence from New PAE Terminal to FAA fence and to old Terminal.

6. PE to sign and date all sheets across professional engineers seal State of Washington license.

7. Provide electrical plans, prior to building permit for wet vault, to address pump operation.

Stormwater Site Plan:

1. Page 1 says the project site as 11.15 AC. On page 6 it says the total site area is 8.43 AC. On page 16 it says 8.43 AC developed site. Are these describing different areas? Sheet C 1.2 reflects a total leased area to be 10.70 acres which appears to be the correct number. What is the 0.25 acres that drains off site from the work area that does not drain to the storm system on sheet C 1.2, this acreage needs to be described in the downstream drainage narrative if new or replaced hard surface is being revised or changed at all within this 0.25 acres?

Will the removal of the existing storm system under the proposed building be shown on a demolition plan somewhere?

Add PFN 16-109244 LDA to all LDA sheets (typ)

2. Figures Sheet C1.2 Land disturbing Activities shows lease area A1 as 7.53 AC. This should be 1.53 AC.

3. Sheet C 4.0 Contractor to supply fabrication drawings for precast vault if precast vault is chosen for design option, otherwise if cast in place, additional structural detailing will be necessary for the penetrations of the inlet and outlet pipes. A separate building permit will be necessary for the vault.
The vault access manholes and layout will need to be reworked to provide a 50 maximum distance to a ladder for anyone inside the vault who has to maintain the vault per EDDS standards.

On the grading plans provide the FF of the vault elevations and on the building pad provide a FF elevation.

The limits of grading or clearing limits line needs to be labeled on this sheet and is this triangle on the southwesterly side consistent with the triangle shown on C1.2?

4. Sheet C5.0 What is happening with the pavement southwesterly of the rectangle that is showing grading in a triangle on C4.0 south of the building?

5. Sheet 6.0 Provide the specification for the aircraft rated trench drains. Reference table C6.4 for location information on catch basins and see sheet C6.1 for profiles of storm drainage system.

6. There is no mention in the SWPPP or the Erosion Control Plans about the Contractor obtaining an NPDES permit. This will need to be done.

8. There is no mention in the SWPPP or the Erosion Control Plans about wet weather erosion control requirements, which seem likely at this point.

9. Place an Emergency Shut-Off Vault and valve close to and downstream of the drainage outlet from the vault in the event there is a fuel spill.

10. On sheet C6.11 provide the pump data and supply the system head curves and pump cycle frequency expected from the design event. Why is only one 8000 GPM being specified when the County normally requires a full back up pump system on an independent generator if the primary power goes out? Please explain the pump design better in the narrative, for example when are the float switches to be activated at what elevation will they trip etc. Where will the electrical system be tied into the main panels at for the primary pumps and back up pumps? Is the footing drain shown on detail 2/C6.11 going to back up and be surcharged prior to pump turn on and what elevation is this footing drain at? Provide more specific data on the operation and maintenance requirements for all of the pump system. This is not currently covered in the Snohomish County Drainage Manual as section 2.1.9 suggests.

11. On Page 26 of the SWPPP, change the 4.1 Site Inspection frequency to 1 week (not one month) for sites that are temporarily stabilized and inactive. (There is only one designated monitoring point.)

12. On Page 30 of the SWPPP, in 6.1.1, add a requirement to submit copies of Site Inspection Field Report to the Paine Field Airport Engineer weekly.

13. Please describe why the fail results are included in the stormwater site plan design report for the stream protection duration standard? If you have modified the vault size to something larger than 108.94 feet square and rerun this based on the actual design size, please provide the numeric data to confirm the design adequacy of the vault size. Why is the OWS being sized to include the disturbed and undisturbed site PGIS impervious of 6.9 acres, but the wet vault itself is just being designed for the 2.9 acres of disturbed PGIS impervious? Confirm how the additional 4.00 acres is being treated that is tributary to the wet vault system, even though it is being pumped.
Traffic Comments from Jan O’Neill, Airport Engineer:

1. Provide more traffic data on the flow of traffic to Airport Road as part of the trip generation and distribution analysis.
MEMORANDUM

July 29, 2016

TO: Tom Barnett, Principal Economic Development Officer
Planning and Development Services

FROM: Mark A. Brown, Engineer III, Transportation Development Reviewer
Planning and Development Services, Transportation Engineering Section

SUBJECT: File No. 16 109244 LDA, Paine Field Passenger Terminal
First Transportation Impact, Mitigation and Concurrency Review Comments

The Transportation Engineering Review Section of Planning and Development Services (PDS) has reviewed the subject development proposal for compliance with Chapter 30.66B SCC (Snohomish County’s Traffic Mitigation and Concurrency Ordinance), Snohomish County Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) and the appropriate County Rules and procedures and has summarized that review below. This development proposal is subject to the requirements of the version of Chapter 30.66B SCC that was in effect at the time of submittal of a complete application to the County.

General Information

The applicant proposes to develop a Passenger Terminal at Paine Field.
The subject property is located west of the intersection of Airport Road/100th St SW in Transportation Service Area (TSA) “D”, inside the urban growth area (UGA).
On site access will be provided by use of the existing private roads on Airport Property.
The plan used for this review was received by (PDS) on June 7, 2016.
The subject development is vested to the 2016 version of the EDDS.
The site is currently developed with an airport. All of the existing activities will remain.

Notice of Decision Requirements for Concurrency and Impact Fee Determination:

The development is still under review and no concurrency decision has been made at this time. Notice language will be provided in a subsequent traffic review memorandum.

Concurrency [SCC 30.66B.120]

The County makes a concurrency determination for each development application to ensure the development will not impact a county arterial unit in arrears or cause a county arterial to go in arrears.
The development is not concurrent at this time.
Additional information is needed to determine whether or not the development is concurrent. The memo from Snohomish County Traffic Operations dated June 21, 2016, indicates that there are items that need to be addressed regarding how the LOS was determined for Arterial Unit 228, Airport Road/128th St SW for the AM and PM PTS. This memo is attached. Once this has been adequately addressed a concurrency determination will be made.

Inadequate Road Condition (IRC) [SCC 30.66B.210]

Regardless of the existing level of service, any development which adds three or more P.M. peak-hour trips to a location in the road system determined to have an existing inadequate road condition (IRC) at the time of imposition of mitigation requirements, or development whose traffic will cause an IRC at the time of full occupancy of the development, must eliminate the IRC.

The subject development proposal will not impact any IRC locations identified within TSA D with three or more of its p.m. peak hour trips, nor will it create any. Therefore, it is anticipated that mitigation will not be required with respect to inadequate road conditions and no restrictions to building permit issuance or certificate of occupancy/final inspection will be imposed under this section of Chapter 30.66B SCC.

Road System Impact Fee [SCC 30.66B.310]

A development shall mitigate its impact upon the future capacity of the Snohomish County road system by paying a road system impact fee reasonably related to the impacts of the development on arterial roads located in the same transportation service area as the development, at the rate identified in SCC 30.66B.330 for the type and location of the proposed development. A development's road system impact fee will be equal to the development's new average daily traffic (ADT), based on the latest edition of the ITE Trip Generation report published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, times the per trip amount for the specific transportation service area identified in SCC 30.66B.330 or acceptable specific trip generation information provided by the applicant or their Traffic Engineer.

Trip generation for the subject development is based on trips from the airport in Bellingham Washington and appears to be acceptable. The impact fee will be identified after the requested concurrency determination has been made.

Frontage Improvements [SCC 30.66B.410]

The site does not have frontage on an opened constructed maintained public road. The roads used to access the site are on Paine Field property.

Right-of-way Classification / Access and Circulation [SCC Title 13, EDDS 3-02 and 30.66B.420]

Classification

Internal Road Classification:

Private Roads

External Road Classification:

The site does not front a public road, but the internal private roads front Airport Road a Principal Arterial according to the adopted Snohomish County Arterial Circulation map, effective July 2, 2015.

SCC 30.66B.420 Access and Circulation Requirements
All developments will be required to:

(a) Provide for access and transportation circulation in accordance with the comprehensive plan and this chapter applicable to the particular development,

(b) Design and construct such access in accordance with the EDDS, and

(c) Improve existing roads that provide access to the development in order to comply with adopted design standards, in accordance with SCC 30.66B.430.

(1) Access to state highways and city streets shall be in accordance with the applicable state or city standards and requirements.

(2) All developments that propose to take access via an existing public or private road which, for the vehicle trips projected to use the road after full occupancy of the development, is not designed and constructed in accordance with the EDDS, will be required to improve such road to bring it into compliance with the EDDS when the director of public works determines it necessary to provide for safety and the operational efficiency of the road. The extent of improvements will be established by the director of public works in accordance with SCC 30.66B.430. No improvements are required for 100th St SW.

Right-of-Way Requirements [SCC 30.66B.510, SCC 30.66B.520]

The site does not front public right-of-way. No right-of-way is required to be deeded.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) [SCC 30.66B.630]

TDM is a strategy for reducing vehicular travel demand, especially by single occupant vehicles during commuter peak hours. TDM offers a means of increasing the ability of transportation facilities and services to accommodate greater travel demand without making expensive capital improvements. The County requires TDM of developments inside the UGA and developments that impact arterial units designated as ultimate capacity.

All new developments in the urban area shall provide TDM measures. Sufficient TDM measures shall be provided to indicate the potential for removing a minimum of five (5) percent of the development’s P.M. peak hour trips from the road system. This requirement shall be met by the provisions of on-site design requirements under SCC 30.66B.640, as applicable, except where the development proposes construction or purchase of specific offsite TDM measures or voluntary payment in lieu of site design, in accordance with SCC 30.66B.620 and SCC 30.66B.625.

In a letter dated July 14, 2016, Everett Transit has indicated that to make future transit possible to the site that the site plan be revised to accommodate a 40 foot bus with appropriate turning radiuses and a load and unload area. This should be considered by the applicant.

The applicant has submitted a TDM plan with the initial application submittal. Additional information is needed for this plan to be acceptable. Those items are:

- A section view through the site that shows the pedestrian facilities regarding type (conc. etc.) width and depth of materials.
- A text description of the TDM measures proposed for the development, as is required by SCC 30.66B.660(1).
- 100th St SW has a concrete sidewalk on its south side. Show that the proposed pedestrian facilities will connect to it.
• 100th St SW needs to be labeled.
• The pedestrian facility on 100th St SW needs to be shown.

**State Highway Impacts [SCC 30.66B.710]**

When a development's road system includes a state highway, mitigation requirements will be established using the terms of the interlocal agreement (ILA) between the County and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT).

This development is subject to ILA between Snohomish County and the WSDOT that became effective on December 21, 1997, and as amended through the date of completeness for this application.

The applicant has offered $32,695.20 for impacts to State highways. This is based on $36.00/ADT. Comment from WSDOT have not been received and is needed.

**Other Jurisdictions Streets and Roads [SCC 30.66B.720]**

Mitigation requirements for impacts on streets inside cities and roads in other counties will be established consistent with the terms of a Reciprocal Traffic Mitigation ILA between the County and the other jurisdiction(s).

This development is subject to the ILA between Snohomish County and the City of Mukilteo. Comment from the City dated July 1, 2016, has been received. Those comments request additional analysis for the proposed new trips to the road system. The City indicates that impacts to the adjacent community will be unmitigated. The City has not commented on the $94,406.25 offer to the City as traffic mitigation for City streets.

**Other Issues or Items:**

None

**Summary of items to be addressed prior to final recommendation:**

Address LOS/Concurrency issues
Address TDM issues.
Comments from WSDOT are needed.
Additional comments from the City of Mukilteo are needed.

attachment
DATE:       June 21, 2016

TO:         Mark Brown, Engineer III  Department of Planning and Development Services

FROM:       Stephanie Prescott, P.E., Engineer II  TES – Traffic Operations

SUBJECT:    Review Comments for Synchro Analysis of Paine Field Arterial Unit LOS Analysis

The Snohomish County Department of Public Works (DPW) has reviewed the analysis for the Paine Field Passenger Terminal Traffic Impact Analysis. The proposed development site is located on the west side of Airport Rd, taking access at the intersection with Airport Rd and 100th St SE. The development is proposed to provide a passenger terminal that can handle 20 76 person aircraft with an additional 20 weekly trips for a 150 person aircraft.

The following arterial units (AU) were analyzed due to the developments impact:

AU 227 – Beverly Park Rd, from Airport Rd to SR 525 – AM and PM Peak

AU 228 - 128th St SW, From I-5 SB ramps to Airport Rd - AM and PM Peak

AU 231 - Airport Rd, From 106th ST SW to Kasch Park Rd – AM and PM Peak

DPW has determined that the analysis contained some departures from the Snohomish County guideline Traffic Study Future Level of Service Analysis, Synchro Model Calibration.

AU 228 – Airport Rd/128th St SW AM and PM Peak

Based on the submittal, both the AM and the PM peak required modeling. Based on the pipeline trips this arterial unit will fall below the 10mph threshold but made the statement that with optimization of the signal timings, the arterial will not fall below the threshold. However, the following correction will need to be made for future analysis to represent the current conditions of the signal operations.

AM and PM Existing

1. Input all the conflicting pedestrians in the volume window and all the pedestrian calls in the Phasing window for signalized intersections. Pedestrian calls should be for each approach. For unsignalized intersections, input the pedestrian conflicts in the volume window only.
2. Channelization between 8th Ave W and Gibson and Admiralty should include a two-way Left turn lane, not an extra lane turning into a drop lane.
3. SR 99 and Airport Way – Remove the minimum recalls for east and west directions. Add the all red and yellow times to the max splits for each phase.
4. 128th St SE and 8th Ave W – Change min recall on phase 4 and 8 to none. During the PM peak the east and westbound left turns are operating as protected only. Also include the overlap sheets in the signal timings for all intersections.
5. 128th ST SE and 5th Ave W – Change min recall on phase 4 and 8 to None. During the PM peak the east and westbound left turns are operating as protected only.
6. 128th ST SE and 4th Ave W – Minimum recall only exists on phase 1. Change Phase 4 and 8 to Recall mode = None.
7. 128th St SE and I-5 ramps – The offset is 0 for the afternoon peak.
8. Snopipe Pipeline sheets are missing 8th ave and 128th St SW and for the I-5 Ramps.

AU 227 – Beverly Park Rd from SR 525 and Airport Rd AM and PM Peak

Based on the submittal, both the AM and the PM peak required modeling. The project volumes will drop the speed, but not below the 13 mph threshold for the Eastbound and Westbound. However, the following items should be noted for future analysis.

1. General comment for all intersections is that the pedestrian activations in Synchro should be for each approach. Phase 2 will have the pedestrians crossing the East leg. Phase 4 will have the pedestrian crossing the south leg and so forth.
2. General comment is that a soft recall in the program is not the same as a Min recall.
3. The network should show the two way left turn lanes. This is modeled in Synchro by first making the signals operate at unsignalized and adding the TWLTL and then putting in the signal timings.
4. Beverly Park Rd and SR 525 – There is a Northbound and Southbound Right turn Overlap from SR 525. These are hardwired, so you will not see it in the program. Ped Calls should be entered as phase 4 is 23. Phase 8 = 7, Phase 2 = 7, and Phase 6 = 1. Remove the minimum recalls. Use the splits supplied from the Phase Table 2 timings.
5. Add in Key Intersection at Beverly Park Rd and 121st St SE. This is a key intersection.
6. Beverly Park Rd and Gibson Rd – Phase 2 is set to None recall.
7. Beverly Park and Center Rd – There is only 1 SB left turn pocket. The recall mode should be set to None.
8. Beverly Park Rd and School – Change the SB left turn pocket to a 150 ft length. The recall mode should be set to Max for phase 2 and 6.
9. Beverly Park Rd and 112th St SE – Change the turn lanes to pockets with 150ft in length.
10. Beverly Park Rd and Holly Dr – Phase 7 always lags phase 8 for this intersection. The recall mode for phase 2 and 6 should be set to None.

AU 231 – Airport Rd from Kasch Park to 106th/Beverly Park AM and PM Peak

Based on the submittal, both the AM and the PM peak required modeling. The project volumes will drop the speed, but not below the 13 mph threshold for the Eastbound and Westbound. However, the following items should be changed for future analysis.

1. General comment for all intersections is that the pedestrian activations in Synchro should be for each approach. Phase 2 will have the pedestrians crossing the East leg. Phase 4 will have the pedestrian crossing the south leg and so forth.
2. General comment is that a soft recall in the program is not the same as a Min recall.
3. The peak for this road is actually earlier in the day around 2PM. Make sure travel time studies account for this and are made during peak hour commutes.
4. Airport Rd and 94th St SW – The signal is running using phase bank 2, not 1. Please update and include that page in the timing sheets published. There is a phase 3 and 8 for the 94th St SW approaches. There is also a westbound right turn overlap that goes with phase 1.
5. Airport Rd and Kasch Park Rd – This intersection is coordinated during the PM peak and running the 90 sec cycle length with an offset of 20 seconds.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Tom Barnett

FROM: Lori Burke

DATE: Jul 29, 2016

SUBJECT: 16 109244 LDA - Paine Field Passenger Terminal

The Fire Marshal’s Office has reviewed the above referenced development proposal for compliance with Snohomish County Code (SCC) Chapter 30.53A Fire Code.

General Information

The application for the above referenced Land Use application was received by Planning and Development Services on June 07, 2016.

Fire review has been conducted for the earthwork in preparation for the construction of a 29,300 square foot passenger air service terminal.

All fire review shall be reviewed to the 2012 Edition of the International Fire Code along with the 2013 Washington State Amendments. This shall be corrected on the plan set (Sheet G1.1) at the time of resubmittal.

30.53A.512 Fire Apparatus Access Roads

The fire lanes shall have an increased width and turning radii due to vicinity of the airport and the emergency vehicle apparatus in use at the airport. All buildings shall be accessible by Paine Field Fire Department crash trucks and aerial apparatus. Therefore, the turning radii shall be 35 feet inside-side turning radius with a 55 feet outside-turning radius.

The increased turning radii shall include access from the airside of the terminal to the public side of the terminal through the newly relocated AOA gate. The dimensions of the gate shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width and provide access for 2-way traffic. This AOA gate is the only gate available for airside access for mutual aid fire and EMS vehicle apparatus. The gate shall be equipped with an Opticom controlled device for entry from either direction.

Access from the existing buildings located to the northeast have been affected by the newly proposed one-way traffic. Access from these buildings and accesses onto the one-lane loop around the proposed parking shall also be provided with turning radii coming out of the existing access to the right. Turning radii shall be provided in both directions for emergency vehicle apparatus access.
Provide additional information and clarification on vehicle service roads and access to airside of the terminal. If parking is proposed on the airside of the terminal at or near the existing FAA Tower, provide details of the parking arrangement to be approved by Paine Field Fire Department to assess for apparatus maneuverability.

Approved signs or pavement striping that include the words “No Parking – Fire Lane” shall be provided for fire apparatus roads to identify such roads or prohibit the obstruction thereof. The means by which fire lanes are designated shall be maintained in a clean or legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.

All fire lanes/fire apparatus access roads shall be maintained and accessible during construction.

30.53A.513 Address Identification

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 street signage shall be in place prior to occupancy. Numbers shall contrast with their background, be Arabic numerals or alphabetical letters with a minimum stroke width of 0.5 inch. The minimum size for commercial occupancies is 6 inches.

30.53A.514 Fire Protection Water Supply

Water mains and fire hydrants shall meet the required minimum standards for water mains and fire hydrants. These requirements shall apply to land use and construction permit actions subject to this title, or to any other existing or future code provision in which compliance with the fire code is specifically required.

All land upon which buildings or portions of buildings are or may be constructed, erected, enlarged, altered, repaired, moved into the jurisdiction, or improved, shall be served by a water supply designed to meet the required fire flow for fire protection as set out in Appendix B of the International Fire Code (IFC).

Appendix B Fire-Flow Requirements for Buildings

I cannot determine the exact fire-flow requirements at this time as I need to know the square footages and type of construction proposed. Fire-flow is determined from Table B105.1. With a square footage of 29,300 square feet with an “assumed” construction type of VB, the required fire flow would be 4,500 gpm at 20 psi for a 4-hour duration. However, a reduction in the required fire flow of up to 75% is allowed when the building is provided with an approved automatic sprinkler system. The resulting fire-flow shall not be reduced below 1,500 gpm and the demands of the fire sprinkler system shall also be calculated back in.

Our office has received a preliminary report of water availability of 3,000 gpm.

Further fire review will be conducted at the time of building permit application, but at this time my review is assuming the construction type of VB, which would be wood-framed construction with a higher fire-flow requirement.

30.53A.516 Fire Hydrant Spacing

Fire hydrant locations shall be determined by the fire marshal, in coordination with the water purveyor, and pursuant to the requirements of Appendix C of the IFC. Where the buildings are protected by an approved automatic sprinkler system, the spacing requirements may be modified, if in the opinion of the fire marshal, the level of fire protection is not reduced.
The proposed water plan shows only two proposed fire hydrants on the public side of the terminal. Fire hydrants shall also be provided on the airside of the terminal. It would appear that three fire hydrants shall be provided, however the number of hydrants will be determined when the exact fire-flow requirements have been determined. It is unlikely that the existing fire hydrant shown on the water plan (Sheet C7.0) will be utilized as it is on a dead-end system and too remote from the proposed new terminal. Provide additional fire hydrants airside of the.

30.53A.518 Hydrant systems

Where a portion of the facility or building hereafter constructed or moved into the jurisdiction is more than 150 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site hydrants and mains shall be provided.

It is clear the applicant understands the requirement of providing additional on-site fire hydrants. Provide clarification of the existing water/fire lines that are running under the proposed new parking lot (Lease Area A1) and impacts to the existing lines may have in relation to the proposed new hard surfaces. Provide clarification if there is conflict with the existing water/fire lines and the proposed new storm system or other utilities.

30.53A.520 Hydrant Inspection, Testing and Maintenance Requirements

The following requirements shall apply to the installation or replacement of any required hydrant:

1. Hydrants shall be installed, tested and charged prior to the start of construction, unless otherwise approved by the fire marshal.
3. Four (4) inch storz type steamer port fittings shall be provided on new hydrants.
4. Hydrants shall stand plumb and be set to the finished grade. There shall be a 36 inch radius of clear area about the hydrant for the operation of a hydrant wrench on the outlets and the control valve. The pumper port shall face the street, or where the street cannot be clearly identified, the port shall face the most likely route of approach of the fire apparatus while pumping. The hydrant shall be installed within 15 feet of the street or access roadway or where approved by the Fire Marshal.
5. Hydrants shall not be obstructed by structures, fences, the parking of vehicles, or vegetation. Hydrant visibility shall not be impaired within a distance of 75 feet in any direction of vehicular approach.
6. The top(s) of the hydrant(s) shall be colored coded to designate the level of service being provided by that hydrant. For this application it has been determined that the top(s) of the hydrant(s) shall be painted blue.
7. For all new hydrant installations, either public or private, the developer shall install blue street reflectors to indicate hydrant locations. Installation of blue street reflectors shall be completed prior to final approval of any development or new constructions and shall be located hydrant side of center line on the driving surface. Blue street reflectors shall NOT be required nor allowed on the airside of the terminal.
8. Vehicles shall not be parked within 15 feet of a fire hydrant, or fire department connection, or a fire protection system control valve.

Addition Comments and Requirements

The new terminal will required an NFPA 13 automatic fire sprinkler system. All fire systems shall be provided with backflow preventers, as also indicated in the review by Mukilteo Water and Wastewater District. An exterior
access to the fire sprinkler riser shall be provided and the FDC location shall be approved by Paine Field Fire Department and the Fire Marshal.

Further fire review will be conducted at the time of building permit application.
12 June 2016

Tom Barnett
Snohomish County Planning & Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201
Tom.Barnett@co.snohomish.wa.us

Re: 16-109244-000-00-LDA Paine Field Passenger Terminal – Initial Comments

Dear Mr. Barnett;

Joe A. Kunzler here. I’ve written many letters to the editor in the Mukilteo Beacon & Everett Herald raising concern about traffic mitigation in regard to this passenger terminal. I’ve even sortied to your Snohomish County Council about this crisis situation. In this initial letter to you, I am focusing my concerns this commercial terminal proposal on traffic mitigation/transit integration.
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Photo of 100th Street SW & Airport Way to Proposed Terminal

![Aerial photo of 100th Street SW & Airport Way to Proposed Terminal]

Figure 1: Aerial Photo Dated 3 June 2023 to 100th Street SW & Airport Way to Paine Field Commercial Terminal & Paine Field Control Tower site south of the control tower.

I believe fundamentally as most of this over 3,000-word comment letter is regarding encouraging pro-transit outcomes, should place an aerial photo into the record. The boomerang street is 100th Street SW crossed by Airport Road. The proposed Paine Field Terminal site is just south of the Air Control Tower, while 100th Street SW & Airport Road is where the nearest transit connections are with plans for improvement. I am fundamentally concerned the walkshed currently discourages using transit to/from the airport terminal.
Laying Ideological Markers

It is no secret I am a transit advocate and I believe fundamentally in public transportation. I donate to Transportation Choices Coalition; I have attended public hearings of Everett Transit, Community Transit & Sound Transit, and written many letters to the editor demanding more transit to Paine Field. For one, I am disabled and therefore cannot drive. For two, the more I learn about public transportation – especially from Seattle Transit Blog – I believe public transportation is the best means of congestion relief out there and there are only so many road lanes. For three I am a “true believer” in public transit as you can watch and listen on YouTube: “2016-06-02 Avgeekjoe ST3+ Sortie”, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JubD32eHqbs.

As such, I am publicly displeased that it appears your permit does not require Propeller Airports Paine Field to either charge for parking or even provide a public transportation option within a quarter of a mile to this terminal. There is nothing in the permit document regarding a private sector airport shuttle as well.

The Need for Transportation Mitigation to The Terminal

Yet, the SEPA Environmental Checklist for this project states on page 13 of 19 that, “An estimated 30-50 permanent employees would work at the proposed terminal once commercial airline service begins”. That’s before mentioning that the SEPA Environmental Checklist on page 17 that says:

> As discussed in the attached Gibson 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis, the proposed passenger terminal is anticipated to generate 922 new average daily trips by terminal employees and airline passengers. The maximum anticipated trips during the peak-hour have been estimated at 212 trips. The trip generation calculations are based on the assumption that there would be one flight arrival and one departure at each of the gates during one hour.

So we’re going to have “922 new average daily trips” peaking at 212 trips and the nearest transit almost if not a half mile away? I have not seen this traffic impact analysis, a document that should be online quite frankly.

The SEPA Environmental Checklist goes on to say on page 17 of 19 that, “Yes, Everett Transit and Community Transit provides service on Airport Road at the 100th Street SW intersection. Within 0.5 miles of the proposed terminal, a 10-minute walk in the elements. For comparison, from the Sound Transit light rail station at SeaTac Airport to the farthest SeaTac main terminal destination – the airpotr center – is only 0.4 miles and covered! My point being the walkshed from the nearest transit stop discourages transit use to/from an airport.”
From the Desk of Joe A. Kundel
growlemojo@gmail.com

Initial Capacity Concern With the Traffic Impact Analysis

Now I’m an aviation geek or a geek for short. So when I hear that Allegiant Air is the chief proponent of this service, I decided to check out their current fleet. Allegiant Air is currently transitioning to an all-Airbus or if you prefer all-Airbus fleet. The largest aircraft Allegiant Air intends to fly into this terminal will be a 177 passenger A320-200, with two pilots and my guesstimate four flight attendants. So roughly about 183 folks needing to exit and another 183 folks needing to board the Allegiant airplane.

Allegiant Airlines is also phasing out within their next year their Boeing 757-200s with capacity for 215 economy seats and probably another 6 in aircrew (pilots & flight attendants). So roughly 221 folks boarding, 221 folks deplaning. Please remember I have not seen this “Gibson 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis”.

Alaska Airlines has also voiced a desire to fly into Paine Field – see March 16, 2016 Mukilteo Beacon, “Alaska Air ‘keenly interested in Paine Field’. Alaska Airlines’ largest aircraft is the Boeing 737-900 with capacity of 181 passengers, 2 pilots and 4 flight attendants.” So about 187 folks off the airplane, 187 folks onto the airplane. I think you respectfully need to look more into how you were told in the SEPA Environmental Checklist, “maximum anticipated trips during the peak-hour have been estimated at 212 trips” as that does not appear to accurately calculate traffic loads.

Public Hunger for Light Rail Connection to/from Paine Field Terminal

I have not seen this “Gibson 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis”, but I am well aware that fellow Paine Field light rail boosters justify support for light rail to Paine Field in Sound Transit 3 or ST3 – the next Sound Transit service expansion plan about to face the voters in November – for servicing a commercial terminal. Sound Transit even received a comment that I quote in part from page 49 of the ST3 Draft Public Comments with my emphasis:

Paine Field has long been studied as the region’s second potential passenger airport. With the continued growth of Snohomish County and the need to build housing to the north and south of Seattle, it is only natural that passenger traffic is going to become a reality in the near term. Already the unprojectability of getting to Sea-Tac timely from the north through downtown Seattle...
freeway congestion provides even more impetus for the Paine Field Airport and extending the Light Rail to the north sooner rather than later.

Another gent at page 107 wrote Sound Transit:

With respect to the light rail connection to Paine Field, please be sure to consider future commercial air service to Paine Field. SeaTAC airport is overcrowded and its capacity. Eventually the region is going to need an additional commercial airport and ground connections to that airport will be key to its success. Further the need for robust transit connections to the Paine Field MIC to support the aerospace industry, cannot be stressed enough.

I copy-paste these ST3 comments into the record to remind you that many who support the Paine Field Commercial Terminal do so hoping to bypass substantial Everett-Seattle traffic before a flight, and a direct transit connection from Everett Station to the terminal would enable this end. There are also many smart-thinking light rail boosters working towards a ST3 light rail stop at Airport Road & 100th Street SW – just half a mile from this terminal. We are even bringing Sound Transit Planning Quarterback Director Karen Kitsis™ and staff bouquets to celebrate getting light rail to Paine Field & Everett! It is also my understanding from watching recent Sound Transit Board meetings Mrs. Kitsis and team are working late into the night this June writing the ST3 playbooks and those playbooks are due 23 June. So can you please review the ST3 playbooks and ensure integration with ST3 plans for Paine Field Before permitting this terminal? Thanks.

Not to put too firm a point on it as well but your County Executive Dave Somers is not just on the Sound Transit Board and a fellow Karen Kitsis fan but also strident any ST3 light rail alignment must serve Paine Field & is a booster for the commercial terminal. I ask you please keep your County Executive apprised.

Again, the SEPA Environmental Checklist on page 17 says this:

As discussed in the attached Gibson 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis, the proposed passenger terminal is anticipated to generate 922 new average daily trips by terminal employees and airline passengers. The maximum anticipated trips during the peak-hour have been estimated at 212 trips. The trip generation calculations are based on the assumption that there would be one flight arrival and one departure at each of the gates during one hour.

So we’re going to have at least “922 new average daily trips” and no good connection to/from Sound Transit light rail or Community Transit’s Swift II? Pardon my concern becoming alarm please!
Connections to Community Transit Swift II?

As you may be aware, Community Transit is wonderfully implementing a series of Bus Rapid Transit lite frequent (10-20 minutes) routes throughout high demand corridors in Snohomish County. The first one goes from Everett Station down State Route 99 to Shoreline and as a regular user. The second is planned to launch in 2018 and go from a new Seaway Transit Center adjacent to the Boeing Factory down Airport Road including a stop at 100th Street, intersect Swift I at Hwy 99 & Airport Road and then go to Bothell.

Below is my photo of a Community Transit Swift for your reference:

![Community Transit Swift BRT Bus](http://Flickr.com/ArgeekJoe)

*This looks like a transit bus able to navigate directly to the proposed terminal? Furthermore, Community Transit made clear on their website their preferred corridor was in part because — with my emphasis: “Existing lanes on part of the corridor for transit *and right-hand turns only*”™. I doubt seriously Community Transit is going to change Swift II’s route to accommodate the terminal.*

Therefore, *I submit to you there needs to be a new Community Transit route or private sector shuttle to link with Swift II as part of the mitigation for this terminal. Folks need to be able in the elements, with their luggage access the public transit provided and substantial new transit investment in the works intended in part to serve this Paine Field Commercial (airline) Terminal.*

Figure 5 on the next page has a map of the entire route:
From the Desk of Joe A. Kunzer  
growlenoise@gmail.com

Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan Compliance

Snohomish County's Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element makes clear on page 43 that, “The county promotes increased transit usage by pursuing ... intergovernmental coordination and transit agency plan review; ... reduced parking requirements; safe, convenient pedestrian access to transit through development review, site design; Capital projects to provide pedestrian connectivity to bus stops, transit centers, station areas, park and ride lots and along transit emphasis corridors.”* Reviewing the SEPA Checklist I saw no work towards “reduced parking requirements”.

But most of all, I see as to with my emphasis, “access features that ensure that safe, continuous sidewalks, walkways and arterial crossing are constructed within a quarter-mile walk of bus stops and are directly accessible from developments” in the Comp Plan this response in the checklist on page 17: “Existing sidewalk / pedestrian facilities from Airport Road along 100th Street SW to the existing terminal will be extended to the new passenger terminal.” Problem is, the closest transit is more a half mile than a quarter mile.

May I suggest you please slap the brakes on this proposal until mass transportation can serve from the terminal doors to a high capacity transit stop? No seriously as your plan says on page 43*, “Enhance the county’s efforts to implement transportation facility design and land use development that is supportive of and compatible with public transportation services, facilities, and programs to increase transit use.” A small sidewalk extension seems inadequate.

Concluding Thoughts

Mr. Barnett, this public comment opportunity may just very well be the very last chance for those with concerns about the Paine Field Commercial Terminal to speak up. Although I have other concerns, I've decided to focus on the traffic mitigation and sound the alarm about the need to better connect this terminal with existing & planned public transit services. Substantial sums and proportions of new public transportation investment are being targeted for Paine Field, let's make sure we get right a transit connection to a passenger terminal as a 1/4 mile walk in the elements, with luggage is not conducive to encouraging transit use.

I believe it is not within the scope of your office to decide if or what airlines – preferably not Allegiant – fly into Paine Field. Nor is it likely within the scope of your office to decide how often or when commercial aircraft service this terminal – preferably not between 10 PM & 6 AM. I believe it is arguably very much within the scope of a planning office to look into lessening trips on highways – and seek cooperation if not compliance with your county's comprehensive plan.
From the Desk of Joe A. Kunzler
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So here is what I ask your office to please do before approving this permit:

1. Wait until Sound Transit Planning is done with the ST3 playbooks and review the relevant sections on Paine Field. Then meet with Sound Transit Planning Director Karen Kitsis and see what the “Russell Wilson of Sound Transit” thinks about this proposal. One of the biggest gripes of Sound Transit Planning is anything that could impact alignment of or delivery time of light rail extension.

2. Seek Everett Transit Planner Sabina Popa’s input. Everett’s City Government is clamoring for this terminal, so Everett Transit’s very capable transit planner should be empowered to draft & execute a plan to reduce the demand on parking and roads at this facility.

3. Make sure Community Transit’s very capable CEO Emmett Heath and staff are aware of this proposal and request input. After all, it’s Community Transit that is building Swift II a half mile away.

4. Demand a copy of the promised Transportation Demand Management (TDM) site plan is made public and submitted for public comment.

5. Review this Gibson 2016 Traffic Impact Analysis and see if that analysis is truly in sync with the proposed amount of air passenger traffic that will be going through the terminal.

Ultimately, what I seek your office do is ensure consultation and integration with Community Transit, Everett Transit & Sound Transit regarding this permit. If this terminal simply must come to fruition, then let’s make sure mass transportation is available, preferably to the terminal doors. Whomever provides that first mile/last mile transit connection is a transit agency, a public-private partnership or a fully private sector provider is irrelevant. What is relevant is encouraging transit use and rewarding boosters of light rail to Everett via Paine Field with a good connection from the light rail to the Paine Field Commercial Terminal proposal before your office.

Finally, I request to please be a party of record in this matter. Please advise me via e-mail or if you must snail mail of updates to this situation.

Very sincerely yours,

Joe A. Kunzler
AvgeekJoe Productions
901 Metcalf Street, PMB 21
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
growlernoise@gmail.com
Endnotes

1 For example, to the Mukilteo Beacon I had published on 11 May 2016 at http://mukilteobeacon.villagesoup.com/2016/05/11/correcting-the-unofficial-paine-field-newspaper-of-record-letter/1153897, that, "Regarding the Paine Field passenger terminal focused more on aesthetics than implementation ("Passenger terminal at Paine Field could open in 2017"), it seemed completely absent the legitimate question how people are going to get to the terminal to the airplane, and how people with no car are going to get from the airplane to their final destination."

As to my Everett Herald sorties, http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20160401/OPINION02/160409962, "Bus better option for Paine Field". Back on 1 April 2016 I had published, "There is also the sensitive matter of traffic mitigation for any commercial terminal at Paine Field seemingly absent from public discussion." Back on 23 February 2015 I had published under "County must work with all parties at http://www.heraldnet.com/article/20150223/OPINION02/150229765 that I felt (and still feel on 10 June 2016) "Community Transit currently has no plan to provide additional service to Paine Field to alleviate traffic by serving the 275,000-plus annual visitors to the Future of Flight, for one. So, obviously if Community Transit cannot serve the Future of Flight, Community Transit will not serve a Paine Field terminal, meaning more traffic."

8 Link to sortie to Snohomish County Council: https://www.facebook.com/AvgeekJoe/videos/765039793602864/ "My public comments to the Snohomish County Council re: Future"

I measured the distance with Google Earth. Also full disclosure: Many times I’ve used the Sound Transit Light Rail to get me to the Bellair Airport via that 0.4 mile covered walk.

My source for the Allegiant Airlines A320 capacity is https://www.allegiantair.com/airline-aircraft-airports and was reviewed on 11 June 2016.

My source is Alaska Airlines’ website at https://www.alaskaair.com/content/travel-infouaircraft/737-900-er.aspx and was reviewed on 11 June 2016.

The Sound Transit 3 Draft Plan public comments are up at http://sit-02blogs.core.windows.net/betas/Default/Document%20Library%20Featured/5-12-3-Draft-Plan-Comment-Public-Comments.pdf

You can review Mrs. Karen Kitis’ resume here: https://www.linkedin.com/in/karen-kitis-93108ba7. Mrs. Kitis had experience with Hampton Roads Transit before Sound Transit, a regional transit agency with light rail and buses, just like Sound Transit.

My source is http://comtrans.org/2ndswift/ which I checked on 11 June 2016.


bid.

bid.
5 July 2016
Tom Barnett
Snohomish County Planning & Development Services
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201
Tom.Barnett@co.snohomish.wa.us

Re: 16-109244-000-00-LDA Paine Field Passenger Terminal – Follow-Up Comments Post-Review of Gibson Traffic Impact Analysis

Tom;

Joe Kunzler here. After reviewing the Gibson Traffic Impact analysis, here are some concerns:

- About “574 stalls of automobile parking for airline passengers, waiting, rental cars, and terminal employees” give or take a few, according to your website. I’m led to believe parking will remain free – so basically a MASSIVE subsidy from lower income to higher income folks, a MASSIVE subsidy of priceless airport land for free parking to a commercial terminal with minimal income back to fund the airport’s operations!

- The Gibson Traffic Impact Analysis considers only a 150-seat aircraft. Not as per my first comments of 12 June, a “177 passenger A320-200\(^1\), with two pilots and my guesstimate four flight attendants. So roughly about 183 folks needing to exit and another 183 folks needing to board the Allegiant airplane.” Nor Alaska Airlines’ largest aircraft is the Boeing 737-900 with capacity of 181 passengers, 2 pilots and 4 flight attendants.\(^2\) So about 187 folks off of the airplane, 187 folks onto the airplane.” Again, I believe, “You respectfully need to look more into how you were told in the SEPA Environmental Checklist, “maximum anticipated trips during the peak-hour have been estimated at 212 trips” as that does not appear to accurately calculate traffic loads.”

- 956 daily trips have been calculated in the traffic study – if you trust proponents’ math

- No current plan for an Airporter or shuttle to Community Transit or Everett Transit services. Which is a huge issue.

- A traffic study with a grand total of ONE mention of the word transit. ONE.

So here it is, it’s Summer 2016 and we have a new transportation facility focused on bringing people to and from aircraft via only one mode of transportation – namely the automobile. At least the Bellingham International Airport mentioned by the Gibson Traffic Impact Analysis has the private sector Bellair Airporter to alleviate some of that.

So I’m going to pose some questions to Snohomish County Planning and Development I think your planning process needs to consider please:

1. Have you initiated contact with Everett Transit and Community Transit about transit service to this facility?

2. Are you in coordination with Sound Transit’s Karen Kitsis or one of her deputy planners to ensure if (and likely when) ST3 is ratified by the voters, Sound Transit can synchronize ST3 plans to have light rail at Paine Field (aka South Everett Industrial Center) with this proposed terminal?

---

\(^1\) My source for the Allegiant Airlines A320 capacity is https://www.allegiantair.com/airline-aircraft-airports and was reviewed on 11 June 2016.

\(^2\) My source is Alaska Airlines’ website at https://www.alaskaair.com/content/travel-info/our-aircraft/737-900-er.aspx and was reviewed on 11 June 2016.
[Voters in the Sound Transit District need to know before October 21 when absentee ballots drop for the 8 November General Election how ST3 if voter approved will work with Paine Field and will there be a transit connection from a Paine Field light rail station to the Paine Field Terminal – yes or no, no fuzzy answers.]

3. How many people are projected to use this terminal as a means of taking a daytrip to Paine Field and/or Mukilteo, then flying out in the evening? (Especially considering no less than three aviation educational facilities on the Paine Field campus, one of which internationally recognized in the Future of Flight & Boeing Tour and the other two occasionally mentioned in national & international aviation publications?)

4. Are you legally able to request terminal proponents incorporate mass transportation with this facility?

5. Can you legally require all parking at this terminal come with an upfront price – especially as the Airport cannot gift land and expect to retain FAA grant eligibility? After all, Bellingham International Airport and SeaTac International charge for parking. I am aware there is also Paine Field management pushback against cooperation with Community Transit requests for land to provide transit services to Paine Field tenants?

In conclusion, thanks for taking these supplemental comments. I hope you understand my decision to raise policy questions is to work towards a collaborative rather than combative result since much of what the majority of regional folks truly want is outside of your jurisdiction.

Ultimately, what I seek your office do is ensure consultation and integration with Community Transit, Everett Transit & Sound Transit regarding this permit. If this terminal simply must come to fruition, then let’s make sure mass transportation is available, and minimal transportation impacts upon both Everett & Mukilteo. Again, I want to see fellow boosters of light rail to Everett via Paine Field rewarded with a good connection from the light rail to the Paine Field Commercial Terminal proposal before your office based on the data.

Again, I request to please be a party of record in this matter. Please advise me via e-mail or if you must snail mail of updates to this situation.

Very sincerely yours;
Joe A. Kunzler
AvgeekJoe Productions
901 Metcalf Street, PMB 21
Sedro-Woolley, WA 98284
growlernoise@gmail.com

3 I use the term “mass transportation” so as to include private sector providers (e.g. Bellair Airporter) in this discussion.
July 14, 2016

Tom Barnett, Project Manager
3000 Rockefeller Ave, #604
Everett, WA 98201

Re: PFN 16 109244 000 00 LDA, Paine Field Passenger Terminal

Dear Mr. Barnett,

Thank you for allowing Everett Transit to review the proposal for the construction of new passenger facilities at Snohomish County Airport – Paine Field. Everett Transit's closest routes are on Airport Rd., and its primary service area is the City of Everett. We have several routes that extend beyond our service area, and have worked with Community Transit in providing services that work together, that are efficient and easy to use for our residents, visitors and commuters. We welcome the opportunity of supporting the economic development of our city and county, by suggesting the infrastructure needs that make future transit service to this particular site possible.

In order to be able to access the site, the infrastructure provided should:

- Accommodate trips for our 40-ft. vehicles, in terms of lane size, road materials used, and turning radiuses within the flow of traffic;
- Allow the designation of a load/unload area dedicated to buses, that permits the boarding and alighting of passengers on the right side of the vehicle. If the bus needs to pull out and then back into the lane of travel, enough space should be allowed for that transition in the designated area;
- Provide the space and customer amenities for transit users at the designated bus zone.

We would be happy to work with Community Transit and Propeller Airports Paine Field to ensure that transit demand for service at this site can be accommodated in the future.

Tom Hingson, Transportation Services Director (425-257-8939 II thingson@everettwa.gov), and I will be the contacts for Everett Transit regarding this project. Please feel free to forward our contact information to the applicant and let us know if you have any questions regarding our feedback.

Thank you,

Sabina Popa, Program Manager – Service Planning II 425-257-8805 II spopa@everettwa.gov
July 19, 2016

Via Facsimile ((425) 388-3872)
and Email (tom.barnett@snoco.org)

Tom Barnett
Principal Economic Development Officer
Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, MS 604
Everett, WA 98201

RE: File No. 16-109244 LDA: Proposal to Construct New Passenger Facilities at Snohomish County Airport-Paine Field (SCA-PA)

Dear Mr. Barnett:

I represent the City of Mukilteo with regard to the Propeller/Paine Field application. The City has already submitted comments directly to you. This letter supplements those comments and concerns two particular issues related to the application.

First, as you may know, the City has pending a challenge in the Washington Court of Appeals to the County’s failure to conduct SEPA review before entering into the “option” agreement with Propeller Inc. concerning the current project. It is not the intent of this comment letter to debate the merits of that appeal. That said, it is important that the Department fulfill the written commitments made by the County in the Court of Appeals in defending against the City’s appeal. These include the following:

The Option expressly requires completion of full SEPA review prior to execution of any lease, and reserves to the County full SEPA authority…

The actual facts support affirmance, including (1) the County approved only a conditional Option, which is not a “project action,” (2) the Option is contingent upon completion of SEPA review, and (3) the County retains full SEPA authority to consider any specific land use application submitted by Propeller Airports and to impose mitigation conditions and to select a “no action” alternative.

Corrected Response Brief at 13 (emphasis added).

The City also argues that SEPA review was triggered because the agreement “limited” the alternative sites to be considered. This is not true. Propeller Airports retains full ability to craft and determine the scope of any actual project proposal it may submit, and the County retains full ability to review, condition, and approve or reject any proposal.

Corrected Response Brief at 22 (emphasis added).

The City’s claim that the Option binds the County to “a decision on a specific construction and operation project in a specific location” is mistaken. See Operang Br. at 26. The County retains sufficient discretion to act in response to SEPA review, including the right to impose mitigation conditions or issue a “no action” determination.

Corrected Response Brief at 25 (emphasis added).

It is a fact that there is only one location currently proposed to construct passenger terminal. This does not prevent the County from conducting an analysis of alternative locations under SEPA.

Corrected Response Brief at 25 (emphasis added).

The same is true here. The Option is conditioned on the outcome of SEPA review, and the County retains discretion to approve, condition, or deny any land use permits thereafter. CP 77-80. The County also has authority to review and
approve all design specifications through the permit procedures. The County also has the ongoing authority, after SEPA review, to require compliance with all environmental laws and permits, which will be an express lease requirement, once executed CP 128. Like the city and county in International Longshore, the County can change course if the SEPA review suggests it should.

Corrected Response Brief at 27 (emphasis added).

Therefore, SEPA review by the County must be conducted to be both procedurally and substantively consistent with the inclusive and broad parameters the County has assured the Court of Appeals will apply.

Second, as a corollary to the first principle noted above, review of the Propeller proposal, including SEPA review, must not assume pre-emption of the County’s authority as Paine Field proprietor to anticipate and mitigate significant adverse impacts, including noise. Proprietor measures to anticipate and mitigate adverse impacts of passenger aircraft operation are not uniformly prohibited under federal law. 49 USC 41713(b)(3), Friends of the E. Hampton Airport, Inc. v. Town of E. Hampton, No. 15-CV-2246(JS)(ARL), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83422 (E.D.N.Y. June 26, 2015); Nat’l Helicopter Corp. of Am. v. City of New York, 137 F.3d 81 (2nd Cir. 1998); Alaska Airlines v. City of Long Beach, 957 F.2d 977 (9th Cir. 1991). In Alaska Airlines the Ninth Circuit held that a city airport proprietor’s noise control measure was not preempted by federal law, but rather fell under the “proprietor exemption” established by Congress. Moreover, the court stated that the “goal of reducing airport noise to control liability and improve the aesthetics of the environment is a legitimate and permissible one.”

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments. Please make sure that this office as well as the City is listed as an interested party for purposes of all notices and decisions concerning this matter.

Sincerely,

EGLICK & WHITED PLLC

[Signature]

Peter J. Egllick

cc: Client
July 18, 2016

Mr. Tom Barnett  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
Economic Development Officer, Planning Division  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604  
Everett, WA 98201

Re: Propeller Airports Paine Field, LLC Permit

Dear Mr. Barnett,

Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment. Save Our Communities members come from many cities and unincorporated areas concerned with the use of Paine Field. We promote the current use of Paine Field which includes promotion of aerospace jobs and economic activity.

The SEPA checklist and Propeller Airport Paine Field, LLC application materials for construction of a new commercial passenger air service facility at Paine Field indicate the intention to build a terminal building and associated parking as set forth in the December 2012 Environmental Assessment and follow on FONSI/ROD.

SOC continues to strongly object to the limited scope of study involved in the EA as it did not fully account for all direct and indirect impacts associated with changing the airport role to facilitate scheduled commercial service the volume of which is largely unrestricted by the FAA outside of safety standards.

In response to a legal challenge on the insufficient scope of the EA, a court ruling highlighted the permit process as the key step where conditions can be required to mitigate impacts. The ruling squarely placed the attention and focus on the permitting process. The permit process must address impacts beyond those merely associated with construction of the terminal and parking lot but all the direct and indirect impacts per the intention and requirements of SEPA which was put into effect to ensure potential significant adverse environmental impacts are disclosed and mitigation measures be identified and implemented. Such measures need to be fully incorporated as conditions of any approved permit.

Logic alone would indicate that changing the role of the airport to accommodate scheduled commercial service would produce significant impacts as activity levels increase. We therefore continue our recommendation to you that a full and comprehensive EIS be conducted on this proposal.
We fully understand that NEPA and SEPA are separate and as such we call upon you to ensure that the SEPA process does not adopt a similarly limited scope but instead fully addresses initial and reasonably foreseeable potential impacts on issues including but not limited to like traffic, stormwater, noise and perhaps the biggest issue – expansion which is included in the lease with Propeller. Instead of repeating all of specifics and arguments around the need for a full impact analysis in these comments, please see the SOC comments on the Draft EA on record with the FAA and County and the SOC October 15, 2012 letter at http://socnw.org/pdf/SOCItrotoFAAOct152012Final.pdf.

It is clear that starting scheduled commercial service has the potential to begin a domino effect converting more and more of Paine Field land and operations to facilitate such service. Comprehensive mitigation is not possible absent full identification of all direct and indirect impacts associated with starting and growing scheduled commercial service. Propeller Airport Paine Field, LLC plans if approved without identification of and paying for comprehensive mitigation measures will over time push impacts and mitigation onto the backs of citizens, cities and the county. The County needs to be committed at every step to avoid this outcome and to instead properly identify all direct and indirect impacts and require the applicant to bear the associated mitigation and costs.

We would be happy to provide a point by point comment list on all direct and indirect impacts associated with the permit process before you. We’d prefer to have public opportunity to comment on your fully completed draft work when that is completed.

We are aware that the City of Mukilteo is submitting comments and we communicate very closely with them on Paine Field issues. Although SOC did not participate in helping the City of Mukilteo draft their comments, I can assure you that SOC supports the input and perspectives of Mukilteo with respect to Paine Field and with respect to the permitting processes associated with addressing the Propeller Airports Paine Field, LLC Permit Application.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit “preliminary” comments on the Propeller Airports Paine Field Passenger Terminal project. Please feel free to contact me at president@socnw.org if you have any questions or would like specific issue comments that would assist you in completing your permit review and condition identification obligations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Moore
President
July 18, 2016

Mr. Tom Barnett  
Snohomish County Planning and Development Services  
Economic Development Officer, Planning Division  
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604  
Everett, WA 98201

Re: Propeller Airports Paine Field, LLC

Dear Mr. Barnett,

Thank you for providing the City of Mukilteo the opportunity to comment on the SEPA checklist and initial application materials submitted by Propeller Airport Paine Field, LLC for construction of a new commercial passenger air service facility at the Snohomish County Airport – Paine Field. Per the SEPA Checklist the facility currently proposed will consist of a terminal building and associated parking consistent with the December 2012 NEPA Environmental Assessment and FONSI/ROD. However, it is apparent that it will be a potential inducement for, and will be treated by some as a precedent for more intense use. It is therefore important to avoid an artificially narrow approach to the application, including in particular with regard to SEPA review.

The purpose of the SEPA process is to ensure that potential significant adverse environmental impacts are disclosed and mitigation measures identified and implemented. Surrounding neighbors, including the City of Mukilteo depend on the process to ensure the identification and mitigation of significant adverse impacts on them. Here, the application falls short in two respects.

As a threshold matter, after comparing the NEPA FONSI with SEPA documents prepared for the project, there appear to be several inconsistencies and omissions between the two which must be addressed prior to issuing any environmental determination. With the exception of applying standard construction Best Management Practices and Traffic Mitigation Fees, the application and SEPA documents do not evaluate project impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods or jurisdictions nor do they contain any reasonable assurances or mitigation conditions to ensure that the limitations imposed by the FONSI are and will continue to be applied to this project.
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Further, the SEPA Checklist and other application materials virtually assure repetition of past errors by ignoring issues that would arise in the event of expansion and/or intensification of use.

**Project Description:**
The December 4, 2012 Finding of No Significant Impact and Record of Decision for commercial passenger service at Paine Field imposed specific limitations on the size and use of the facility. According to the FONSI, page 3, the proposal was to: construct a modular addition to the existing terminal building, accommodate up to two prospective carriers, two gates, 18,000 square foot holding area that accommodates 225 people in the boarding area, all with no additional parking required.

The project description in the SEPA Checklist is minimal; it describes a 29,300 square feet of interior space in compliance with FAA Advisory Circular 150/5360-13 Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities. What does that even mean? For the lay person, the project description provided by the applicants of this project cannot be easily compared to that contained in the FONSI.

- How does the project comply with the 18,000 square foot holding area described in the FONSI?
- How does the passenger holding area comply with the maximum 225 person occupancy?
- Does the current proposal allow for further expansions?
- The project is limited to two gates and two carriers; where does the SEPA Checklist or proposed mitigation condition(s) limit the project to two carriers?
- The FONSI limited service to short flights: Portland, Spokane, and Las Vegas. Where in the SEPA Checklist does it clearly specify how this terminal will be used and what flights will be offered?

**Impervious Area:**
Drainage from the project will flow into Japanese Gulch in the City of Mukilteo. The SEPA Checklist (question 1.g) notes that the project will have a net impervious coverage of about a half-acre. However, the application materials note 53,000 square feet of new impervious area: that’s about 1.2 acres of new impervious surface. SEPA question 4.b states “approximately 31,000 square feet of grass-covered infield would be removed and replaced with a landscaped parking area”; that is approximately .71 acres of new impervious area.

- Were the drainage facilities designed for a half acre, 0.71 acres or 1.2 acres of new impervious surface? How does the stormwater affect Japanese Gulch?
- Why are there 1.2 acres of new impervious surface when the FONSI states “Automobile parking will be provided in existing parking areas”? How is building new parking consistent with the FONSI? Will existing parking be removed to keep the parking count on the airport consistent with current conditions?
- Importantly, there is no acknowledgement of or assessment of impacts from expansion or intensification of use. The City of Mukilteo of course does not support such changes which would result in even greater impacts. But, in the absence of durable binding restrictions against that, such matters as parking facilities, including location and arrangements, must be acknowledged and cannot be assumed to be without significant adverse impact. Arrangements for private
vehicle parking, shuttle parking, rental car parking and their consequent impacts (including increased impervious surface) all must be included in SEPA review and must address both the current vague application, as well as subsequent induced intensification and expansion. For example, avoidance of old-style approaches that facilitate private car passenger facility access must be built into a proposal from the start. The absolute necessity for addressing such issues and attendant impacts at the outset and avoiding mistakes of the past is now even more important due to public safety factors. Until all such impacts and factors are comprehensively addressed, the current proposal is not ready for review or approval.

**Noise:**
The Environmental Assessment evaluated how the surrounding communities would be affected by increased aircraft noise resulting from commercial air service at Paine Field. The FONSI specifically identified three aircraft types with limitations on the number of operations starting in year one through year five. (FONSI, page 5, proposed action) The SEPA Checklist, Environmental Health, question b. Noise, responds by noting that construction noise will be subject to the Snohomish County Noise Ordinance and that operations are monitored via the Airports noise abatement program. This response is both inadequate and open ended. The limitations on which the federal FONSI depends such as limiting the number of operations per the FONSI and limiting the type of aircraft that meet the DNL 65 noise contour or less are not reflected in the proposal submitted to the County or in the corresponding SEPA Checklist.

**Transportation Impacts:**
Section 14, Traffic, question f states that the parking calculation for the proposed new terminal was based on of the Bellingham International Airport, the ITE manual and various County and City of Everett staff expertise. The Bellingham Airport has five gates with 2,500 parking stalls; this equates to approximately 500 stalls per gate. Between 1980 and 2010, Bellingham had to expand their parking area twice to keep up with the demand for service.

- The Propeller proposal references the Bellingham Airport as an example of similar facilities; however there is no reconciliation or analysis of how their model of 300 stalls per gate compares with Bellingham’s 500 stalls per gate.
- How do the 300 stalls per gate meet the aircraft operations limitations imposed in the FONSI? There is no mention in the SEPA Checklist connecting parking to the number of flights allowed under the existing FONSI.

Question h goes on to ask how the proposal will mitigate any traffic impacts created by the proposal. The response: payment of traffic impact mitigation fees and preparation of a Transportation Demand Management Plan. Again, the response to the SEPA question is minimal and completely inadequate for the type of project being proposed and leaves significant adverse impacts unmitigated. Building a new passenger air service terminal in Snohomish County has the potential to create significant unmitigated adverse environmental effects on the adjacent community.
The SEPA Checklist as submitted does not adequately describe the project and does not fully analyze the potential significant adverse environmental effects that building and operating a new passenger air service terminal in Snohomish County can generate. While the FONSI may have been adequate for FAA purposes, it does not satisfy SEPA requirements nor fulfill the commitment made in other forums that when the actual proposal was up for review, there would be full SEPA compliance. Therefore, as a first step, and without delay, the County should issue a Determination of Significance for the proposal and get on with the critical work of preparing a SEPA Environmental Impact Statement for the proposal.

As part of its full disclosure and analysis of impacts, such an EIS at a minimum should consider the following as potential requirements to be imposed before the proposal may be approved:

- An over-all plan for development of the terminal that through mandatory location, planning, and facilities standards avoids the obvious mistakes of the past reflected in passenger air facilities elsewhere and instead, for example, requires access by public transit while strongly discouraging if not eliminating direct access by private vehicle
- A traffic management monitoring plan that evaluates the actual traffic impacts from air service operations against the traffic modeling included in the application with specific benchmarks triggering review and additional mitigation including operator (currently Propeller) financial responsible to evaluate new access routes to and from the terminal or other forms of mitigation that will reduce impacts on major intersections
- Third party, independent noise monitoring to measure noise levels quarterly and report to an oversight committee formed of local government staff, county staff, business leaders, and residents authorized to review and monitor compliance with the expected versus measured noise levels and issue binding recommendations for remedial action;
- Adoption of a “Fly Friendly Program” similar to Bend Oregon or the Port of Portland, which directs the flight patterns away from noise sensitive areas.
- Closures to ensure compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods during specified hours.

To emphasize, these potential measures for study in an EIS are not a substitute for preparation of an EIS in the first place. They are examples of what should be part of the EIS process that is required before this proposal can be moved through the application process.

Finally, the City of Mukilteo is in a position that does not always arise under SEPA. Snohomish County, the permitting agency, is proceeding as the SEPA lead agency while another jurisdiction, Mukilteo, has a cognizable interest in the over-all Paine Field site (for example, part of Snohomish County Airport lies within the City of Mukilteo’s jurisdiction) and will bear the substantial brunt of the proposal’s impacts. Yet Mukilteo has been left in the role of outside commentator on the proposal. Fortunately, SEPA addresses this through regulations that allow for co-lead agency status.
or for one agency to substitute for another as lead agency. Mukilteo therefore requests, at a minimum, SEPA co-lead agency status with regard to this proposal. If the County is not amenable to that then the City reserves all rights and objections with regard to Snohomish County proceeding as the (sole) lead agency.

In conclusion, the City is requesting a full EIS be conducted on this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these preliminary comments on the Propeller Airports Paine Field Passenger Terminal project. Please feel free to call or email me at 425-263-8041 or plove@mukilteowa.gov if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patricia Love
City of Mukilteo
Community Development Director

Cc: Mukilteo Mayor and City Council Members
STATE OF WASHINGTON )
COUNTY OF Snohomish )

We,__________________________________________ as Principal (the Principal), and ____________________________ as Surety (the Surety), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of ____________________________ and duly authorized to transact Surety business in the State of Washington, are held and firmly bound unto Snohomish County (the County), a political subdivision of the State of Washington, in the amount of $__________________, for the payment of which sum we bind ourselves, and each of our executors, administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally.

Now, therefore, the conditions of these obligations are such, that if the Principal installs and maintains all erosion control and sediment control measures as shown on the approved stormwater site plan for the project of ________________________________________, project file number ______________________ required under Snohomish County Code (SCC) and abates potential adverse impacts to public and private drainage facilities and property from the failure of the erosion control and sediment control measures until final inspection and construction acceptance by the County of all drainage facilities specified by the stormwater site plan, then this obligation shall be void; otherwise the obligations set forth herein shall remain in full force and effect until released by the County, PROVIDED that the duration of the obligations set forth herein may be extended by the Director of Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (the Director) as provided by SCC 30.84.030.

We further agree, that if, during the period this performance security is in effect, the Director determines that the Principal has failed to regularly and properly maintain the erosion control and sediment control measures and/or the drainage facilities or the erosion control and sediment control measures and/or drainage facilities are not operating as designed, the Director shall notify the Principal and Surety, in accordance with SCC 30.84.050. The notice shall describe the work or improvements that must be done to prevent the forfeiture of the security device, provide a date certain by which the required work or improvements must be completed to the Director’s satisfaction, and state that if the work or improvements are not completed within the time specified, the County may proceed with forfeiture of the security device and use the funds to complete the required work or improvements. The Surety, in accordance with SCC 30.84.050(4), has the option to either pay up to the full security amount to the County upon demand or complete the work according to the County’s terms and conditions. The amount demanded by the Director or their designee will be a good faith estimate of the actual cost of the work or improvements to be completed.

We further agree that if it is necessary for the County to take any legal action against any signatory to this agreement to assure the proper completion of this project, the County shall be entitled to its reasonable costs and attorney’s fees.

We further agree that in the event the real property upon which the work secured by this security device is annexed into an incorporated municipality, the County, pursuant to SCC 30.84.020(2)(b), shall have the right, at its option and in its sole discretion, to assign the County’s interest in this security device to the annexing municipality without the necessity of obtaining a re-issuance of the security device. Should the County assign its interest in this security device to a municipality, the County shall promptly deliver written notice of the assignment to the Surety and the Principal.
We further agree that the Principal and the Surety shall promptly notify Snohomish County Planning and Development Services of any change of address. Change of addresses notices shall be in writing and shall be mailed to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services, 3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 604, Everett, WA 98201. The County will mail only to the last known address of Principal and Surety.

Signed this _______ day of ______________________, ____________.

Principal

Address

City, State, Zip

Phone Number: __________________________

Signature of Principal

Please Print Name & Title

Surety

Address

City, State, Zip

Phone Number: __________________________

Signature of Surety Official

Please Print Name & Title

Accepted by Snohomish County: ___________________________ Date: ______________
STATE OF WASHINGTON  )
COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH )

We hereby agree as Principal (the Principal) that the sum of $____________________ will be held in savings account number ________________________________ in the name ________________________________ for the benefit of Snohomish County to assure performance requirements hereunder.

Now, therefore, the conditions of these obligations are such, that if the Principal installs and maintains all erosion control and sediment control measures as shown on the approved stormwater site plan for the project of _______________________________, project file number __________________ required under Snohomish County Code and abates potential adverse impacts to public and private drainage facilities and property from the failure of the erosion control and sediment control measures until final inspection and construction acceptance by Snohomish County of all drainage facilities specified by the stormwater site plan, then this obligation shall be void; otherwise the obligations set forth herein shall remain in full force and effect until released by Snohomish County, PROVIDED that the duration of the obligations set forth herein may be extended by the Director of Snohomish County Planning and Development Services (the Director) as provided by SCC 30.84.030.

We further agree that if, during the period this performance security is in effect, the Director determines that the Principal has failed to regularly and properly maintain the erosion control and sediment control measures and/or the drainage facilities or the erosion control and sediment control measures and/or drainage facilities are not operating as designed, the Director shall notify the Principal and Financial Institution, in accordance with SCC 30.84.050. The notice shall describe the work or improvements that must be done to prevent the forfeiture of the security device, provide a date certain by which the required work or improvements must be completed to the Director’s satisfaction, and state that if the work or improvements are not completed within the time specified, the County may proceed with forfeiture of the security device and use the funds to complete the required work or improvements. The Financial Institution, in accordance with SCC 30.84.050(4), has the option to either pay up to the full security amount to the County upon demand or complete the work according to the County’s terms and conditions. The amount demanded by the Director or their designee will be a good faith estimate of the actual cost of the work or improvements to be completed.

We further agree that if it is necessary for the County to take any legal action against any signatory to this agreement to assure the proper completion of this project, the County shall be entitled to its reasonable costs and attorney's fees.

We further agree that in the event the real property upon which the work secured by this security device is annexed into an incorporated municipality, the County, pursuant to SCC 30.84.020(2)(b), shall have the right, at its option and in its sole discretion, to assign the County’s interest in this security device to the annexing municipality without the necessity of obtaining a re-issuance of the security device. Should the County assign its interest in this security device to a municipality, the County shall promptly deliver written notice of the assignment to the Financial Institution and the Principal.
We further agree that the Principal and the Financial Institution shall promptly notify Snohomish County Planning and Development Services of any change of address. Change of addresses notices shall be in writing and shall be mailed to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services, 3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 604, Everett, WA 98201. The County will mail only to the last known address of Principal and Financial Institution.

Signed this ______ day of ______________________, ________.

Principal

Financial Institution

Address

Address

City, State, Zip

City, State, Zip

Phone Number: _______________________

Phone Number: _______________________

Signature of Principal

Signature of Bank Official

Please Print Name & Title

Please Print Name & Title

Accepted by Snohomish County: _____________________________ Date: ______________________