



Eastin, Darryl

From: Karen Walter <KWalter@muckleshoot.nsn.us>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2014 10:43 AM
To: Eastin, Darryl
Subject: FW: Point Wells Development, Urban Center Development 11-101457-000-00-LU and 9-lot short plat, 11-101007-000-00-SP, Requests for Review

Mr. Eastin,

We received notice that Snohomish County has issued a Determination of Significance and Scoping for a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Point Wells project. Previously we commented on the Request for Review documents for this project as shown below. We have two follow-up questions in response to the DS:

1. Did Snohomish County ever respond to our email below? I cannot find a record of any response.
2. If there is no response as the project is on hold, then please consider the comments below in response to the DS for issues that the EIS should address (i.e. clean-up status; proposed shoreline actions which may include groins, bulkheads, piers ,etc. moorage; impacts to all critical areas and mitigation sequencing including potential mitigation measures, etc).

We appreciate the opportunity to review the DS and look forward to reviewing the EIS that addresses these comments in detail. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Karen Walter
Watersheds and Land Use Team Leader

*Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division
Habitat Program
39015 172nd Ave SE
Auburn, WA 98092
253-876-3116*

From: Karen Walter
Sent: Monday, April 11, 2011 8:16 AM
To: darryl.eastin@co.snohomish.wa.us
Cc: Ginger Holser
Subject: Point Wells Development, Urban Center Development 11-101457-000-00-LU and 9-lot short plat, 11-101007-000-00-SP, Requests for Review

Mr. Eastin,

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe has reviewed the Requests for Review materials for the two projects referenced above. The first project proposes to permit an urban center development on 60.9 acres at the Point Wells site. The second project, also at the Point Wells site, proposes to permit a 9-lot short plat on the same 60.9 acres. We have questions about these proposals as noted below:

1. What is status of clean up action plan for site? Per the materials that we reviewed, the necessary remediation activities will take 1-2 years per phase on the inland areas and the nearshore and other contaminated areas may take up to 3 to 5 years for clean-up. The documents also indicate that the cleanup criteria for groundwater may not be met for the entire site until 10 to 15 years after cleanup begins. Based this information, it seems pre-mature for Snohomish County to approve development permits prior to an approved clean up plan. The clean up plan may result in limitations to areas that can be graded or cut, as well as, the types of stormwater facilities that can be used to treat and detain stormwater.
2. Where is project in overall approval process? The Critical Areas Report (David Evans and Associates, Jan 2011) mentions a project specific EIS which will be when potential impacts from the proposed three groins in Puget Sound will be evaluated. The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Final Docket XIII Amendment, Paramount (ICF Jones and Stokes, 2009) also states:

“Additional detailed environmental impact review of a site-specific development proposal would occur as specific projects are proposed (e.g., land use and building permit applications).”

3. Are the 30 piles authorized at the existing dock for the Brightwater outfall to remain or are they replaced as part of the overall dock replacement portion of the project?

4. What are the details for dock modifications to accommodate moorage?

The Critical Areas Report (2011) states *“to support recreational boating on the existing pier, it will be necessary to construct new boat slips (**Appendix A**). These boat slips are likely to be floating piers located on the northeast side of the existing pier. Each of these piers are likely to be anchored with a single new piling.”*

5. Additional information regarding the potential nighttime lighting at dock and the other built structures is needed as this lighting could adversely affect salmon by increasing predation.

The Critical Areas Report (2011) states *“it is unknown at this time how future lighting from the developed condition will compare with the existing condition, or what changes in lighting are proposed at the dock. However, dock lighting for the developed condition should be designed to reduce impacts to juvenile salmonids.”*

6. What streams will be re-routed and relocated and potentially daylighted as briefly discussed in the Critical Areas Report? What are the plans for the rest of stream channels currently piped? The Docket XIII DEIS (2009) states: *“improvements to the constructed ditch along the north and eastern boundaries of the site to create a channel that mimics a natural creek. Removing the culvert that conveys the unnamed creek in the southern portion of the site and restoring the natural channel through the site for that creek.”* The details of the potential relocations and specific stream improvements were lacking in the materials that we reviewed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal and look forward to the County's responses. We may have comments subsequently. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Karen Walter
Watersheds and Land Use Team Leader

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division
39015 172nd Ave SE
Auburn, WA 98092
253-876-3116