



Snohomish County
Office of Hearings Administration
3000 Rockefeller Ave., M/S 405
Everett, WA 98201
(425) 388-3538
Hearing.Examiner@snoco.org
www.snoco.org
Peter Camp
Hearing Examiner

DECISION of the

SNOHOMISH COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER

I. SUMMARY

DATE OF DECISION: March 7, 2023

PROJECT NAME: Residential Treatment Facility North

APPLICANT: Tulalip Tribes
6406 Marine Drive
Tulalip, Washington 98271

LOCATION: 7800 block of 300th St.
Stanwood, Washington 98292

OWNER: Tulalip Tribes
6406 Marine Drive
Tulalip, Washington 98271

FILE NO.: 22-102230 CUP

REQUEST: Conditional use permit to construct and operate a secure civil behavioral health services facility (level II health and social services facility)

DECISION SUMMARY: Conditional use permit to construct and operate a secure civil behavioral health services facility (level II health and social services facility) is approved with conditions

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I. SUMMARY	1
2	II. TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
3	III. SITE SUMMARY	4
4	IV. FINDINGS OF FACT	4
5	A. Regulatory Review and Vesting	4
6	B. Open Record Hearing	5
7	C. The Record.....	5
8	D. Public Notice.....	5
9	E. Background Information.....	5
10	1. Proposal.....	5
11	2. Site Description and Surrounding Uses.....	5
12	3. Site Visit.....	6
13	4. Concerns.....	6
14	F. Conditional Use Permit (Chapter 30.42C SCC)	8
15	1. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan (SCC 30.42C.100(1)(a))	8
16	2. Compliance with Title 30 SCC (SCC 30.42C.100(1)(b))	9
17	a. General Zoning Standards (Chapters 30.22 through 30.26 SCC)	9
18	i. Conditional Use Allowed in Zone (Chap. 30.22 SCC)	9
19	ii. Height, Setback, Bulk, and Lot Dimensions (Chap. 30.23 SCC).....	9
20	iii. Parking (SCC 30.26.030(1))	9
21	iv. Landscaping (SCC 30.25.025)	9
22	b. Environmental Review (SEPA) (Chapter 30.61 SCC).....	9
23	c. Critical Areas Regulations (Chapters 30.62A, 30.62B, and 30.62C SCC)	10
24	d. Drainage and Grading (Chapters 30.63A, 30.63B, and 30.63C SCC)	10
25	e. Impact Mitigation Fees (Chaps. 30.66A, 30.66B, and 30.66C SCC).....	11
26	f. Transportation (Title 13 SCC, EDDS §3-02, and SCC 30.66B.420)	11
27	i. Area Transportation	11
28	ii. Project Site.....	13
29	3. Not Materially Detrimental to Nearby Uses or Property	15
30	4. Compatibility with Site and Surrounding Property	15
31	V. CONCLUSIONS	16
32	VI. DECISION	16

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 2 of 27

1	VII. Conditions.....	16
2	A. Operating Conditions	16
3	B. Development Conditions.....	18
4	1. General	18
5	2. Prior to Commencement of Any Work.....	18
6	3. Prior to Combustible Construction.....	21
7	4. Prior to Final Inspection of the Land Disturbing Activity Permit	21
8	5. Building Permits	22
9	6. Prior to Occupancy	23
10	C. Termination and Expiration.....	24
11	VIII. EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES	25
12	Reconsideration	25
13	Appeal.....	26

III. SITE SUMMARY

LOCATION:	78xx 300 th St. NW Stanwood, Washington 98292
TAX PARCEL NOS.:	320418-001-001-00 320418-001-014-00
ACREAGE:	4.66 acres
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION:	Local Commercial Farmland
ZONING:	R-5
UTILITIES:	
Water:	City of Stanwood
Sewer:	Not in a sewer district
Electricity:	Snohomish County PUD No. 1
SCHOOL DISTRICT:	Stanwood-Camano School District No. 401
FIRE DISTRICT:	North County Regional Fire Authority
PDS STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Approve the proposed behavioral health facility with conditions

Based on a preponderance of the evidence in the record, the Hearing Examiner finds the following facts and makes the following conclusions of law.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Regulatory Review and Vesting

Applicant Tulalip Tribes of Washington, a federally recognized Indian tribe and native sovereign nation, applied to Snohomish County Planning and Development Services department (PDS) on January 31, 2022 for a conditional use permit to construct and operate a secure civil behavioral health services facility. PDS determined the application to be complete for vesting as of the date of submittal. Tulalip Tribes submitted additional information on June 27, 2022 and August 22, 2022.

B. Open Record Hearing

An open record hearing was held on January 24, 2023 and January 26, 2023. The record was left open until February 3, 2023 for the limited purpose of allowing PDS and Tulalip Tribes to respond to public comments and provide additional information regarding traffic and whether patients could walk out of the facility's doors when the civil order confining the patient expires.

C. The Record

The Hearing Examiner considered exhibits A.1 through M.28, O.1, O.3, P.5 and P.6.¹ The Hearing Examiner did not consider exhibit U.1, which was a public comment submitted after the record closed to public comment. The Hearing Examiner also considered the testimony of the witnesses at the open record hearing. A recording of the hearing is available in the Office of Hearings Administration.

D. Public Notice

PDS notified the public of the open record hearing, threshold determination, and concurrency and traffic impact fee notifications.²

E. Background Information

1. Proposal

Tulalip Tribes proposes to construct and operate a 32-bed secure civil behavioral health facility for adults, consisting of two buildings with 16 beds each. Tulalip Tribes will provide parking for 60 vehicles. The facility is intended to serve patients who are involuntarily committed by court order pursuant to chap. 71.05 RCW for stays between 90 and 180 days and patients who voluntarily commit themselves to inpatient treatment. The patient population will be medically stable and not involved in the criminal justice system.

2. Site Description and Surrounding Uses

The site is zoned R-5 and was created by a boundary line adjustment of a 30-acre site to create a parcel of approximately 4.66-acres and parcel of approximately 25 acres. The latter parcel will not be developed under this proposal. The parcel is undeveloped pasture. Surrounding properties are rural residential properties on five or more acres.

¹ Exhibits O.1, O.3, P.5, and P.6 were submitted by SEPA appellants. The Hearing Examiner dismissed the SEPA appeal, but considers the appeal documents as public comments.

² Exhibits F.1 through F.14.

1 **3. Site Visit**

2 The Hearing Examiner visited the site unaccompanied and viewed the area from public rights of
3 way on Wednesday, February 15, 2023. H. Ex. Rule of Proc. 1.9 (2021).

4 **4. Concerns**

5 Many community concerns were raised in written comments and testimony in the open record
6 hearing. The concerns range from public safety to protection of the environment to the impact on
7 the rural character of the community. Concerns were raised, too, about the appropriateness of the
8 location for such a facility.

9 Some of the public worried that the facility would house patients accused or convicted of crimes.
10 However, the facility will not be part of the criminal justice system and will not house patients
11 charged with or convicted of crimes.³ The facility is for civil commitment pursuant to chap. 71.05
12 RCW and for patients who voluntarily place themselves in the facility for care.

13 Some testified that other locations with closer proximity to public transportation would be more
14 appropriate for the proposed facility. However, the purpose of these proceedings is not to
15 determine the optimal location for the facility or whether another location may be better, but to
16 evaluate this application against county code requirements. County code does not authorize the
17 Hearing Examiner to reject an application because he thinks another location would be more
18 suitable for a proposed development. The proposed use is explicitly permitted by county code and
19 can only be rejected if it cannot be sufficiently conditioned to mitigate its impact on the
20 neighborhood.

21 County code and associated regulations protect critical areas such as wetlands. Health department
22 regulations protect wellheads and public welfare by requiring approval of the design, location, and
23 installation of on-site sewer systems. Setback, building height, and landscaping requirements
24 mitigate a development's impact on the surrounding properties.

25 Although the county drainage manual's default preference is for infiltration of stormwater, it is not
26 required when subsurface conditions make infiltration infeasible. Here, subsurface exploration
27 demonstrated the infeasibility of infiltration due to a shallow low permeability layer. Stormwater
28 from hard surfaces such as roofs and the parking area will be collected, detained, receive
29 enhanced water quality treatment, and be discharged at its historic, natural discharge location at a
30 rate and volume designed to maintain the hydroperiod of the on-site wetlands.

³ It is possible that a patient could have been convicted of a crime in the past. The facility will not serve those currently in the criminal justice system.

1 Neighbors expressed concern regarding the impact of the facility on their water wells, but the
2 facility will not draw from the aquifer used by the neighbors and instead will obtain water from the
3 city of Stanwood.

4 Perhaps most importantly, the community is deeply concerned about safety—a secure civil
5 behavioral health facility is specifically designed to treat patients who are a grave danger to
6 themselves and possibly others. The facility is secure; patients cannot just walk out the door.
7 Elopements (escapes) of patients subject to court-ordered treatment are rare and almost always
8 occur away from the facility, such as when a patient visits a health care provider. Between January
9 2018 and December 2022, 60,000 people entered treatment at similar facilities, but less than one-
10 tenth of 1% eloped.⁴

11 Some raised the specter of patients refusing care and simply walking out the door into the rural
12 neighborhood. This is extremely unlikely for several reasons. First, a court ordered the patient to
13 be held in a secure facility so they may receive treatment and begin to recover their health. If they
14 refuse care (including refusal to participate in planning their discharge), they are very unlikely to be
15 freed by expiration of a court order; a further court order would usually be entered to maintain them
16 in a secure treatment facility until such time as the patient sufficiently improves or, in the worst
17 case scenario, is transferred to a different facility better able to care for the patient on a long-term
18 basis. Second, approval will be conditioned on prohibiting discharge directly into the rural
19 community. Discharge planning will include transportation to the patient's next residence, whether
20 taken there by a friend or family in a car or by taxi or shared ride service.

21 Some expressed concern about calls for emergency services. The patient population is not likely to
22 be medically fragile as in a skilled nursing facility.⁵ Patients who are not medically stable will be
23 kept at an acute care facility and not transferred to this facility unless and until they are medically
24 stable.

25 Community members worried that the facility would look “institutional” or like a prison and therefore
26 be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood. Some even worried that the facility would
27 be ringed with barbed wire. However, the facility is not designed to look institutional, or like a
28 prison, or have barbed wire. The buildings will be one-story with sloped metal roofs like many
29 residential and agricultural buildings in the area.⁶ The siding of buildings will have residential
30 treatments and fenced areas will be secured without looking like a prison.⁷

⁴ 59 elopements out of 60,000 detentions. Testimony of Dr. Waterland.

⁵ If the patients were medically fragile, it is unlikely they would be moved from an acute care facility to this facility, which is not designed or equipped to provide acute medical care.

⁶ E.g., ex. B.4.

⁷ E.g., exhibits M.3 and M.4.

1 Some expressed concerns about the impact of the facility on area property values. The record
2 does not contain sufficient legal basis to reject the application. Generalized concerns over impact
3 of a development on area property values do not constitute substantial evidence sufficient to deny
4 the application. See *Omnipoint Corp. v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Pine Grove Twp.*, 181 F.3d 403, 409
5 (3d Cir. 1999), citing *Cellular Tel. Co. v. Town of Oyster Bay*, 166 F.3d 490, 496 (2d Cir. 1999).
6 The record demonstrates that impact on property values is equivocal at best.⁸

7 ***F. Conditional Use Permit (Chapter 30.42C SCC)***

8 An application for a conditional use permit must meet the following criteria:⁹

- 9 a. The proposal must be consistent with the county's comprehensive plan;
- 10 b. The proposal must comply with the applicable requirements of title 30 SCC;
- 11 c. The proposal will not be materially detrimental to the uses or property in the immediate
12 vicinity; and
- 13 d. The proposal is compatible with, and incorporates specific features, conditions, or revisions
14 that ensures it responds to, the existing or intended character, appearance, quality of
15 development, and physical characteristics of the site and surrounding property.

16 **1. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan (SCC 30.42C.100(1)(a))**

17 The comprehensive plan designates the area as Local Commercial Farmland and is zoned Rural
18 5-acre. Tulalip Tribes obtained a boundary line adjustment of the approximately 30-acre site to
19 carve out 4.66 acres for the facility and leave the remaining 25 acres for agricultural use. While
20 less than 5 acres will be removed from agricultural use, county code explicitly permits the proposed
21 use if conditioned to mitigate its impact on the immediate community. Further, the loss must be
22 balanced against other community needs and comprehensive plan goals and objectives. The
23 comprehensive plan explicitly supports public health initiatives like this.¹⁰ No one disputed that
24 more facilities such as this are needed. The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

⁸ Ex. M.25.

⁹ SCC 30.42C.100(1) (2012).

¹⁰ Comprehensive Plan, Objective IC(1)(G).

1 **2. Compliance with Title 30 SCC (SCC 30.42C.100(1)(b))**

2 ***a. General Zoning Standards (Chapters 30.22 through 30.26 SCC)***

3 ***i. Conditional Use Allowed in Zone (Chap. 30.22 SCC)***

4 The proposed project is a level II health and social services facility, which is a permitted use with
5 conditions in the R-5 zone.

6 ***ii. Height, Setback, Bulk, and Lot Dimensions (Chap. 30.23 SCC)***

7 The proposed structure and ground support equipment comply with height, setback, bulk, and lot
8 dimension requirements.

9 ***iii. Parking (SCC 30.26.030(1))***

10 County code requires PDS to determine an appropriate number of parking stalls. SCC 30.26.035.
11 A parking study¹¹ prepared at PDS' request estimated peak parking hours, parking space demand,
12 and turnover. Although the number of staff will vary depending on patient census and visits by
13 providers, case workers, family, and friends, Tulalip Tribes proposed a ratio of 1.88 parking stalls
14 per bed, resulting in 30 stalls per building and 60 stalls total. The day shift will likely see
15 approximately 25 employees per building at full census. This is likely to be an adequate amount of
16 parking.

17 ***iv. Landscaping (SCC 30.25.025)***

18 County code typically requires a 20-foot-wide type A landscaping buffer along the perimeter of a
19 conditional use permit site, although it requires a 20-foot type B landscaping buffer for critical areas
20 and a 10-foot type B landscaping buffer along a road frontage.¹² Tulalip Tribes proposes to install
21 perimeter landscaping consistent with these requirements.

22 ***b. Environmental Review (SEPA) (Chapter 30.61 SCC)***

23 PDS issued a threshold determination of non-significance.¹³ An appeal from the threshold
24 determination was filed on October 3, 2022,¹⁴ and dismissed on December 21, 2022.¹⁵

¹¹ Ex. C.6.

¹² SCC 30.25.025(1) (2018).

¹³ Ex. E.1.

¹⁴ Ex. O.1.

¹⁵ E. T.3.

c. Critical Areas Regulations (Chapters 30.62A, 30.62B, and 30.62C SCC)

Three wetlands lie on the site. All three are category III wetlands. One has a habitat score of 6, requiring a buffer of 150 feet, and the other two have habitat scores of 5, requiring buffers of 80 feet. Tulalip Tribes will use mitigation measures to reduce the buffers from 150 to 110 feet and from 80 feet to 60 feet. Tulalip Tribes will also use buffer averaging allowed by SCC 30.62A.320(1)(g)(i) in the eastern portion of the buffers. The buffer will be reduced by 12,610 sq. ft. and replaced by the same amount between the on-site wetlands. The maintenance road, stormwater facilities, and septic drain field line will suffer temporary and permanent impacts, but will be mitigated at an enhanced ratio as provided in SCC 30.62A.320.

Douglas Creek is approximately 500 feet east of the northeastern corner of the site. An on-site swale converges with Douglas Creek approximately one-quarter mile south of the site, but the swale does not meet the definition of a regulated stream for at least 550 feet south of the site.

d. Drainage and Grading (Chapters 30.63A, 30.63B, and 30.63C SCC)

Full infiltration of stormwater is not feasible at the site because of relatively low permeability and the fine-grained nature of lodgement till at a shallow depth. Stormwater will therefore be collected and conveyed to a detention vault. Enhanced water quality treatment will be provided by a Department of Ecology approved filter plus a bioretention system. Stormwater will be discharged at a rate, volume, and duration mimicking predeveloped forested conditions to the existing discharge location to maintain the hydroperiod of the on-site wetlands.

Grading quantities are expected to be approximately 8,500 cubic yards of cut and 10,000 cubic yards of fill.

	Description	How Fulfilled?
1	Stormwater Site Plan	The targeted drainage report and preliminary civil drawings satisfy this requirement. ¹⁶
2	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)	Tulalip Tribes submitted a SWPPP that is adequate for preliminary approval.
3	Water pollution source control for new development or redevelopment	Tulalip Tribes must comply with source best management practices.
4	Preservation of natural drainage systems	Natural drainage systems will be preserved to the extent feasible. Stormwater will be discharged at the natural location with an approved dispersion

¹⁶ Exhibits B.2 and C.2.

		device. No impact to downstream drainage is expected based upon analysis of downstream conditions.
5	On-site stormwater management	On-site stormwater management will be adequate as described in the stormwater site plan and drainage narrative.
6	Runoff treatment	Enhanced water quality treatment will be provided by two modular wetland systems for parking, the drive aisle, and fire turnaround. A bioretention cell will provide treatment for roadway runoff from 300 th St. NW.
7	Flow control requirements for new development or redevelopment	Flow control will be provided by a detention vault.
8	Detention or treatment in wetlands or wetland buffers	Stormwater discharge will meet wetland hydroperiod protection criteria.
9	Inspection, operation, and maintenance requirements	Tulalip Tribes provided sufficient operation and maintenance information for preliminary approval.

e. Impact Mitigation Fees (Chaps. 30.66A, 30.66B, and 30.66C SCC)

The project is not defined as development under SCC 30.91D.200 (2005) and is therefore not subject to parks and recreation impact mitigation fees otherwise required by chapter 30.66A SCC. School impact mitigation fees will not be assessed because the project is not a development as defined by SCC 30.91D.220 (2005).

f. Transportation (Title 13 SCC, EDDS §3-02, and SCC 30.66B.420)

i. Area Transportation

a. Concurrency Determination (SCC 30.66B.120)

County ordinances prescribe the measures and tests with which a development must comply. This project meets those measures and tests. The project must be approved if it does not affect a county arterial unit in arrears or cause a county arterial to go into arrears, i.e., fall below the minimum level of service established by ordinance.¹⁷ Transportation Service Area (TSA) A had no

¹⁷ SCC 30.66B.120(1) (2003). Public Works deemed the proposed development concurrent as of August 8, 2022.

arterial units in arrears or at ultimate capacity as of the date of submittal. The development will not likely generate more than 50 peak-hour trips.¹⁸

b. Inadequate Road Conditions (IRC) (SCC30.66B.210)

Irrespective of the existing level of service, a development which adds at least three evening peak hour trips to a place in the road system that has an Inadequate Road Condition (IRC) must eliminate the IRC to be approved. The development will not affect any IRCs in TSA A with three or more evening peak hour trips, nor will it create an IRC. Therefore, it is expected that mitigation will not be required with respect to IRC and no restrictions to issuance of building permits, certificates of occupancy, or final inspection will be imposed under SCC 30.66B.210.

c. Impact Fees

i. County

The proposed development must mitigate its impact upon the future capacity of the county's road system by paying a road system impact fee.¹⁹ The road system impact fee will be the product of the average daily trips (ADT)²⁰ created by the development multiplied by the amount per trip for TSA D identified in SCC 30.66B.330. Based on the average daily trips projected for the facility, Tulalip Tribes must pay \$49,104.32 for impacts to the county road system.

1	Number of Beds	32
2	ADT per Bed	8.87
3	New ADT (line 1 x line 2)	283.84
4	ADT Credit for Existing Trips	-0-
5	Net New ADT (line 3 – line 4)	283.84
6	TSA A mitigation fee per ADT	\$173.00
7	Total Road System Impact Fee (line 5 x line 6)	\$49,104.32
8	Number of new square feet to be constructed	31,000
9	Impact Fee per square foot (line 7 ÷ line 8)	\$1.58

¹⁸ 32 beds x 0.91 AM peak-hour trips/beds = 29.12 net new morning peak-hour trips. 32 beds x 0.67 PM peak-hour trips/bed = 21.44 net new evening peak-hour trips.

¹⁹ SCC 30.66B.310 (2003).

²⁰ Public Works accepted the ADT calculation using sample data from five similar sites.

1 *ii. Other Jurisdictions*

2 *a. State Highway Impacts (SCC 30.66B.710)*

3 When a development's road system includes a state highway, mitigation requirements will be
4 established using the county's SEPA authority consistent with the terms of the interlocal agreement
5 between the county and the WSDOT. This is consistent with the county's SEPA policy²¹ through
6 which the county designates and adopts by reference the formally designated SEPA policies of
7 other affected agencies for the exercise of the county's SEPA authority.

8 No state highway mitigation payment will be required because no projects on Exhibit C of the
9 interlocal agreement between WSDOT and the county will be affected by three or more directional
10 trips from the development.

11 *b. Cities (SCC 30.66B.710)*

12 The county has reciprocal traffic mitigation interlocal agreements with the cities of Arlington and
13 Stanwood. The proposed project will not sufficiently affect the road network of the city of Stanwood
14 as defined by the interlocal agreement to require a mitigation payment to the city.

15 With respect to Arlington, Tulalip Tribes contends that project will not trigger any mitigation fees
16 under the interlocal agreement. Arlington disagreed and requested mitigation based upon the use
17 of mitigation measure two's mitigation zone map. However, an applicant can choose between
18 mitigation measure one or mitigation measure two. Measure one requires a mitigation impact
19 payment if one percent or more the development's evening peak-hour trips affect any
20 improvements identified in the comprehensive plan. Tulalip Tribes chose mitigation measure one
21 and no planned Arlington improvements will be affected by one percent or more of the
22 development's peak-hour trips. Therefore, Arlington's requested mitigation based on measure two
23 is not reasonably related to the impacts of the development as defined by the interlocal agreement
24 and will not be imposed.

25 ii. Project Site

26 a. Access

27 The development site will access the public road network on 300th St. NW. Sight distance at the
28 access point to the west is adequate, but sight distance to the east is not.²² Tulalip Tribes applied
29 for a deviation from the Engineering Design and Development Standards (EDDS) §3-08.²³ Tulalip

²¹ SCC 30.61.230(9) (2012).

²² Ex. C.7, p.5.

²³ PDS file no. 22-102225 WMD.

1 Tribes proposed restricting the access to right-in only from eastbound 300th St. NW and right-out
2 only from the development on to 300th St. NW. The County Traffic Engineer approved the
3 deviation, conditioned on installation of a median island to restrict turning movements.²⁴

4 b. Right of Way

5 The site fronts on 300th St. NW, a minor arterial usually requiring 40 feet of right of way on each
6 side of the center line. Only 35 feet exists on the development's side of the center line. An
7 additional five feet of right of way will be required. The additional right of way will not be credited
8 against the road mitigation payment because 300th St. NW is not in the impact fee's cost basis.

9 c. Internal Road System

10 No new public roads will be created within the development. A private commercial access and fire
11 lane will provide internal vehicular circulation.

12 d. Frontage Improvements (SCC 30.66B.410)

13 Full urban frontage improvements are usually required where the project abuts a public road.²⁵
14 Approval will be conditioned installation of asphalt concrete pavement 12 feet wide from the center
15 line with an eight-foot-wide paved shoulder. This work will not be credited against the county's road
16 impact mitigation fee because 300th St. NW is not in the impact fee's cost basis.

17 ADA ramps at the intersections of all the roads of the development must comply with minimum
18 ADA standard requirements for grades and landings as detailed in the current EDDS §4-05 D and
19 WSDOT Standard Plans F-40 series. A detail of each ADA ramp will be required in the
20 construction plans.

21 A horizontal clear/control zone is required along the parcel's frontage.²⁶ Existing or proposed fixed
22 object obstructions must be removed or relocated from this buffer for motorist safety, including
23 utility poles. The clear zone must be established as part of the frontage improvements which must
24 be implemented before the earlier of (a) approval of the final plat or (b) issuance of any occupancy
25 certificate. The clear zone will be addressed during construction plan review.

26 e. Bicycle

27 The site borders a bicycle route shown on the county-wide bicycle facility system map. The
28 frontage improvements will provide the needed bicycle path.

²⁴ Ex. G.1.

²⁵ Snohomish County Department of Public Works Rule 4222.020(1).

²⁶ EDDS §§4-15, 8-03; WSDOT Utility Manual.

1 f. Signing and Striping

2 Approval will be conditioned on payment by Tulalip Tribes to the county for signing and striping
3 installed or applied by county forces.

4 **3. Not Materially Detrimental to Nearby Uses or Property**

5 The facility is not physically detrimental to uses or property in the immediate facility, nor is the
6 proposed use materially detrimental. The facility will be set back from the property lines and
7 visually screened by landscaping buffers. The architectural elements of the proposed facility are
8 consistent with the area.²⁷ The buildings are a single story with sloped roofs and residential style
9 window design and spacing. The buildings are therefore architecturally consistent with area
10 development and not detrimental to nearby uses or property. External speakers or public address
11 systems will not be allowed, nor will exterior light fixtures without full cut-off features that prevent
12 glare and light pollution. Parking will be behind the buildings; it will not look a strip mall was
13 transplanted from the suburbs to a rural area. Water will be provided by the city of Stanwood and
14 the facility will not impair any neighboring wells or the aquifer. Too, the on-site sewer system will be
15 designed and installed consistent with health department requirements that will protect wellheads
16 of other property in the area.

17 **4. Compatibility with Site and Surrounding Property**

18 As found above, the proposed facility is visually compatible with the site and surrounding property.
19 The buildings are consistent with the scale of barns, landscaping will screen them visually, and
20 parking will be hidden from view. The wetlands will be protected by a recorded critical area site
21 plan and buffers. Stormwater will be collected, detained, treated, and discharged at its historic
22 location at a rate and volume to maintain the hydroperiod of the wetlands.

²⁷ Ex. B.4.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. The Hearing Examiner has authority to approve conditional use permits. SCC 30.42C.020 (2003); SCC 30.42C.100 (2012); SCC 30.70.025 (2021); SCC 30.72.025 (2012).

2. The proposal is consistent with the county's comprehensive plan, complies or can comply with the applicable requirements of title 30 SCC, will not be materially detrimental to the uses or property in the immediate vicinity, and is compatible with, and incorporates specific features, conditions, or revisions that ensures it responds to, the existing or intended character, appearance, quality of development, and physical characteristics of the site and surrounding property.²⁸

2. The Hearing Examiner concludes that Tulalip Tribes met its burden of showing the criteria established by county code have been met. The proposal is consistent with the comprehensive plan, county codes, the type and character of land use permitted on the project site, and applicable design and development standards, subject to the conditions described below.

3. The Hearing Examiner concludes that adequate public services exist to serve the proposed project.

4. The proposed project will make adequate provisions for public health, safety, and general welfare with conditions as described below.

5. Any finding of fact in this decision which should be deemed a conclusion of law is hereby adopted as a conclusion of law.

6. Any conclusion of law in this decision which should be deemed a finding of fact is hereby adopted as a finding of fact.

VI. DECISION

Based on the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Hearing Examiner hereby approves the conditional use permit, subject to the following conditions:

VII. CONDITIONS

A. Operating Conditions

1. The facility and its operation shall comply with all applicable federal and state laws and regulations, including those of the Washington State departments of Social and Health Services and Health. If applicable state or federal standards and regulations change, the facility and its

²⁸ SCC 30.42C.100(1) (2012).

operation shall comply with the changed regulation within the timelines required by the revised regulation.

2. The use of external speakers or an external public address system is prohibited.
3. Patients shall not be discharged as pedestrians at the facility's location. Discharge plans shall include transportation from the facility to the patient's next residence. For example, a patient should not be allowed to walk out the facility's doors on discharge except to a waiting vehicle that will transport them to their next residence, such as a friend, family, or caregiver's vehicle, medical transport vehicle, taxi, or shared ride service vehicle.
4. Tulalip Tribes will develop written procedures for notification of the public in case of elopement. The procedures will be developed in consultation with law enforcement and with due regard for privacy and safety of the patient and community. The procedures may provide for different notification procedures and recipients for different situations. The procedures will be available to the public upon request and a copy provided to PDS. The procedures shall be finalized prior to occupancy and shall be updated no less often than every three years.
5. The facility will be staffed at a ratio of at least one clinical staff per four patients, unless subsequent standards or best practices identify a higher ratio of staff to patients.
6. All approved landscaping shall be maintained after installation. Dead or significantly damaged plants and other landscaping material shall be replaced within three months of the death or damage. PDS may authorize delay in replacement up to 180-days when plant death or damage occurs outside the normal planting season.
7. Buildings shall be equipped with NFPA 13 automatic sprinkler systems and NFPA 72 fire alarm systems, which shall be maintained in good working order.
8. All exterior lighting installed initially or in the future shall prevent glare and light pollution on adjacent properties by being shielded, directed downward, and have full-cutoff features. All site area lighting shall be equipped with (a) motion sensors and (b) integral photocells for dusk to dawn operation. All building-mounted exterior lighting shall be controlled by dusk to dawn sensors.
9. Access from and to 300th St. NW shall be restricted to right-in/right-out only, as required by the EDDS deviation approved by the County Traffic Engineer.²⁹
10. Minor and major revisions to the administrative site plan shall be subject to SCC 30.70.210 or 30.70.220.

²⁹ PDS file no. 22-102225 WMD.

11. Nothing in this approval excuses Tulalip Tribes, an owner, lessee, agent, successor or assigns from compliance with any other federal, state, or local statutes, ordinances, or regulations applicable to this project.

B. Development Conditions

1. General

12. Exhibit B.1 received by PDS on August 22, 2022 shall be the official site plan. No changes to the scope or configuration are permitted without prior PDS approval. Any discrepancies between the approved site plan and title 30 SCC shall be resolved in favor of title 30 SCC.

13. Exhibit B.3 received by PDS on August 22, shall be the approved preliminary landscaping plan. Any discrepancies between the approved site plan and title 30 SCC shall be resolved in favor of title 30 SCC.

2. Prior to Commencement of Any Work

14. No on-site construction activity other than surveying and marking is authorized unless and until the required plan approvals have been obtained.

15. Boundary line adjustment 22-104576 BLA shall be recorded, and the recording number shall be provided to PDS.

16. Tulalip Tribes shall have installed advance warning signs that warn drivers of construction vehicles entering and exiting the site. The signs and locations shall be approved by the county. The signs shall remain in place until the access point is restricted to right-in and right-out only.

17. A landscape maintenance security may be required in accordance with SCC 30.84.150 if Tulalip Tribes requests a planting delay and PDS concurs with the suitability of the delay.

18. Tulalip Tribes must temporarily mark the boundary of all Critical Area Protection Areas (CAPAs) required by chapter 30.62A SCC and the limits of the proposed site disturbance outside of the CAPA, using methods and materials acceptable to the county.

19. A right-of-way use permit is required for work within the county road right-of-way.

20. Tulalip Tribes shall obtain the permits required for the facility, including a land disturbing activity permit required by chapters 30.63A and .63B SCC.

21. The application for a land disturbing activity permit shall include:

- a. A proposed final landscaping plan generally consistent with the approved preliminary landscaping plan. The final landscaping plan shall include specifications for design and locations for CAPA signs and split rail fencing.

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 18 of 27

- b. Revised civil and landscape plans that correctly identify the wetlands as wetlands A, B, and C and are consistent with the approved *Wetland Buffer Mitigation Plan* written by Widener and Associates and *Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment Report* written by Soundview Consultants, LLC dated January 26, 2022.
- c. A final mitigation plan based on the approved mitigation plan contained in the *Wetland Buffer and Mitigation Plan* written by Widener and Associates dated June 16, 2022, and revised August 19, 2022. The mitigation plan shall be included as a plan sheet(s) in the land disturbing activity plan set. Any temporary or permanent impacts resulting to Wetlands A and B from the proposed culvert replacement shall be accounted for in the final mitigation plan. Culvert designs and specifications shall be provided in the land disturbing activity construction plans.
- d. The landscape plan review fee. SCC 30.86.145(1).
- e. A full drainage plan pursuant to chapters 30.63A and 30.63B SCC.

22. The land disturbing activity permit shall include:

- a. Conditions that incorporate the inadvertent discovery protocols contained in the Cultural Resources Assessment for a Proposed 32-Bed Behavioral Health Center, prepared by Drayton Archaeology, dated January 5, 2022.

- b. The following text required by SCC 30.32B.210:³⁰

Your real property is on, adjacent to, or within 1,300 feet of designated farmland; therefore, you may be subject to inconveniences or discomforts arising from agricultural activities, including but not limited to, noise, odors, fumes, dust, smoke, the operation of machinery of any kind (including aircraft), the storage and disposal of manure, the application by spraying or otherwise of chemical or organic fertilizers, soil amendments, herbicides and pesticides, hours of operation, and other agricultural activities.

Snohomish County has adopted an Agricultural Lands Regulations (chapter 30.32B SCC) which may affect you and your land. You may obtain a copy of chapter 30.32B SCC from Snohomish County.

A provision of chapter 30.32B SCC provides that "agricultural activities conducted on designated farmland in compliance with acceptable agriculture

³⁰ SCC 30.32B.210(2) (2018) requires the disclosure in all development permits. Although "development permit" is undefined in county code, and "development" is defined in chap. 30.91D SCC in a way that does not include this work, the definition of "development activity" includes land disturbing activity. SCC 30.91D.240 (2003).

practices are presumed to be reasonable and shall not be found to constitute a nuisance unless the activities have a substantial adverse effect on the public health or safety."

This disclosure applies to the real property upon any development or building permit approval; or, in the case of real property transfers, the disclosure applies to the subject property as of the date of the transfer. This disclosure may not be applicable thereafter if areas designated as farmland are changed from the farmland designation.

Prior to issuance of the land disturbing activity permit:

23. Tulalip Tribes shall obtain approval of its on-site sewer system design from the Health Department and provide a copy of the design and approval to PDS.

24. Tulalip Tribes shall record the following with the County Auditor and provide PDS with a copy of the recorded document and Auditor's file number:

- a. Stormwater facility easement.
- b. Off-site septic easement.
- c. Declaration of covenant for maintenance of the pre-treatment system of the on-site sewer system.³¹
- d. A Critical Areas Site Plan (SCC 30.62.160) that designates critical areas and their buffers as Critical Area Protection Areas (CAPAs). A copy of the recorded plan and the Auditor's recording file shall be provided to PDS. The plan must identify areas which are currently being used for other purposes (e.g., mowed fields). The plan must contain the following restrictive language:

Except as provided herein All CRITICAL AREA PROTECTION AREAS shall be left permanently undisturbed in a substantially natural state. No clearing, grading, filling, building construction or placement, or road construction of any kind shall occur except: non-ground disturbing interior or exterior building improvements; routine landscape maintenance of established, ornamental landscaping; non-ground disturbing normal maintenance or repair; felling or topping of hazardous trees based on review by a qualified arborist; removal of noxious weeds conducted in accordance with chapter 16-750 WAC; maintenance or replacement that does not expand the affected area of septic tanks and

³¹ See testimony of Evan Haines.

1 drainfields, wells, or individual utility service connections; data collection by non-
2 mechanical means; and non-mechanical survey and monument placement.

3 e. An executed land use permit binder.

4 25. Tulalip Tribes shall have paid:

5 a. A landscape site inspection fee consistent with SCC 30.86.145(3).

6 b. The amount required by the county for installation of signs and striping. SCC 13.10.180.

7 **3. Prior to Combustible Construction**

8 26. Tulalip Tribes shall have provided PDS with a final certificate of water availability that verifies all
9 hydrants have been installed, are charged and operational, and the minimum required fire flow
10 can be met.

11 **4. Prior to Final Inspection of the Land Disturbing Activity Permit**

12 27. The high decorative screen fence detailed on sheet L-520 of the approved preliminary
13 landscape plan must be satisfactorily installed adjacent to the parking lot, as depicted on
14 sheets L-210, L-211, and L-212 of the preliminary landscape plan.

15 28. All CAPA boundaries shall have been permanently marked on the site prior to final inspection
16 by the county, with both CAPA signs and adjacent markers which can be magnetically located
17 (e.g., rebar, pipe, or 20 penny nails). Tulalip Tribes may use other permanent methods and
18 materials if they are approved by the county before installation. Where a CAPA boundary
19 crosses another boundary (e.g., lot, tract, plat, or road), a rebar marker with surveyors' cap and
20 license number must be placed at the line crossing.

21 29. CAPA signs shall have been placed no greater than 100 feet apart around the perimeter of the
22 CAPA. Minimum placement shall include one Type 1 sign per wetland, and at least one Type 1
23 sign shall be placed in any lot that borders the CAPA, unless otherwise approved by the county
24 biologist. The design and proposed locations for the CAPA signs shall be submitted to PDS for
25 review and approval prior to installation.

26 30. The final mitigation plan shall have been implemented to the satisfaction of the county.

27 31. Mitigation maintenance and warranty security shall have been provided in accordance with the
28 mitigation and warranty security requirements of chapter 30.84 SCC to ensure that the
29 mitigation meets the performance requirement targets contained in the approved mitigation
30 plan.

31 32. Split-rail fencing shall be satisfactorily installed around the boundary of CAPA.

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 21 of 27

5. Building Permits

33. The architectural plans submitted for building permit review shall comply with all applicable building and fire code requirements and with conditions 7 (automatic fire sprinklers and alarms) and 8 (exterior lighting).

34. Prior to building permit issuance:

- a. Tulalip Tribes shall provide PDS with a copy of the Snohomish County Department of Health's approval of the on-site sewer system installation.
- b. Tulalip Tribes shall pay an impact fee to Snohomish County for traffic impacts on the county's road system in the amount of \$49,104.32. The impact fee shall be distributed to each Transportation Service Area in accordance with SCC 30.66B.340, as indicated in the allocation table below. This payment may be made proportionately with each building permit.

Road System Impact Fee Allocation Table	
To TSA	Total Amount
TSA A	\$16,312.46
TSA B	\$4,556.88
TSA C	\$373.19
TSA D	\$21,055.93
TSA E	\$2,293.17
TSA F	\$4,512.69
Total Owed: \$49,104.32	

- c. Tulalip Tribes shall have deeded five feet as right of way along the property frontage on 300th Street NW for a total of 40 feet from the center line of the right of way, or as determined by the Department of Public Works.

35. As required by SCC 30.32B.210, the following disclosure language of SCC 30.32B.220 shall be included on the commercial building permit:

Your real property is on, adjacent to, or within 1,300 feet of designated farmland; therefore, you may be subject to inconveniences or discomforts arising from agricultural activities, including but not limited to, noise, odors, fumes, dust, smoke, the operation of machinery of any kind (including aircraft), the storage and disposal of manure, the application by spraying or otherwise of chemical or organic fertilizers, soil amendments, herbicides and pesticides, hours of operation, and other agricultural activities.

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 22 of 27

Snohomish County has adopted an Agricultural Lands Regulations (chapter 30.32B SCC) which may affect you and your land. You may obtain a copy of chapter 30.32B SCC from Snohomish County.

A provision of chapter 30.32B SCC provides that "agricultural activities conducted on designated farmland in compliance with acceptable agriculture practices are presumed to be reasonable and shall not be found to constitute a nuisance unless the activities have a substantial adverse effect on the public health or safety."

This disclosure applies to the real property upon any development or building permit approval; or, in the case of real property transfers, the disclosure applies to the subject property as of the date of the transfer. This disclosure may not be applicable thereafter if areas designated as farmland are changed from the farmland designation.

6. Prior to Occupancy

36. The elopement notification procedures required by condition 4 shall be finalized and a copy provided to PDS.

37. Prior to installation of the proposed monument sign, Tulalip Tribes shall obtain a sign permit. The proposed monument sign shall substantially match the proposed monument sign on the conditional use application signage plan and be located as shown on the approved site plan.

38. All required landscaping, including perimeter, parking, and site, shall be installed, and a qualified landscape designer shall certify to PDS that the installation complies with county code and the approved plans.

39. All fire hydrants shall have been equipped with the following:

- a. A 4-inch Storz steamer port.
- b. The top of the hydrant shall be painted pursuant to the level of service provided. The tops of the hydrants shall be painted blue because the level of service provided is greater than 1,500 gpm.

40. Tulalip Tribes shall have installed blue street reflectors hydrant side of the center line to assist approaching emergency vehicles apparatus to locate the hydrant.

41. Tulalip Tribes shall have installed all fire lane pavement striping per the approved site plan. The fire lane shall be labeled "No Parking Fire Lane" every 50 feet.

42. Tulalip Tribes shall have constructed rural frontage improvements along the parcel's frontage on 300th Street NW to the satisfaction of the county.

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 23 of 27

43. The access point shall be restricted to right-in/right-out only and the construction of this access restriction will be to the satisfaction of the county

C. Termination and Expiration

44. This conditional use permit shall expire:

- a. Five years from the date of this approval if the proposed use has not commenced (SCC 30.70.140); or
- b. One year after the site ceases to be used as a secure inpatient behavioral health facility.

45. This conditional use permit shall terminate if:

- a. Conditions of this permit are violated and not promptly corrected;
- b. Conditions of this permit are repeatedly violated, even if promptly corrected;
- c. Any license or permit required by state or other law or regulation for operation of the facility expires or is terminated; or
- d. Applicable federal, state, or local laws or regulations are violated and not promptly corrected.

Decision issued this 7th day of March, 2023.

Peter B. Camp

Peter B. Camp
Hearing Examiner

VIII. EXPLANATION OF RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL PROCEDURES

The decision of the Hearing Examiner is final. Any party of record petition the Hearing Examiner to reconsider the decision and any party of record may appeal the decision to the County Council. However, reconsideration by the Hearing Examiner may also be sought by a party of record. The following paragraphs summarize the reconsideration and appeal processes. For more information about reconsideration and appeal procedures, please see chapter 30.72 SCC and the respective Hearing Examiner and Council Rules of Procedure.

Reconsideration

Any party of record may request reconsideration by the Hearing Examiner from the date of this decision. A petition for reconsideration must be filed in writing with the Office of Hearings Administration, 2nd Floor, Robert J. Drewel Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington, (Mailing Address: M/S No. 405, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett WA 98201) by hand delivery, US mail, or email³² **on or before March 17, 2023**. There is no fee for filing a petition for reconsideration. The petitioner for reconsideration shall mail or otherwise provide a copy of the petition for reconsideration to all parties of record on the date of filing. SCC 30.72.065.

A petition for reconsideration does not have to be in a special form but must contain the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of the petitioner, the signature of the petitioner or of the petitioner's attorney, if any; identify the specific findings, conclusions, actions and/or conditions for which reconsideration is requested; state the relief requested; and, where applicable, identify the specific nature of any newly discovered evidence and/or changes proposed by the applicant.

The grounds for seeking reconsideration are limited to the following:

- (a) The Hearing Examiner exceeded his jurisdiction;
- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law;
- (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by the record;
- (e) New evidence is discovered which could not reasonably have been produced at the hearing and which is material to the decision; or

³² Hearing.Examiner@snoco.org.

(f) The applicant proposed changes to the application in response to deficiencies identified in the decision.

Petitions for reconsideration will be processed and considered by the Hearing Examiner pursuant to the provisions of SCC 30.72.065. Please include the county file number in any correspondence regarding this case.

Appeal

An appeal to the County Council may be filed by any aggrieved party of record **on or before March 21, 2023**. Where the reconsideration process of SCC 30.72.065 has been invoked, no appeal may be filed until the reconsideration petition has been decided by the hearing examiner. An aggrieved party need not file a petition for reconsideration but may file an appeal directly to the County Council. If a petition for reconsideration is filed, issues subsequently raised by that party on appeal to the County Council shall be limited to those issues raised in the petition for reconsideration.

Appeals shall be addressed to the Snohomish County Council but shall be filed in writing with the Department of Planning and Development Services, 2nd Floor, County Administration-East Building, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Washington (Mailing address: M/S No. 604, 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, WA 98201), and shall be accompanied by a filing fee in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500.00) for each appeal filed; PROVIDED, that the fee shall not be charged to a department of the County. The filing fee shall be refunded in any case where an appeal is summarily dismissed in whole without hearing under SCC 30.72.075.

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

An appeal must contain the following items in order to be complete: a detailed statement of the grounds for appeal; a detailed statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based, including citations to specific Hearing Examiner findings, conclusions, exhibits or oral testimony; written arguments in support of the appeal; the name, mailing address and daytime telephone number of each appellant, together with the signature of at least one of the appellants or of the attorney for the appellant(s), if any; the name, mailing address, daytime telephone number and signature of the appellant's agent or representative, if any; and the required filing fee.

The grounds for filing an appeal shall be limited to the following:

- (a) The decision exceeded the Hearing Examiner's jurisdiction;
- (b) The Hearing Examiner failed to follow the applicable procedure in reaching his decision;
- (c) The Hearing Examiner committed an error of law; or

Residential Treatment Facility North

22-102230 CUP

Decision Approving Conditional Use Permit with Conditions

Page 26 of 27

1 (d) The Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and/or conditions are not supported by
2 substantial evidence in the record. SCC 30.72.080

3 Appeals will be processed and considered by the County Council pursuant to the provisions of
4 chapter 30.72 SCC. Please include the county file number in any correspondence regarding the
5 case.

6 Staff Distribution:

7 Department of Planning and Development Services: Rebecca Samy

8 The following statement is provided pursuant to RCW 36.70B.130: "Affected property owners may
9 request a change in valuation for property tax purposes notwithstanding any program of
10 revaluation." A copy of this Decision is being provided to the Snohomish County Assessor as
11 required by RCW 36.70B.130.

POR & Agency List	Name	Address	City	State	Zip	E-Mail	Concerns
	22-102230-CUP	Residential Treatment Facility North	Hearing: Jan 24, 25 & 26 2023, 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Jan 26, 2023				
PUBLIC COMMENTS	Allen Saunders					allen.saunders@comcast.net	Comments/Opposition
	Allie Perry					sheparda@hotmail.com	Comments/ Opposition
	Allison Warner	316 Dove Drive	Camano Isla	WA	98282	allisivy@gmail.com	Comments/Support
	Amy Bergemeier					abergemeier@yahoo.com	Comments/ Opposition
	Anna Nepomuceno	1107 NE 45th St, Suite 330	Seattle	wa	98105	anepomuceno@namiwa.org	Comments/Support
	Anne Jones	7607 Stauffer Rd	Stanwood	WA	98292	anniewaynorth@yahoo.com /ajones@sno-i	Comments/ Opposition
	Brent Koos					brentkoos@gmail.com	POR/Comments
	Bruce Collins					bruceposu@frontier.com	Comment/Opposition
	Bruce & Peggy Kitting	7229 286th Pl NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	peggypooh321@yahoo.com	POR/Opposition
	Candace Trautrman	1025 Aqua Vista Lane	Camano Isla	WA	98282	philandcandy@wavecable.com	Comments/Support
	Carol Dvorak Volkman					caroldvorak@outlook.com	Comments/support
	Carol Korpi					korpcj1@gmail.com	Comments/Support
	Catherine Carpenter	5128 Happy Hollow Road	Stanwood	WA	98292	uryurhere@earthlink.net	Comments/Opposition
	Chris Davis					cdavisbusiness@yahoo.com	POR/Comments
	Chris Larson					captlarski1@gmail.com	POR/Opposition
	Christi Bell					christimbell@yahoo.com	Comments/Opposition
	Christina Gravin					cgarvin86@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Christina Robertson					moosetales@aol.com	Comments/Opposition
	Claudia Davidson					claudia@mainstreetyarn.com	Comments/Support
	CM Nate Nehring					nate.nehring@co.snohomish.wa.us	Comments
	Darren and Alyona Franz					izbushka.llc@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	David Fugate	Mount Baker Meadows				mountbakermeadows@gmail.com	POR/Comments
	Dean Van Vleet					dean.namiskagit@gmail.com	POR
	Deana Ottum					kezo@comcast.net	POR/Comments/Support
	Deb Hubenthal					deborahhubenthal@gmail.com	POR
	Debbie Jadwin					djadwin53@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Dee Shishido	31707 West Lake Ketchum Road	Stanwood	WA	98292	tangles39@hotmail.com	POR/Opposition
	Delbert Fox	7229 300th St. NW	Stanwood	WA	98292		Comments/Support US Mail
	Diana Perry					diventuresinc@aol.com	Comments/Opposition
	Dinah Aldrich					dinahaldrich@gmail.com	Comments/Support
	Donna Knight					errymor@gmail.com	Comments
	Donna Olson	Board Chair for Take the Next Step				donnaolson@gmail.com	Comments/Support
	Elizabeth Reed	31522 West Lake Ketchum Road	Stanwood	WA	98292	elizabeth@interfacetechnw.com	Comments
	Frederic Berg	8202 317th Pl NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	fredericpberg@msn.com	POR Request/General Opposition
	Garry Olson	273rd Street NW	Stanwood	WA		stanwoodstumpy@hotmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Gay-Lynn Beighton					gay-lynnb@namisnohomishcounty.org	POR Request/Comments
	Ganelle Swindler	4621 191st Pl NE	Arlington	WA	98223	swindler_gan@LIVE.COM	Comments/opposition
	G.L. DeBortole	30432 80th Ave NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	Geno6860@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Gregg Small					gregg.small@wsu.edu	Comments/opposition
	Gretchen Saari					gsaari@msn.com	Comments/support
	Gwen Phillips					mcinlineq@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Hank Tingler	7420 300th St NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	brownshooo@earthlink.net	POR Request
	Harvey Stackhouse					hstackhouse1948@gmail.com	Comments, safety, response times. Etc.
	James Hamilton	9718 271ST ST NW	Stanwood	WA	98292		Comments/opposition US Mail

Jan Iverson					janiverson4950@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Janet Graafstra					graafstrajan@gmail.com	Comment/Opposition
Jayson Russell					jaysonrussell@outlook.com	Comment/Opposition
Jeremiah Bauman					jeremiah.r.bauman@gmail.com	Comment/Support
Jessica Gilman					jessicamarie0125@aol.com	Comment/Opposition
Jim Bloss					jbloss132@gmail.com	POR request
Jim Dolan	10027 269th Place NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	jbdolan@jbdolan.com	comment/support
Joan Andrews	28130 Lund Hill Rd	Stanwood	WA	98292	andfre65@yahoo.com	POR/General Opposition
Joan Rave					fedheads@hotmail.com	Comment/Support
Joseph Chartier					jac98270@comcast.net	Comments/Support
Joseph Wilson					joeyw206@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Julia Katzenmaier					j_katzenmaier@icloud.com	Comments/Road Improvements
Julie Melville					julielmelville@gmail.com	POR Request/Comments Support
Kaitlinn Donham					kkaters20@aol.com	Comments/ Opposition
Kandyce Hansen	30627 87th AVE NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	kandycehansen1@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Kara Dineen	202 South Sams Street	Monroe	WA	98272	kara@ttns.org	Comments/Support
Karen Dickson					kranmom@hotmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Karen Schilde	5012 West View Drive	Everett	WA	98203	schildek@comcast.net	Comments/Support
Kathleen Chiles	21423 55th Ave SE	Woodinville	WA	98072	k.chiles22@live.com	Comments/Support
Kathleen McKee	PO Box 121	Stanwood	WA	98292	mckee.kdm@gmail.com	POR request
Kathy Richarson					kathymrichardson@yahoo.com	POR/Questions
Katie & Ed Farrey	27313 Pioneer Hwy	Stanwood	WA	98292	kffarrey@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Katie Mahoney					katie.a.mahoney@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Katie Weeks	32030 76th Ave NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	klweeks@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Kelsey Edwardsen					kelseyedwardsen@gmail.com	POR request
Kelsi Opland					KelsiOpland@hotmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Kevin & Jenell Jones					jordannursery@yahoo.com	Comments
Kiley Casey					caseykiley@me.com	Comments/Opposition
Kimberly Acuff					kimberly.acuff@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Kip Litehiser & Margo Townsend					litetown@frontier.com	Comments/Opposition
Konni Kasemeier					katokon@aol.com	Comment/Opposition
Kris Cimino					kriscimino@comcast.net	Comments/Opposition
Laura Oltman					horsenerd801@gmail.com	Comments/ Opposition
Lauren Simonds	1107 NE 45th St, Suite 330	Seattle	WA	98105	LSimonds@namiwa.org	POR/supportive
Leanna Partridge					leannapartridge@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Liliana Uribe					lilianadelourdes@yahoo.com	Support comment
Linda Godwin					lgodwin5601@gmail.com	Comments/support
Lynn White					ldaviswhite@yahoo.com	POR/Opposition
Lynne Donovan					lynne51donovan@yahoo.com	POR/Opposition
Marcy Imus					deterow@aol.com	Comments/ Opposition
Maria Arreola					Maria_arreola@nsbhaso.org	POR
Mark Schinman	8324 300th St NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	mark@schinman.com	Comments/Opposition
Marsha J. Hicks	6705 57th Steet NE	Marysville	WA	98270	marjon.hicks@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Mary Anne Osborn	PO Box 670	Edmonds	WA	98020	mawosborn@msn.com	Comments/Support
Mary Gage					meliz50@hotmail.com	Comments
MaryAnn Kridler	8120 300th Street NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	mi.cha.el9.mk@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Meagen Watne					meagen.watne@gmail.com	Comment

Meg McClure					megmcclure234@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Megan Tucker					malone812003@yahoo.com	Comments/Opposition
Melanie & Paul Sobotta					paulandmelanie@wavecable.com	Comments/Opposition
Melissa Walstad					braaten794@icloud.com	Comments
Michael Carmichael	28807 80th Av NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	stokewood33@yahoo.com	POR /Comments
Michael James					mfj62@yahoo.com	POR
Michele Meaker					michelem@namisnohomishcounty.org	Comments/Support
Mike Buckland					bucklandmike@hotmail.com	Comments/Support
Mike Hayslip					mikejenhayslip@hotmail.com	Comments/Support
Murphy Russell	7314 300th St NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	jnmr0617@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
Nora Davis					lowcforme@gmail.com	Comments/support
North Stanwood Concerned Citizens					northstanwoodconcernedcitizens@gmail.co	Comments/Support
Pam Reeves	29106 68th Ave Nw	Stanwood	WA	98292	preevesrq@gmail.com	Comments
Pamela Thompson	29330 46th Drive NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	dogday@myfrontiermail.com	Comments/Opposition
Pat Wilder	8305 311th St NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	fanta002@aol.com	POR Request/Comments
Patrick & Heidi Wade					pjwade_454@yahoo.com	Comments
Patty Tingle					animalfancy@gmail.com	Comments
Paul & Candice Amrine	31009 76th Ave. NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	candipaul@aol.com	Comments/Opposition
Paul Miller	30733 76th Ave NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	millerpaulcutler@gmail.com	POR request
Paula Segale					PaulaSegale@msn.com	POR/Opposition
Peggy Kitting	7229 286th PI NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	peggypooh321@yahoo.com>	Comments/Opposition
Peggy Miller	30733 76th Ave NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	pfmiller.49@gmail.com	POR Request/Comments/Opposition
Rachelle Cummings					rachellecummings92@gmail.com	POR/Opposition
Ralph & Amy Esary	4626 Village Road	Stanwood	WA	98292	esary5@frontier.com	Comments/Opposition
Ramona Snowden					ramona.thepest@frontier.com	Comments/Opposition
Richard Moparman					richardmoparman@aol.com	Comments/Opposition
Richard Vaughan					windenrayn@yahoo.com	POR
Rick Flores					rick.d.flores@gmail.com	POR/Questions
Rob Gilden					robgilden@yahoo.com	Comment/Opposition
Robert and Gloria Drury					drurylane1@yahoo.com	Comment
Robert James					lovelychevytruck@gmail.com	Comment/Opposition
Robin Carmichael					robinwood333@yahoo.com	Comments/Opposition
Robyn Gibson	8217 313th PI NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	gibsonrobyn9@gmail.com	POR/Comments
Ron Howell					rhowell@wavecable.com	Comment/Opposition
Rose Dennis					roseden21@hotmail.com	Comment/Support
Roy Everett					royamy@wavecable.com	POR/Comments
Sam Keller					sam_c_Keller@hotmail.com	POR request
Sandra E. Sanford					sandysanford@comcast.net	Comments/Support
Sarah Gibson					s.j.gibs1@gmail.com	Comments/ Opposition
Saranne Moreshchi					saranne.moreschi@gmail.com	Comments/Support
Sean Gillespie					omalley1537@yahoo.com	Comments/ Opposition
Sharon Swift					sharonbuddy@wavecable.com	Comments/support
Sheila Harrington	3520 214th St SW	Brier	WA	98036	sheharr@aol.com	Comment/Support
Shirley O					zocs@comcast.net	Comment/Support
Sid Roberts	10220 270th St NW	Stanwood	WA	98292	sid.roberts@stanwoodwa.org	Comments
Skyler Malan					Skyler.Malan@snoco.org	Comments/support
Sonya Johnson					sjohnson409@gmail.com	Comments/Support

	Stacy Moore				stacyamoore@ymail.com	comments/support
	Stan Burwell	8627 Myrtle Road	Stanwood	WA	98292 stanburwell78@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Stephen Hendrickson	29206 64th Ave NW	Stanwood	WA	98292 steve@hendricksonhomestead.com	POR
	Steve Snowden				steve.snowden@frontier.com	Comments/Opposition
	Stuart Heady	851 Westview Court	Stanwood	WA	98282 stuart.HEADY@gmail.com	POR/Supportive Comments
	Sue Keller	PO Box 601	Stanwood	WA	98292 sjkeller61@gmail.com	POR request
	Susann E Hendrickson				suehenhome@gmail.com	Comments/Opposition
	Teresa Buckland				bucklandmike@hotmail.com	Comments/Support
	Tim Schmitt	26910 92nd Ave NW, Suite C5, Box 115	Stanwood	WA	98292 lethalwit@hotmail.com	POR request/questions
	Tina Sharp				myemail2tina@yahoo.com	Comments/Opposition
	Toni Reading				toni.reading@gmail.com	Comments/POR support
	Tracy Sellers				tracy271wa@yahoo.com	POR request/questions
	Trisha Pearce	PO Box 121	Stanwood	WA	98292 tpearcern@yahoo.com	Comments
	Tyler Shellenberg				tyler.shellenberg@outlook.com	Comments/support
	Vicki Russell	PO Box 626	Stanwood	WA	98292 vmrranch@msn.com	POR/Opposition
	Vivian Henderson				vmail@cedarcomm.com	Comment/Support
AGENCIES/TRIBAL	Amy Rusko	Ci of Arlington			arusko@arlingtonwa.gov	
	Mary Wicklund for Mark Flury	PUD - electrial			MLWicklund@SNOPUD.com	
	Roland Storme	WSDOT			stormer@wsdot.wa.gov	
	Tansy Schroeder	Ci of Stanwood			Tansy.Schroeder@ci.stanwood.wa.us	
	Kevin Hushagen	Ci of Stanwood Public Works			kevin.hushagen@ci.stanwood.wa.us	
	Antonia Weiss	Health Department			antonia.weiss@snoco.org	
	Lucas Larson	Health Department			lucas.larson@snoco.org	
	Ian Huri	Sno Co Sheriffs Office			ian.huri@co.snohomish.wa.us	
	Scott Robertson	Sno Co Sheriffs Office			Scott.Robertson@co.snohomish.wa.us	
	Steve Goforth	North County EMS			sgoforth@northcountyfireems.com	
	Rebecca Samy	Sno Co Pland & Dev Svcs			rebecca.samy@snoco.org	
	Doug McCormick	Sno Co DPW			Doug.McCormick@so.snohomish.wa.us	
	Shelley Klasse	Stanwood -Camano School District			rklasse@stanwood.wednet.edu	
	Ann C. House	Staff Attorney for Snoqualmie Tribe			ann.harrie@snoqualmietribe.us	wetland information request
	Gene Enick	Tulalip Tribe Cultural Division			genick@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov	Requesting Cultural Assessment
	Todd Gray	Tulalip Tribe Environmental Division			toddgray@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov	Comments/Wetlands
	Kelsey Payne	Snoqualmie Tribe/Water Quality Manager			kelsey.payne@snoqualmietribe.us	wetland information request
	Richard Young	Tulalip Tribes Cultural Division			ryoung@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov	
MEDIA	Hannah Furfaro	Seattle Times			hfurfaro@seattletimes.com	POR Request
	Izzie Lund	Stanwood Camano News			ilund@scnews.com	POR Request
	Jacqueline Allision	Everett Herald			jacqueline.allison@soundpublishing.com	Inquiry for Hearing Date
APPLICANT/OWNER CONTACT PERSON	Kelsey Edwardson	Tulalip Tribes			kelseye@wenahagroup.com	
	Christine Phillips	BCRA			cphillips@bcradesign.com	
	Evan Haines	Korsmo			ehaines@korsmo.com	
	Keith Banes	Wenaha Group representing Tulalip Tribes			KeithB@wenahagroup.com	
	Zachary Crum	BCRA			zcrum@bcradesign.com	
	Dr. Charissa Fotinos	HCA			charissa.fotinos@hca.wa.gov	
	Dr. Keri Waterland	HCA			keri.waterland@hca.wa.gov	

	Jim Wolch	BCRA	jwolch@bcradesign.com
	Aaron Van Aken	Heath and Associates	avanaken@heathtraffic.com
	SEPA APPEAL (Dismissed 12/21/22)		
APPEAL	Applicant		
	Christine Phillips, BCRA (Applicant) BCRA		cphillips@bcradesign.com
	Evan Haines, Korsmo (Applicant) Korsmo		ehaines@korsmo.com
	Keith Banes, Wenaha Group (Applic Wenaha Group representing Tulalip Tribes		KeithB@wenahagroup.com
	Jim Wolch, BCRA (Applicant) BCRA		jwolch@bcradesign.com
	Rhylee Marchand, Tulalip Tribes (Att Counsel for Tulalip Tribes		rmarchand@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov
	Lisa Koop, Tulalip Tribes (Applicant) Counsel for Tulalip Tribes		lkoop@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov
	Tyler Eastman, Tulalip Tribes (Applic Counsel for Tulalip Tribes		teastman@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov
	PDS		
	Rebecca Samy, PDS		rebecca.samy@snoco.org
	Laura Kisielius, PDS		Laura.Kisielius@co.snohomish.wa.us
	David Irwin, PDS		David.Irwin@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Erin Harker, PDS		Erin.Harker@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Kenneth Crossman, PDS		Ken.Crossman@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Caleb Duhnke, PDS		Caleb.Duhnke@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Seth Henderson, PDS		Seth.Henderson@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Tom Barnett, PDS		Tom.Barnett@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Michael Dobesh, PDS		Michael.Dobesh@snoco.org
	Mohammad Uddin, PDS		Mohammad.Uddin@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Douglas McCormick, PDS		DMcCormick@co.snohomish.wa.us
	Health Dist		
	Antonia Weiss, SnoHD		antonia.weiss@snoco.org
	Lucas Larson, SnoHD		lucas.larson@snoco.org
	Appellant		
	Kathy Richardson, Appellant		kathymrichardson@yahoo.com