CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL
Chair Tuttle
Vice Chair Bull
Commissioner Fisher
Commissioner Jensen
Commissioner Rousey
Commissioner Silva
Commissioner Stanger

COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Members of the audience may comment on any city matter that is not listed on the agenda. Comments by individuals are limited to five (5) minutes. The Commission usually does not respond to matters brought up during audience participation and may; if appropriate, address the matter at a subsequent meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
October 28, 2019
Documents:

Minutes - PC10282019.pdf

PUBLIC HEARING
NONE

OLD BUSINESS
Documents:


NEW BUSINESS
NONE

DISCUSSION BY COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

ADJOURNMENT

THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY ADD AND/OR TAKE ACTION ON OTHER ITEMS NOT
LISTED ON THIS AGENDA
Accommodations for people with disabilities will be provided upon request.
Please contact City Hall at 360-794-7400 and allow one-week advanced notice.
The regular meeting of the Monroe Planning Commission was held on Monday, October 28, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers at 806 West Main Street, Monroe, WA 98272.

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Tuttle called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL
Planning Commission Secretary Leigh Anne Barr called the roll.

Commissioners Present: Chair Tuttle, Vice-Chair Bull, Commissioner Rousey, Commissioner Jensen and Commissioner Stanger. Commissioner Fisher was present via conference call.

Commissioners Excused: Commissioner Silva

Staff Present: Community Development Director Ben Swanson, Senior Planner Shana Restall and Secretary Leigh Anne Barr

Chair Tuttle announced that there is a need for Commissioner Fisher to attend the October 28, 2019, Planning Commission meeting via teleconference. Chair Tuttle asked if there were any objections. No objections were noted so the request was considered approved.

COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS
NONE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Commissioner Rousey made a motion to accept the minutes of September 23, 2019 as written. Motion seconded by Commissioner Bull. Motion carried 6/0.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Tuttle opened the public hearing.

Principal Planner Shana Restall introduced the 2018-2019 Comprehensive Plan Docket and noted that the City has two Comprehensive Plan dockets running concurrently, the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. After the Planning Commission closes the public hearing for the 2018-2019 Comprehensive Plan docket, the amendments will go to City Council with the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

The first two amendments are standard amendments that the City brings forward every two years for the school impact fees for the Monroe and Snohomish School Districts. The third proposal is the land use designation amendment for the Memorial Field site from its current designation of institutional to multifamily and a concurrent rezone to change the zoning district from institutional to multifamily R25. When the original public hearing was scheduled and noticed, the City received quite a few public comments so a historic inventory of the site was requested from the applicant and the public hearing was postponed. Principal Planner Restall
reminded Commissioners that this proposal is for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and not a specific project.

Commissioner Jensen inquired about the noticing of the public hearing and asked for clarification about what recommendations the Planning Commission can make. Principal Planner Restall pointed out the five choices listed on the Findings of Fact.

Commissioner Stanger made a motion to open the public testimony portion of the public hearing. Motion seconded by Commissioner Rousey. Motion carried 6/0.

Public Testimony

Paula Townsell
Brent Planning Consultants
PO Box 1585 Mukilteo, WA 98275

Ms. Townsell thanked staff for their work on the packet materials. Ms. Townsell emphasized that this is a Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal and any possible development on the site will follow its own process in the future.

Darcy Cheeseman
Monroe School Board Member
16911 267th Dr SE Monroe, WA 98272

Ms. Cheeseman thanked staff for their work on the project also and gave a brief history of the project including the School District’s analysis of the property as an asset.

Commissioner Jensen asked Ms. Cheeseman if the District had considered a replacement of the district office in this location. Ms. Cheeseman explained that the construction of a new building would require a large capital investment that the District does not have.

John Mannix
Monroe School District, Assistant Superintendent for Operations
200 E Fremont St Monroe, WA 98272

Mr. Mannix explained that the School District has looked at several different options for a new district office. The most cost effective option is to locate an existing structure where a tenant improvement could fit the needs of a new district office.

Robert Meyer
513 W Columbia St Monroe, WA 98272

Mr. Meyer expressed his concerns about traffic and the potential demand on public services.

Principal Planner Restall reminded Commissioners and the public that the language of the proposal does not address a project specific proposal. Community Development Director Ben Swanson noted that with a proposed change in zoning the City requests information on a worst case scenario. Director Swanson went on to explain the process of a project specific action and how the checks and balances of the process will work.
Diana Meyer  
513 W Columbia St Monroe, WA 98272  

Ms. Meyer expressed her concerns about the additional capacity on the City’s sewer system and the feel of the neighborhood with the addition of three story buildings.

Will Schlegel  
PO Box 1742 Woodinville, WA 98072  

Mr. Schlegel expressed his concerns about the project and his interest in having the rezone voted on by the public.

Paula Townsell explained the docketing process as a planning tool. Ms. Townsell noted that public outreach was a large part of the project and project specific questions cannot be answered at this time because a specific project has not been proposed.

Commissioner Stanger clarified that the school district specifically is asking for the Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone and they are not requesting single family housing. Ms. Townsell explained that the School District must comply with the highest and best use of the site, which after a study was conducted, was determined to be multifamily residential.

John Mannix explained that the School District stopped maintaining the fields about 15-18 months ago and since that time the gates have been locked. Any activities taking place on the fields have not been approved through the district office for the risk assessment team.

Darcy Cheeseman noted that the team sports activities have been moved to the all-weather fields at Park Place Middle School since the fields have been completed.

Robert Meyer believes the baseball fields are still being used and asked for clarification on “highest and best use”. Chair Tuttle responded.

Diana Meyer expressed her concerns about traffic. Chair Tuttle clarified that there currently is not a specific project proposal.

Will Schlegel suggested the site be used for additional school bus parking and questioned the public noticing for the SEPA application.

Karen Haines  
PO Box 783 Monroe, WA 98272  

Ms. Haines believes the fields have been recently used and maintained. Ms. Haines would be in favor of the district office moving to the site.

Principal Planner Restall reminded Commissioners and the public that when a project is applied for on the site, a project specific SEPA process including public noticing will take place again. Commissioner Jensen inquired about eminent domain, Sky Valley Education’s plans for the field and traffic reports. Director Swanson responded.
Chair Tuttle asked for clarification on traffic reports, impacts to sewer and traffic, surrounding zoning, historical preservation and consistency with the goals and intent of the comprehensive plan. Director Swanson and Principal Planner Restall responded to Chair Tuttle.

Commissioner Stanger made a motion to close the public testimony portion of the public hearing. Motion seconded by Commissioner Bull. Motion carried 6/0.

Discussion by Planning Commissioners

The Planning Commissioners discussed the proposal with specific attention given to parks and the need for multifamily housing in the City.

Chair Tuttle read the criteria aloud for proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments that were included in the Staff Analysis in attachment 1 of the agenda packet. The Commissioners then further discussed any concern they had regarding specific criteria.

Commissioner Rousey made a motion to continue the public hearing. Motion seconded by Commissioner Stanger. Motion carried 6/0.

Chair Tuttle took a recess from 8:50 to 8:55pm for staff to work through timing of the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Bull moved to extend the meeting past 9pm. Motion seconded by Commissioner Stanger. Motion carried 6/0.

After discussion between Commissioners and staff, the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting on November 11 will remain as scheduled, despite it falling on Veterans Day to allow the comprehensive plan docket to be forwarded and heard by City Council before the end of the 2019 year.

Commissioner Rousey made a motion to continue the public hearing to the Planning Commission meeting of November 11th, 2019. Motion seconded by Commissioner Jensen. Motion carried 6/0.

OLD BUSINESS
NONE

NEW BUSINESS
NONE

DISCUSSION BY COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

Director Swanson noted that staff is working to finish many projects before the end of the calendar year.

Commissioner Stanger attended a Parks Board Meeting and reported on topics discussed.
Commissioner Jensen inquired about the old Albertson’s location. Director Swanson informed the commissioners that there is nothing new to report.

Commissioner Rousey attended an Economic Development Advisory Board meeting. The City is currently interviewing firms for a City wide wayfinding project.

Chair Tuttle noted that there are three new businesses going in Downtown.

ADJOURNMENT
Commissioner Jensen made a motion to adjourn at 9:12 p.m. Motion seconded by Commissioner Rousey. Motion carried 6/0.

______________________________  ______________________________
Bridgette Tuttle                Leigh Anne Barr
Chair                           Planning Commission Secretary
MONROE PLANNING COMMISSION


DATE: 11/11/2019
DEPARTMENT: Community Development
CONTACT: Shana Restall
PRESENTER: Shana Restall
ITEM: Public Hearing # 1

2. CPA2018-A – SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance
3. CPA2018-B – SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance
4. CPA2018-01 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application
5. CPA2018-01 – Site Vicinity Map
6. CPA2018-01 – Conceptual Site Plan
7. CPA2018-01 – Appendix I: Project Narrative
8. CPA2018-01 – Appendix II: Criteria Reponses
9. CPA2018-01 – Appendix III: SEPA Environmental Checklist
10. CPA2018-01 – Appendix IV: Plat Certificate
11. CPA2018-01 – Appendix A: Legal Description
13. CPA2018-01 – Traffic Study
14. CPA2018-01 – SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance
15. CPA2018-01 – Marshall Field and Memorial Stadium Historic Information
16. CPA2018-01 – Written Comments Received from the Public
   a. Email from Jim McDaniel (11/28/2018)
   b. Email from Randall Trivett (11/28/2018)
   c. Email from Anita Maceda (11/29/2018)
   d. Email from Ashley Floyd (7/16/2019)
   e. Email from Randall Trivett (7/16/2019)
   f. Email from Amy Martin (7/17/2019)
   g. Letter from Drew James, Commander of VFW Post 7511 (8/11/2019)
   h. Email from David Irwin (9/4/2019)
17. Planning Commission Draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

REQUESTED ACTION
Conduct a public hearing to evaluate and take public testimony on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment docket, and subsequently forward a recommendation regarding the docket to the City Council.

MOTIONS
A. Move that the Planning Commission ADOPT these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, AUTHORIZE the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council APPROVE the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket; OR
B. Move that the Planning Commission ADOPT these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, AUTHORIZE the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council APPROVE the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket, to be modified as follows: [list modifications]; OR
C. Move that the Planning Commission ADOPT these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, AUTHORIZE the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council APPROVE proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] and DENY proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket; OR

D. Move that the Planning Commission ADOPT these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, AUTHORIZE the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council DENY the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket; OR

E. Move to CONTINUE the public hearing to [future date] to continue review of the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS
Pursuant Chapter 22.74 MMC, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, the City accepts proposals for Comprehensive Plan amendments from interested parties on an annual basis. Upon receipt of applications, the City Council holds a public hearing to select those proposals to be placed on the docket for further consideration during the annual amendment cycle. After the docket is set, staff reviews the proposed amendments and provides an analysis of the amendments to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and subsequently forwards a recommendation to the City Council, which makes the final determination on the docket of proposed amendments. All Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals are required to be considered concurrently so that their cumulative impacts can be determined.

DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND
The 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket contains are two (2) City-initiated applications and one (1) citizen-initiated application for the Planning Commission to review. These applications include the following proposals for amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan:

1. CPA2018-A – City-initiated amendment to adopt the 2018 – 2023 Monroe School District CFP
2. CPA2018-B – City-initiated request to adopt the 2018 – 2023 Snohomish School District CFP
3. CPA2018-01 – Site-specific, citizen-initiated request to change the land use designation established by the Comprehensive Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and to concurrently rezone property owned by the Monroe School District. The current land use map and zoning designations of the proposal site, known as Memorial Stadium and Marshall Field (identified by Snohomish County Assessor’s tax parcel numbers 27060100205100, 27060100100400, and 27060100404500), are Institutional. The School District is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to modify the site’s Future Land Use Map designation from Institutional to Multifamily. Associated with the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, the applicant is also requesting a concurrent rezone of the subject property from Institutional (IN) to Multifamily Residential (R25).

On October 28, 2019, the Planning Commission held a public hearing to review and take testimony on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket. The Commission voted to continue the public hearing to November 11, 2019 to allow for additional deliberation. The Planning Commission’s recommendation on the proposed docket will be forwarded to the City Council.

FISCAL IMPACT
N/A

TIME CONSTRAINTS
## ATTACHMENT 1

### STAFF ANALYSIS OF APPROVAL CRITERIA

#### Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket

### A. GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number(s):</th>
<th>CPA2018-A, CPA2018-B, and CPA2018-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Summary:</strong></td>
<td>In accordance with Chapter 22.74 MMC, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, the City accepts amendment proposals annually from interested parties. Upon receipt of applications, the City Council holds a public hearing to select those proposed amendments to be placed on a docket for further consideration. The docketed Comprehensive Plan amendment applications are evaluated by the Planning Commission, which forwards to the City Council a recommendation regarding their approval. On the docket for the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle, there are two City-initiated applications and one citizen-initiated application for the Planning Commission to review. These applications include the following proposals for amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan: CPA2018-A and CPA2018-B – Two (2) City-initiated requests to adopt the Monroe School District and Snohomish School District Six-Year Capital Facilities Plans CPA2018-01 – A site-specific, citizen-initiated request to change the land use designation established by the Comprehensive Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and to concurrently rezone property owned by the Monroe School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location(s):</strong></td>
<td>CPA2018-A and CPA2018-B – These proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan are non-project actions that are not site-specific. The amendments do not apply to a specific property or properties, but rather to the entire area within the limits of the City of Monroe. CPA2018-01 – The Memorial Stadium and Marshall Field site, identified by Snohomish County Assessor’s tax parcel numbers 27060100205100, 27060100100400, and 27060100404500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Hearing Date:</strong></td>
<td>Monday, October 28, 2019 at 7:00 PM Monroe City Hall Council Chambers 806 West Main Street Monroe, WA 98272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Contact:</strong></td>
<td>Shana Restall, Principal Planner City of Monroe 806 West Main Street Monroe, WA 98272 (360) 863-4608 <a href="mailto:srestall@monroewa.gov">srestall@monroewa.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. BACKGROUND

The Annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process provides an opportunity for interested parties, including members of the public, to propose revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, and to monitor and evaluate the progress of the implementation strategies and policies incorporated therein. Submitted amendment proposals may:

- Propose new sections, elements, appendices, goals, and/or policies of the plan
- Amend existing sections, elements, appendices, goals, and/or policies of the plan
- Be site-specific
- Correct errors
- Edit language
- Adopt other documents by reference
- Change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM)

The City accepts annual Comprehensive Plan amendment applications continuously. However, amendments proposed by the public after the last working day in July will not be considered until the following amendment cycle. With the exception of a few specific situations, Comprehensive Plan amendments shall be considered by the City no more than once a year. Additionally, all Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals are required to be considered concurrently so that their cumulative impacts can be determined.

C. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

1. Overview

Chapter 22.74 MMC, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, delineates the procedure for reviewing annual Comprehensive Plan amendment applications. All proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments must be consistent with the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan, all other City Codes and applicable regulations, and the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) in RCW 36.70A. Plan amendments are considered concurrently on an annual basis so that the cumulative effects of all proposed amendments can be analyzed for consistency and the overall effect on the remainder of the Plan. The annual Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle is subject to the requirements for public participation, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.140. The review process shall proceed as described below.

2. Amendment Review Procedures

a. Phase I - Selection of Amendments to be Considered
   i. Applications Forwarded by Staff: City of Monroe staff submits to the City Council all proposed amendments received prior to the last working day in July, along with an analysis of the proposed amendment in relation to the selection criteria and the application checklist.
   ii. Public Hearing for Docket Selection: The City Council holds a public hearing to select those proposed amendments that should be considered for further review.
   iii. Modifications: The City Council may modify a proposed amendment during the selection process.
   iv. Schedule for Review: When selecting the proposed amendments to be considered, the City Council will adopt a schedule for completion of the review and amendment adoption process.

b. Phase II - Review and Action for Selected Amendments
   i. Staff Review: For each amendment selected by Council for the amendment cycle, staff will prepare a written analysis.
   ii. Environmental Review: Review under SEPA shall be conducted and a threshold determination issued.
iii. **Planning Commission Review:** The Planning Commission shall conduct one or more public hearings to solicit comments; develop language for definitions, policies, and goals; and provide recommendations for proposed amendments.

iv. **Criteria for Recommendation of Approval:** The Planning Commission shall use the following criteria in considering whether or not to recommend approval, or approval with modification, of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments:

a) Each amendment:
   1) Shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way;
   2) Shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan, as amended by the proposals;
   3) Shall be in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws; and
   4) Must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

b) In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:
   1) The proposed amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole, or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances;
   2) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts;
   3) Is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations;
   4) Is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable; and
   5) Is consistent with other plan elements as amended by the proposals.

c) Any compelling reasons relied upon to justify adopting an amendment without meeting the above criteria must be specified in the ordinance adopting the amendment. When an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan also requires a subsequent rezone or amendment to the development regulations both may be considered concurrently.

v. **Concurrent Land Use Applications:** When an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan also requires a subsequent rezone or amendment to the development regulations both may be considered concurrently.

vi. **Council Public Hearing and Notice:** The City Council will review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and may hold a public hearing for the purpose of receiving public comment regarding the merits of proposed amendment(s).

vii. **Council Action:** Upon receipt of a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall adopt, adopt as modified, deny, or remand the application(s) to the Planning Commission for further consideration.

viii. **Map Revisions:** If the City Council approves a change to the Comprehensive Plan that changes the land use designation of parcels within the Urban Growth Area, the City Council shall adopt an ordinance that amends the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and authorizes the Mayor to sign the revised map.

ix. **Revocation:** The Comprehensive Plan amendment may be reversed by the City Council outside of the regular amendment period, upon finding of any of the following:

   a) The approval was obtained by fraud or other intentional or misleading representation;
b) The amendment is being implemented contrary to the intended purpose of the amendment or other provisions of the comprehensive plan and City ordinances; or

c) The amendment is being implemented in a manner that is detrimental to the public health or safety.

x. Transmittal to State – Proposed Amendments: City staff shall transmit a copy of each proposed amendment of the Plan to the State of Washington Department of Commerce at least sixty (60) days prior to the expected date of final Council action on proposed amendments.

xi. Transmittal to State – Adopted Amendments: Staff will transmit a copy of all adopted amendments to the Department of Commerce within ten (10) days after the adoption by the Council.

c. Appeals

Per MMC Table 22.84.060(B)(2): Decision-Making and Appeal Authorities, the Council’s decision is the City’s final action on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. The decision may be appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board.

D. REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

The 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan docket includes two City-initiated and one citizen-initiated proposals. The Planning Commission will evaluate the proposed 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket during a public hearing scheduled for October 28, 2019. Subsequent to the public hearing, the Planning Commission will forward to the City Council a recommendation concerning whether or not the docketed amendments should be approved. Upon receipt of the recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall adopt, adopt as modified, or deny the proposed amendments. Council also has the option of remanding the application(s) back to the Planning Commission for additional review.

The following applications to amend the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan will be considered by the Planning Commission at the October 28, 2019 public hearing:

- **Application CPA2018-A**

- **Application CPA2018-B**

- **Application CPA2018-01**
  Amendment to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan and concurrent rezone to allow other land use options on property owned by the Monroe School District.

MMC 22.74.040(D), Criteria for Recommendation of Approval, provides the following criteria for review of a docketed Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal. When deciding whether or not to recommend approval of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Planning Commission shall review the applications for consistency with the following criteria:

1. **Each amendment:**
   a. Shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.
   b. Shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.
   c. Shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws; and
   d. Must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.
2. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:
   a. Addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.
   b. Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.
   c. Is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.
   d. Is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable; and
   e. Is consistent with other plan elements as amended by the proposals.

Provided below is a description and analysis of each proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment application on the 2018 – 2019 docket. The analysis is for consistency with the criteria set forth in MMC 22.74.040(D), Criteria for Recommendation of Approval.

1. **CPA2018–A**: City-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Adopt the Monroe School District’s Capital Facilities Plan
   a. Description: The application proposes an amendment to the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan to adopt the 2018 – 2023 Monroe School District Capital Facilities Plan. As the Monroe School District adopts a Capital Facilities Plan biennially, the City must revise its Comprehensive Plan every two years to adopt the School District's Capital Facilities Plan by reference. These are essentially comprehensive plan "housekeeping" amendments required of the City.
   
   b. **Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D):** For an analysis, please see section 2.b. below.

2. **CPA2018–B**: City-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Adopt the Snohomish School District's Capital Facilities Plan
   a. Description: The application proposes an amendment to the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan to adopt the 2018 – 2023 Snohomish School District Capital Facilities Plan. As the Snohomish School District adopts a Capital Facilities Plan biennially, the City must revise its Comprehensive Plan every two years to adopt the School District's Capital Facilities Plan by reference. These are essentially comprehensive plan "housekeeping" amendments required of the City.
   
   b. **Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D):** The applications described above (CPA2018–A and CPA 2018–B) are for the same comprehensive plan amendment from two separate agencies. Therefore, the following analysis is applicable to both proposals.

   i. Each amendment shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.
      
      **Staff Analysis:** The proposed amendments adopt the School Districts’ Capital Facilities Plans by reference and updates the City’s fee schedule to reflect the amendments. The amendments have neither a direct relation to nor an impact public health, safety, and/or welfare.
   
   ii. Each amendment shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.
      
      **Staff Analysis:** The Capital Facilities Element of the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan incorporates both the Monroe and Snohomish School Districts’ CFPs by reference.
The Vision and Policy Framework in Chapter 2 of the Plan contains specific goal and policy statements including:

a) **P.106**: Require development proponents to mitigate service and utility impacts, ensuring that proportional costs are borne by new development rather than present residents and ratepayers, and that level of service standards are not degraded.

b) **P.107**: Develop and adopt new, or refine existing GMA compliant impact fees as part of financing public facilities, balancing between impact fees and other sources of public funds.

The proposal is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.

iii. Each amendment shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

**Staff Analysis:** Of the fourteen Planning Goals in RCW 36.70A.020, the proposals address the following:

- Urban Growth
- Reduce Sprawl
- Economic Development
- Citizen Participation and Coordination
- Public Facilities and Services

The proposals facilitate the collection of the School Districts’ current impact fees, as authorized by RCW 82.02.050(5)(a):

> Impact fees may be collected and spent only for the public facilities defined in RCW 82.02.090 which are addressed by a capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive land use plan adopted pursuant to the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070 or the provisions for comprehensive plan adoption contained in Chapter 36.70, 35.63, or 35A.63 RCW...

Pursuant to RCW 82.02.050(5)(a), the City of Monroe adopted Ordinance 1205, which established the authority to collect school impact fees and created a school mitigation program under GMA. Provisions for impact fees must be in the Comprehensive Plan’s Capital Facilities Element to allow for their collection. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments would permit this to occur. The proposed amendments are in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

iv. Each amendment must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

**Staff Analysis:** All proposed amendments on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle docket have been noticed and reviewed concurrently. All of the proposed amendments have been weighed in light of their potential cumulative effects.

v. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:

a) Each amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

**Staff Analysis:** The proposed amendments would allow for the collection of the current impact fee amount, which is presently inconsistent with the City’s adopted fee amount.

b) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.
Staff Analysis: Regarding file no. CPA2018-A, the Monroe School District conducted a review of the proposal under SEPA and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on June 26, 2018. The Snohomish School District conducted a review of file no. CPA2018-B under SEPA and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on June 27, 2018. The proposed amendments meet the requirements of MMC Chapter 20.04 MMC, RCW43.21C, and Chapter 197-11 WAC.

c) Each amendment is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

Staff Analysis: These proposals are consistent with growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan. Every net new residential unit incurs impact fees. The Comprehensive Plan assumes a future residential capacity at build-out. The School Districts use the calculated capacity to approximate future revenue from impact fees. The proposal would not change the growth projections.

d) Each amendment is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.

Staff Analysis: The proposed amendments are not site-specific. This does not apply.

e) Each amendment is consistent with other plan elements, as amended by the proposals.

Staff Analysis: The proposed amendments will not amend other Comprehensive Plan elements. Furthermore, the proposed amendments will bring the Plan into compliance with both the Monroe and Snohomish School Districts’ Capital Facilities Plans.

3. CPA2018-01: Citizen-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the Monroe School District for an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Concurrent Rezone (File No. RZ2018-01)

a. Description: The Monroe School District is proposing an amendment to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the designation of the site known as Marshall Field and Memorial Stadium (Snohomish County tax parcel numbers 27060100100400, 27060100205100, and 27060100404500) from an “Institution” designation to a “Multifamily” designation. Concurrent with the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, the applicant submitted a rezone request to change the site’s zoning from “Institutional (IN)” to “Multifamily Residential (R25).”

Project Site Land Use and Zoning Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan FLUM Designation(s)</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
<td>Existing Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Institutional Multifamily Institutional (IN) Multifamily Residential (R25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Marshall Field / Memorial Stadium)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject site is approximately 12.41 acres in area, is situated in the vicinity of N. Kelsey Street and West Columbia Street, and is currently accessed from West Columbia Street. The subject properties are largely surrounded by single-family residential uses with St. Mary of the Valley church to the west and Sky Valley Educational Center to the east. The site is largely vacant and was formerly used as a sports fields for the Monroe School District. However, according to the District, the site is no longer used for formal education programs, and does not lend itself to future school facilities. The District does not use the site for school athletic programs of other school program uses.
b. **Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D):**

i. Each amendment shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.

   **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

   The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

   Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

   **Staff Analysis:** If the proposed amendment and concurrent rezone are approved by the City, multifamily residential development is anticipated on the subject site. The construction of high-density, multifamily dwelling units on a site that is presently underutilized will increase transportation demands. Although traffic volumes would increase, the traffic analysis submitted to the City by the applicant maintains that roads would still operate at an acceptable level of service. The subject site is fully served with utilities, and any anticipated increase in demand is likely to fall within the capacity range for the City’s sanitary sewer, water, and stormwater systems. Nevertheless, the potential increase in population density within the area of the proposal may generate a greater need for public safety services, which are not likely to be increased or expanded prior to development of the site.

ii. Each amendment shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.

   **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

   The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

   Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

   **Staff Analysis:** The proposed amendment has the possibility of providing up to 288-296 multifamily dwelling units to the City. Where the residential housing stock is 75-percent single family, the proposal is consistent with Goal 5 of the comprehensive plan by providing for a wide range of housing types for all Monroe residents.

iii. Each amendment shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

   **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light
of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Staff Analysis: RCW 36.70A.020, Planning Goals, establishes objectives under the Growth Management Act to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations. The Monroe School District proposal identified by file no. CPA2018-01 potentially advances the following GMA objectives:

- RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 1: Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
- RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 2: Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
- RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 4: Housing. Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

iv. Each amendment must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

Applicant Response: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Staff Analysis: All proposed amendments on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle docket have been noticed and reviewed concurrently. All of the proposed amendments have been weighed in light of their potential cumulative effects.

v. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:

a) Each amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

Applicant Response: The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.
The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments. The Subject Site is in an area of high-density multifamily development.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment addresses the needs and changing circumstances of the City as a whole because the Monroe School District is a public service provider. The District is the provider of public school education service within the City and has determined this Docket Request is necessary. The District routinely evaluates their facilities and properties for long-term viability and to evaluate necessity. The Subject Site is no longer serving the program needs of students in the District. It was therefore decided to pursue a plan for the future use of the site for a non-school use.

Staff Analysis: As discussed above, 75-percent of the residential housing stock in the City is single family. New multifamily residential development is essential to establishing diversity in housing types, which would make Monroe more accessible to a wider segment of the population. The School District’s proposal has the potential to mitigate these concerns.

b) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

Applicant Response: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is a non-project action. The Monroe School District prepared a SEPA Environmental Checklist, which discusses the anticipated potential environmental impacts. Project-level environmental impacts would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Staff Analysis: As each proposed amendment on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of the other amendments being considered, the City conducted a review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to identify potential environmental impacts in the aggregate. However, as discussed above, SEPA review on CPA2018-A and 2018-B was conducted by their respective applicants, the Monroe School District and the Snohomish School District, acting as lead agencies. Consequently, this comprehensive plan amendment proposal from the Monroe School District for a concurrent FLUM amendment and rezone, identified by file no. CPA2018-01, was the only docket proposal identified on the Determination of Nonsignificance, issued July 3, 2019. The deadline for both submitting public comments and appealing the DNS was July 17, 2019. As stated in the applicant’s response above, any potential project-related environmental impacts will be addressed at the time of permit review. During the SEPA DNS concurrent comment and appeal period, no appeals were received. However, written comments were received from the following parties:

- Ashley Floyd (email received 7/16/2019)
- Randall Trivett (email received 7/16/2019)
- Amy Martin (email received 7/17/2019)

c) Each amendment is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

Applicant Response: The proposed Docket Request would be consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations. Granting the appropriate non-
school designation (multifamily) adds buildable land for high-density residential infill in the City, which is consistent with the Housing, Land Use Assumptions, which rely on land use strategies to accommodate the City’s housing unit needs through 2035. Some objectives include:

- Encouraging infill opportunities within existing City limits
- Encouraging the provision of diverse housing types in all areas of Monroe
- Encouraging housing growth near existing services, including park facilities

The request is necessitated because of changing circumstances as the sport fields are no longer useful or viable for the Monroe School District. In order to consider a future surplus of the properties, the Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning for the Subject Site need to be for non-school use. That action would provide increased residential (multifamily) infill land within the City, thereby meeting the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Staff Analysis: The comprehensive plan amendment application and associated rezone propose to change the future land use designation and zoning of the subject properties to accommodate multifamily residential development. At present, the site is zoned Institutional, which generally does not allow for residential development.

To ensure consistency with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designations that were adopted as part of the City’s state-mandated periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan in 2015, the zoning of many properties within the City, including the subject site, changed when the Unified Development Regulations (UDR) went into effect on May 1, 2019. Prior to the 2015 update, the property had been designated by the FLUM as Public Facilities School (PFS), and was compatibly zoned Public Open Space (PS). However, the FLUM changed substantially during the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update. The future land use of the subject properties was designated as Institutional. When the UDR was adopted, an Institutional zone was created. Consequently, upon adoption of the UDR, all properties designated as Institutional by the 2015 FLUM were zoned Institutional for consistency with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan assumes a future residential capacity at build-out. Residential capacity calculations for the 2012 buildable lands analysis were predicated on the zoning in place at the time. As detailed above, the subject property was zoned Public Open Space (PS) at the time of the buildable lands inventory. Therefore, the properties were not included in the evaluation of the City’s residential capacity to accommodate growth. Any residential development in an area that did not previously permit such residential land uses will presumably result in an increase in population capacity.

Approving the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will add buildable land for high-density residential infill in the City, as consistent with the Housing and Land Use Elements. The City has capacity to accommodate a greater population than is established by its growth targets. This is generally a nonissue for larger cities that have sufficient resources to take on additional growth. Nevertheless, it can prove problematic for cities like Monroe that are unable to offer similar benefits, such as greater connectivity to high-capacity transit. The Puget Sound Regional Council’s draft Vision 2050 plan concentrates most projected growth along major transportation routes such as Interstate 5. It is likely that small cities, such as Monroe, will not be expected to take on the same amount as population growth.
Under these circumstances, the allocated growth targets for Monroe are to be considered more of a ceiling than a floor.

d) Each amendment is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed Docket Request is to provide future consistency with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods. The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments.

The sports fields no longer serve the programing needs of school students in the Monroe School District. Preliminary evaluation shows adequate levels of service for area utilities, and public facilities and services to serve the Subject Site with development similar to the surrounding area (multifamily). Approval of the Docket Request would provide future flexibility to the District, a public service provider, and follows the timing and regulations of the City planning processes.

**Staff Analysis:** The proposal put forth by the Monroe School District is to amend the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to change the land use designation of the subject site from an “Institution” designation to a “Multifamily” designation. Concurrent with the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, the applicant submitted a rezone request to change the site’s zoning from “Institutional (IN)” to “Multifamily Residential (R25).” Information regarding adjoining land uses and zoning districts is provided in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use(s)</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan FLUM Designation(s)</th>
<th>Zoning District(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Multifamily residences</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential (R25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>N. Kelsey St. right-of-way</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sky Valley Education Center (across N. Kelsey St.)</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential (R25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
<td>High Density Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>Institutional (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Columbia St. right-of-way</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential (R25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential – 15 Units per Acre (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>St. Mary of the Valley Church</td>
<td>High Density Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>Institutional (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-family residences</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential – 15 Units per Acre (R15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the table above, the proposed comprehensive plan amendment appears to be compatible with neighboring land uses.

e) Each amendment is consistent with other plan elements, as amended by the proposals.

**Applicant Response:** The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

The proposed Docket Request is consistent with the overall intent of the Comprehensive Plan as demonstrated within the application packet (including
E. **PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

Following review of the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket for consistency with the specified review criteria, the Planning Commission may elect to make one of the following possible motions:

1. **Motion # 1:** Move to direct staff to draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law recommending that the Monroe City Council APPROVE the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle docket.

2. **Motion # 2:** Move to direct staff to draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law recommending that the Monroe City Council APPROVE the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle docket, to be modified as follows: [list modifications]

3. **Motion # 3:** Move to direct staff to draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law recommending that the Monroe City Council APPROVE proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] and DENY proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle docket.

4. **Motion # 4:** Move to direct staff to draft Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law recommending that the Monroe City Council DENY the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle docket.

5. **Motion # 5:** Move to continue the public hearing to a future date to continue review of the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle docket.
DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Issued with a 14-day comment period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Monroe School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2018-2021 by the Monroe School District No. 103 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District; and

2. The proposed amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of Snohomish County and the City of Monroe to include the Monroe School District's 2018 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plans of those jurisdictions. The District will forward this request to the relevant jurisdictions for review and potential action.

Proponent: Monroe School District No. 103

Location of the Proposal:

The Monroe School District includes an area of approximately 85 square miles. The City of Monroe and parts of unincorporated Snohomish County fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Monroe School District No. 103

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

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted in writing by 4:30 p.m., July 16, 2018. The responsible official will reconsider the DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.
Responsible Official:  Dr. Fredrika Smith  
Superintendent  
Monroe School District No. 103  

Telephone:  (360) 804-2500  
Address:  Monroe School District  
200 E. Fremont  
Monroe, WA 98272  

You may provide comments regarding this determination in writing with receipt required by 4:30 p.m., July 16, 2018, to John Mannix, Assistant Superintendent for Operations, Monroe School District 200 E. Fremont, Monroe, WA 98272.

Date of Issue:  June 26, 2018  
Date Published:  June 27, 2018
DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Issued with a 14-day comment and appeal period

Description of Proposal:

This threshold determination analyzes the environmental impacts associated with the following actions, which are so closely related to each other that they are in effect a single course of action:

1. The adoption of the Snohomish School District's Capital Facilities Plan 2018-2023 by the Snohomish School District No. 201 for the purposes of planning for the facilities needs of the District; and

2. The proposed amendment of the Comprehensive Plans of Snohomish County and the cities of Monroe and Snohomish to include the Snohomish School District's 2018 Capital Facilities Plan as part of the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plans of those jurisdictions. The District will forward this request to the relevant jurisdictions for review and potential action.

Proponent: Snohomish School District No. 201

Location of the Proposal:

The Snohomish School District includes an area of approximately 165 square miles. Parts of unincorporated Snohomish County and parts of the cities of Monroe and Snohomish fall within the District's boundaries.

Lead Agency:

Snohomish School District No. 201

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

This Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issue. Comments must be submitted in writing by 4:30 p.m., July 11, 2018. The responsible official will reconsider the
DNS based on timely comments and may retain, modify, or, if significant adverse impacts are likely, withdraw the DNS. If the DNS is retained, it will be final after the expiration of the comment deadline.

Responsible Official:  Dr. Kent Kultgen
Superintendent
Snohomish School District No. 201

Telephone:  (360) 563-7300

Address: Snohomish School District
1601 Avenue D
Snohomish, WA 98290

You may provide comments and/or appeals regarding this determination in writing by 4:30 p.m., July 11, 2018 to Tom Laufmann, Executive Director, Business, Snohomish School District No. 201, 1601 Avenue D, Snohomish, WA 98290.

Date of Issue:  June 27, 2018
Date Published:  June 27, 2018
Citizen-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application and Requirements

**REQUIRED MATERIALS FOR A COMPLETE APPLICATION ARE:**

- ✓ 1 Original plus 4 copies of the completed application (Pages 1, 2, & 3)
- ✓ Appendices (See Page 4)
  - Appendix I – Describe proposal; one (1) original plus 4 copies.
  - Appendix II – Answer Parts A & B; one (1) original plus 4 copies.
  - Appendix III – Environmental (SEPA) checklist with supporting reports as required, one (1) original plus 4 copies, if applicable.
  - Appendix IV – Legal description/proof of ownership. Provide a current title report; one (1) copy dated within 30 days of application, if applicable.
- ✓ 1 copy of Vicinity and Site Plan Maps (*Only required for site specific proposals*)
- ✓ Fees – Refer to the latest fees resolution to determine cost of application.

**OFFICE USE ONLY**

| Planning Application Fee: | $1,650.00/275.00 |
| Fire Plan Check Fee:      | $0             |
| SEPA Fee:                 | $550.00        |

**TOTAL FEES:** $2,998.75

**Office Use Only**

| Application Number:     | #5132 (CPA2018-01) COMP. PLAN #5133 (RZ2018-01) REZONE |
| Complete Application Date: | 7/31/2018 |
| Received By:            | Kim Shaw |
| Zoning of Site:         | POS      |
| Zoning of Adjacent Property: | MR6000 (North) MR6000/UR6000 (South) |
| Comp Plan Designation:  | Institutional |
| Comp Plan Adjacent Property: | Multifamily (North) Multifamily/High Density SFR (South) |
| Institution:            | Multifamily |
| Zoning of Adjacent Property: | MR6000 (East) MR6000 (West) |
| Fee Paid (date/time):   | $2,998.75/2:30 |
| Fire Plan Check Fee:    | $0          |
| Mailing Fee:            | $150.00+$50.00 Signs |
| Technology Fee:         | $123.75     |

**TOTAL FEES:** $2,998.75
Citizen-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application

**Type of Application** *(Check all that apply.)*
- □ Change of goals, policies & implementation measures
- √ Change to future land use map
- □ Change of Urban Growth Boundary (in conjunction with request to Snohomish County).
- □ Change to an element of the Comprehensive Plan *(Transportation, Parks, Land Use, etc.)*
- □ Technical Corrections *(Terminology, References, etc.)*

**1. Application Information**

**A. Name of Applicant:** Brent Planning Solutions, LLC, Attn: Laura S. Brent, AICP

Signature: ____________________________
P.O. Box 1586
Home Address: ____________________________
Mukilteo, WA 98275
City and Zip Code: ____________________________
Email address: lbrent@brentplanningsolutions.com Phone: 425.971.6409
Mailing Address *(if different): ____________________________
City and Zip Code: ____________________________

**B. Name of Owner (if different):** John Mannix, Assistant Superintendent, Operations

Signature: ____________________________
Home Address, City and Zip Code: ____________________________________________
Email: manniixj@monroe.wednet.edu
200 E. Fremont Street, Monroe, WA 98272 Phone #: 360.804.2579
Mailing Address *(if different): ____________________________
City and Zip Code: ____________________________

**NOTE:** A PROPERTY OWNER is any person, corporation or financial institution that has ownership of all, a portion of, or percentage of, a property shown on the title certificate for said property. If additional property ownership is involved, attach additional names, addresses and signatures to this page.

Updated 2018 – Please verify accuracy of this information/form prior to submitting.
Citizen-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application

2. Location of Property (If applicable)
   A. Section 01           Township 27 N           Range 06 E

3. Legal Description(s) - Property Information (If applicable)
   A. Tax Account Number(s): 27060100100400, 27060100205100, and 27060100404500
   B. Size of entire site (acres/square feet): Three parcels totalling 12.41+/- acres
   C. Comprehensive Plan Designation: The site is designated as "Institutional"
   D. Current Use of Property: Informal Ballfield
   E. Describe physical characteristics:
      The site is known as Marshall Field & Memorial Stadium. A detailed project and site description are included with the full application submittal.
   
F. Sensitive Areas (wetlands, steep slopes, etc.):
   None. A detailed site description is included with the full application submittal.

Applications will be accepted Monday through Friday
8:00 am – 12:00 pm & 1:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Monroe School District
Comprehensive Plan Amendment / Rezone

Figure 1 – Vicinity Map
ATTACHMENT 6

- PROPOSED 60' RIGHT-OF-WAY
- RECREATION / OPEN SPACE

- PARKING COUNT 595
- UNIT COUNT 288 (6-3 STORY BUILDINGS)
APPENDIX I

Provide a type written description of the proposal including any relevant background material. The proposed amendment application shall consist of at least the following information, and consistent with the Citizen Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment Application and Submittal Checklist:

1. A description of the proposal, including any relevant background material;

1.a. If a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map is approved for consideration during the review cycle, staff may require additional information to be submitted including, but not limited to, an environmental review, traffic study, and utilities analysis.

Response: As provided for in Resolution No. 2012/020, the City of Monroe is now accepting “Citizen-Initiated” requests to amend the City of Monroe 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The amendments will be considered as part of the City’s 2018-2019 Plan amendment cycle. The Monroe School District #103 is submitting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Docket Request) and concurrent rezone during this amendment cycle. The Docket Request is a non-project action proposal for the City of Monroe (City) to amend the Comprehensive Plan with a change to the Future Land Use Map and a concurrent rezone.

The current Comprehensive Plan map designation of the site is “Institutional” and current implementing zoning is “Open Space”. The District is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map to the “Multifamily” designation (consistent with the adjacent area), as well as requesting a concurrent rezone to “Multifamily”.

The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The District’s proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density. While there is not a project associated with the Docket Request, the density used for review in the Environmental Checklist was at the high-end of this range. This was done to determine the full-range of the necessary infrastructure to serve any future land-use development proposal.
Additionally, since the District’s request is to amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map during the review cycle, City staff requested analysis and submittal of additional information. This included an environmental review, traffic study, and utilities analysis, which were based upon a conceptual site layout to provide discussion of potential environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use. The following items were prepared and have been submitted as a part of this application:

Wetland and Stream Determination Report ............................................. Wetland Resources, Inc.
Conceptual Site Layout ....................................................................... Harmsen & Associates, Inc.
Memorandum (Transportation – Rezone Volume Analysis) ....... Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc.

Results of the analysis showed compatibility of multifamily on the site. While the study was of a conceptual site layout, future site-specific development proposals would be subject to a subsequent analysis (including a full SEPA environmental review) of the proposal, and review of any proposed measures to reduce or control impacts.

Analysis of the conceptual site layout determined the following:

- The on-site soils are conducive to erosion and would require on-site erosion control measures during any clearing and/or site construction. Any future development would meet code requirements for grading and erosion control.
- Any future development of the site would generate emissions related to construction on the site, which would be of short duration. Any potential future residential development would create emissions typical of a residential development.
- A minimal amount of oils, grease and other pollutants from paved areas could potentially enter the ground or downstream surface waters through runoff. As part of any future development a drainage plan with water quality treatment would be provided for stormwater collected from pollution-generating surfaces.
- No Priority Habitats or Species are known to be on the site or were observed during site visits. There is a nearby Vaux’s swift communal roost, which is designated a priority habitat per the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). However, development or construction on the subject property would not physically affect the chimney where the roost is located. Any development on the subject property would not impact the designated priority habitat area.
- Noise levels would vary due to the type and usage of the equipment. Construction noises are only generated during those times and are usually of short duration for each activity.
- Long-term noise sources are those associated with the site use, including building functions, on-site vehicles and any recreational areas that may be provided.
- Development consistent with the proposed designation would be related to residents and based on units developed per acre. Development at the high-end of the multifamily designation could yield 288-296 units. Based on 2.97 persons per household, potentially 879 residents could reside on the site.
- Any future development of the site would have to go through various permits from the City. At that time, there would be a review of potential impacts related to traffic drainage and
other site development impacts. The proposal would allow development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan future land use map and provide a consistent implementing zone.

- Future development would potentially change the views on and to the site from field areas to developed housing.
- The conceptual site layout provided approximately 600 onsite parking spaces.
- The potential rezone, with a future development, would add vehicle trips to several City intersections that are projected to operate at level of service E or F in 2035. However, the City has established a corridor level of service for its concurrency evaluation. Based on the concurrency corridor analysis contained in the City’s operational level of service appendix of the City’s Transportation Plan the future 2035 level of service of the corridors are all expected to operate at acceptable level of service D or better with the highest corridor delay being on W Main Street East corridor that has a projected delay of 50 seconds per entering vehicle. The four intersections that the rezone (future development proposal) adds any measurable trips to are:
  - Main Street/Frylands Blvd (Int #9)
  - Main Street Ramps with SR-522 (Int #10, 11)
  - Main Street/179th Street (Int #29)

The proposed rezone would add between 0.4% to 1.55% increase in volume to those corridor intersections or an average of less than 1% increase to the highest delay concurrency corridor. The plan shows that W Main Street East corridor has a projected delay in 2035 of 50 seconds (without the rezone) while 55 seconds appears to be the threshold for LOS E (i.e., a delay increase capacity of approximately 10% before LOS E is likely to be reached).

Any future development of the site would be required to provide a traffic study based on the number of units to be developed. The study would review impacts and potential mitigation that may be necessary. Frontage and pedestrian walkway improvements would be required.

- A specific study on utility capacity was not performed. The following provides details regarding utilities (sanitary sewer, water, storm water) for the site area.

  Sanitary sewer is available along Kelsey Street (10” line) and Columbia Street (8” line). The depth in Kelsey is approximately nine feet. The length of the site might require multiple sewer connections or a pump for the future potential projects’ western-most units.

  Water is available along Kelsey Street (10” line) and Columbia Street (8” line). The valley area of the City is generally known to have adequate capacity and pressure for future potential projects of this nature.

  All stormwater would need to be handled on-site through infiltration as there are no local storm connections that offer capacity for the future subsequent potential project. The soils in the Monroe valley area are generally very conducive to infiltration and the site is expected to have no issues controlling stormwater runoff. All projects need to control
construction stormwater and protect it from pollutants and sediment. With the site having free draining soils, the threat of soil erosion is small. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used during future subsequent potential project construction.

Additional details are provided in the SEPA Environmental Checklist and combined application packet.

2. Reference to the element(s) of the comprehensive plan that is proposed for amendment;

Response: The District is requesting a Comprehensive Plan amendment to the Future Land Use Map from “Institutional” to “Multifamily”.

3. Proposed amendment language, when applicable;

Response: Not applicable. The requested amendment is to the Future Land Use Map designation only.

4. An explanation of why the amendment is being proposed;

Response: The District is requesting the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and concurrent rezone to allow other options to manage this site resource. While the site is no longer used for formal education programs, the location doesn’t lend itself for future school facilities. The site is located in close proximity to other schools that are developed. The site is currently used as an informal ballfield, which is used by the community. The District does not use it for school athletic programs or other school program uses. There are other schools in the area that provide such facilities for school-use. A number of these fields have newer all-weather surfaces allowing for additional opportunities for community use after school hours.

As the District has reviewed options for site use, the ability to process a Comprehensive Plan Amendment provides the opportunities for future development options that could provide additional funding for other needed school projects. While there are currently no plans for the site, this Docket Request allows the best management of the site resource.

5. A description and/or map of the property affected by the proposal;

Response: The Subject Site includes three tax parcels (#27060100100400, 27060100205100, and 27060100404500), totaling 12.41± acres in size (see Figure 1 – Vicinity Map and Figure 2 – Parcel Map). Two of the parcels have physical addresses assigned (210 Kelsey Street and 447 W Columbia Street) and one parcel is described as vacant/undeveloped with no physical address.

Generally, the property is bounded by residential use on the north (including an apartment complex), church property on the west, residential properties and W. Columbia Street on the south, and Kelsey Street on the east. The current use is an informal ballfield, which is used by
the community. The site is developed with four sports fields, which includes grass ballfields and a cinder track, associated buildings, bleachers, lighting and a parking lot. The structures on site are in poor condition. The vegetation is maintained lawn with a few scattered trees along the border of the site.

Figure 1 – Vicinity Map

Figure 2 – Site/Parcel Map

6. The appropriate fee, as listed in the Fees Resolution in place at the time of application submittal

Response: The appropriate fee for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and concurrent rezone will be paid as part of the application.
APPENDIX II

Part A

The Planning Commission will provide a recommendation to the City Council whether the proposed amendment should be considered for further review based on the following criteria:

1. Consideration of the previous record if the amendment was reviewed and denied during a previous amendment review cycle;

   **Response:** The Monroe School District has not applied for this amendment previously.

2. The proposed amendment advances goals and policies of the comprehensive plan;

   **Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment advances the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map. The proposed zoning designation would provide the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan designation. The density of 12-25 units per acre has been used for review purposes only; however, it is consistent with forecast conditions as illustrated by the City in their Land Use and Housing Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. Recent trends are showing increases in multifamily developments. Higher density housing development also helps the City achieve goals of the downtown, Main Street growth and GMA supported infill development.

   The District does develop a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), which outlines the present and future facilities need for the District. The proposal is consistent with the District’s adopted CFP. The proposed Docket Request is consistent with the District’s determination that the Subject Site is no longer an athletic resource for school-use.

   The existing infrastructure allows future development on the site with appropriate development improvements and satisfying the City development standards.

3. The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and regulations of the Growth Management Act;

   RCW 36.70A contains many elements that address development in regards to the Growth Management Act. Of particular consideration are the planning goals contained in RCW 36.70A.020. This amendment request is consistent with those planning goals and are addressed below in italics. As stated in the RCW, “The following goals are adopted to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations of those counties and cities that are required or choose to plan under RCW 36.70A.040. The following goals are not listed in order of priority and shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations:”
(1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

**Response:** The proposal would provide a Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map change from “Institutional” to “Multifamily” and concurrent rezone. This would allow the Subject Site to develop consistent with the surrounding urban area. The area is served by urban-level public facilities and services, including utilities.

(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

**Response:** The proposal would reduce sprawl by allowing infill of high-density multifamily development within the City.

(3) Transportation. Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.

**Response:** Through infill high-density development within the City, transportation systems are better able to accommodate residents and commuters, who could take advantage of mass transit and alternative forms of transportation. Preliminary evaluation suggests that the existing street system would accommodate multifamily development on the Subject Site.

(4) Housing. Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

**Response:** This proposal would allow vacant land to be redeveloped into multifamily use. Through encouraging appropriate infill of high-density development within the City, a variety of residential densities and housing types would be offered. This increases the residential options, which helps to keep housing affordable and available to all economic segments and further encourages preservation of existing housing stock.

(5) Economic development. Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state’s natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

**Response:** The Monroe School District routinely evaluates their facilities and properties for long-term viability and to evaluate necessity. The Subject Site is no longer necessary to serve the program needs of students in the District. It was therefore decided to pursue options for the future use of the site for a non-school use.

(6) Property rights. Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.

**Response:** The request does not impact property rights of other land owners, but allows the Monroe School District to plan for a future use of the Subject Site for a non-school use, as a private property. The District therefore is seeking to have the Comprehensive Plan –
Future Land Use Map changed to a designation and zoning consistent with a non-school site, and compatible with the adjacent multifamily designations.

(7) Permits. Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.

Response: This Docket Request will follow the prescribed timing as outlined by the City. As stated on the City’s website: As provided for in Resolution No. 2012/020, the City of Monroe is now accepting “Citizen-Initiated” requests to amend the City of Monroe 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The amendments will be considered as part of the City’s 2018-2019 Plan amendment cycle.

The existing sport field use was granted through proper governmental approvals more than 20 years ago. Any future land-use application would be required to apply through the City, and be subject to then current processes and timeframes for approval. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

(8) Natural resource industries. Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forestlands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible uses.

Response: Natural resource industries would not be impacted with the approval of this amendment.

(9) Open space and recreation. Retain open space, enhance recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks and recreation facilities.

Response: While approval of this amendment does remove a perceived open space with recreational opportunities for the neighborhood, the Subject Site is not a public park, but rather a school property. School property must either be serving the District, typically in meeting programing needs of students, or potentially be surplused in the future.

Multifamily development of the site in the future may be subject to parks mitigation and/or open space requirements from the City.

(10) Environment. Protect the environment and enhance the state’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.

Response: The Subject Site was reviewed for any wetlands and/or critical areas. There are none on or adjacent to the property. The area has both public water and sanitary sewer service provided by the City. Impacts on environmental elements, including air and water quality, and the availability of water, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

(11) Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

Response: The Monroe School District has held a community discussion at a school board meeting to discuss the proposal. There would be additional opportunities for area residents to provide input during the City’s Docket process, as well as any future District property evaluation. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the...
2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements. The City’s plan updates have a public process with participation of the community.

(12) Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

Response: The sports fields no longer serve the programming needs of school students in the Monroe School District and are not utilized for school-use. Preliminary evaluation shows adequate levels of service for area utilities, and public facilities and services to serve the Subject Site with development similar to the surrounding area (multifamily).

Approval of the Docket Request would provide future planning flexibility to the District, a public service provider, and follows the timing and regulations of the City planning processes.

(13) Historic preservation. Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, that have historical or archaeological significance.

Response: The Subject Site is not known to have any structures of historic significance, nor has it been mapped on the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation’s WISSARD system online. The Monroe School District is unaware of any archaeological or historical significance regarding the Subject Site.

4. The relationship of the proposed amendment to other City codes and regulations; and

Response: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is consistent with the City codes and regulations. The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments. The City is currently reviewing zoning designations to be consistent with the adopted land use map. Analysis of the conceptual site layout included review of the City’s proposed chapter on Multifamily Zoning Residential Zoning Districts, which promotes the small town character of Monroe with provision of compatible multifamily housing stock and encourages Multifamily:

…for land that is located convenient to principal arterials and business and commercial activity centers where a full range of public facilities and services to support urban development exists. Multifamily residential zoning districts are intended for areas of infill housing and housing developments for seniors and other special housing groups.

Since the Subject Site no longer serves the programming needs of students, the Monroe School District is requesting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Future Land Use Map.
designation from “Institutional” to “Multifamily”, which is an appropriate non-school use designation that is compatible with the surrounding area. Approval of the Docket Request would provide future flexibility to the District, a public service provider, and follows the timing and regulations of the City planning processes.

5. The cumulative effect(s) of the proposed plan amendment(s).

Response: The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment cumulative effects(s) would allow the Monroe School District to potentially surplus property no longer needed for school-use, which is supported by the MSD Capital Facilities Plan (CFP).

If the Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone are approved, the property would have the potential to provide increased multifamily housing land within the City of Monroe to better meet increasing population demands.

Part B

A comprehensive plan amendment may be approved or approved with modifications:

1. Each amendment:
   a. Shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way;
   b. Shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan;
   c. Shall be in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws; and
   d. Must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

Response: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.
2. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:
   
a. Addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

   **Response:** The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

   The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments. The Subject Site is in an area of high-density multifamily development.

   The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment addresses the needs and changing circumstances of the City as a whole because the Monroe School District is a public service provider. The District is the provider of public school education service within the City and has determined this Docket Request is necessary. The District routinely evaluates their facilities and properties for long-term viability and to evaluate necessity. The Subject Site is no longer serving the program needs of students in the District. It was therefore decided to pursue a plan for the future use of the site for a non-school use.

b. Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

   **Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is a non-project action. The Monroe School District prepared a SEPA Environmental Checklist, which discusses the anticipated potential environmental impacts. Project-level environmental impacts would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

c. Is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

   **Response:** The proposed Docket Request would be consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations. Granting the appropriate non-school designation (multifamily) adds buildable land for high-density residential infill in the City, which is consistent with the Housing, Land Use Assumptions, which rely on land use strategies to accommodate the City’s housing unit needs through 2035. Some objectives include:

   - Encouraging infill opportunities within existing City limits
   - Encouraging the provision of diverse housing types in all areas of Monroe
• Encouraging housing growth near existing services, including park facilities

The request is necessitated because of changing circumstances as the sport fields are no longer useful or viable for the Monroe School District. In order to consider a future surplus of the properties, the Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning for the Subject Site need to be for non-school use. That action would provide increased residential (multifamily) infill land within the City, thereby meeting the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

d. Is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.

Response: The proposed Docket Request is to provide future consistency with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods. The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments.

The sports fields no longer serve the programming needs of school students in the Monroe School District. Preliminary evaluation shows adequate levels of service for area utilities, and public facilities and services to serve the Subject Site with development similar to the surrounding area (multifamily).

Approval of the Docket Request would provide future flexibility to the District, a public service provider, and follows the timing and regulations of the City planning processes.

e. Is consistent with other plan elements and the overall intent of the comprehensive plan.

Response: The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

The proposed Docket Request is consistent with the overall intent of the Comprehensive Plan as demonstrated within the application packet (including attachments and appendices), the SEPA Environmental Checklist and the Monroe School District’s Capital Faculties Plan.
Appendix III

Provide a completed and signed Environmental Checklist.

Response: The Monroe School District has prepared a SEPA Environmental Checklist. The original and four copies are a part of the application submittal packet.
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ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write “do not know” or “does not apply.” Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered “does not apply.” IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words “project,” “applicant,” and “property or site” should be read as “proposal,” “proposer,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Monroe School District Comprehensive Plan Amendment / Rezone (Docket Request)

2. Name of applicant: Monroe School District #103

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

   Applicant: Monroe School District #103
   Contact Person: John Mannix, Assistant Superintendent of Operations
   200 East Fremont Street, Monroe WA 98272
   Phone: 360.804.2570
   Email: mannixj@monroe.wednet.edu
Environmental Consultant: Brent Planning Solutions, LLC
Contact Person: Laura S. Brent, AICP
P.O. Box 1586, Mukilteo, Washington 98275
Phone: 425.971.6409
Email: lbrent@brentplanningsolutions.com

4. Date checklist prepared: This Checklist was prepared in July 2018.

5. Agency requesting checklist: The City of Monroe (City) is the agency with land use permit authority. The City is also the lead agency for environmental review and SEPA compliance for this project. This document has been prepared by Brent Planning Solutions, LLC (BPS) and has been reviewed and authorized by the Monroe School District (District).

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

This Docket Request will follow the prescribed timing as outlined by the City. As stated on the city’s website: As provided for in Resolution No. 2012/020, the City of Monroe is now accepting “Citizen-Initiated” requests to amend the City of Monroe 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The amendments will be considered as part of the City’s 2018-2019 Plan amendment cycle.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

This proposal is for a non-project action related to a Docket Request for a comprehensive plan amendment and concurrent rezone. The District may decide in the future to surplus the property, which would require a formal surplus procedure.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

This proposal is for a non-project action related to a Docket Request for a comprehensive plan amendment and concurrent rezone. As part of the Docket Request application, a conceptual site layout was prepared to analyze potential impacts associated with future development if the request was approved. The conceptual site layout (site plan) is included in this Checklist. Utility and transportation information was also completed for the potential of future site development.

Wetland and Stream Determination Report................................................................. Wetland Resources, Inc.
Conceptual Site Layout.............................................................................................. Harmsen & Associates, Inc.
Memorandum (Transportation – Rezone Volume Analysis)....................................... Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc.

As part of the community outreach process, the District did hold a discussion of the request at their July 16, 2018 board meeting. A number of community members attended that meeting.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

There are no governmental approvals of other proposals that would have a direct effect on the subject docketing proposal.
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

Comprehensive plan amendments must be considered and approved by the Planning Commission and County Council, with coordination of state agency review during the comment period. SEPA determination/compliance would also be completed by the City.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page.

As provided for in Resolution No. 2012/020, the City of Monroe is now accepting “Citizen-Initiated” requests to amend the City of Monroe 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The amendments will be considered as part of the City’s 2018-2019 Plan amendment cycle. The Monroe School District is submitting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Docket Request) and concurrent rezone during this amendment cycle. The Docket Request is a non-project action proposal for the City of Monroe (City) to amend the Comprehensive Plan with a change to the Future Land Use Map and a concurrent rezone.

The site includes three parcels totaling 12.41± acres in size (see Figure 1 – Vicinity Map and Figure 2 – Parcel Map). Two of the parcels have physical addresses assigned (210 Kelsey Street and 447 W Columbia Street) and one parcel is described as vacant/undeveloped with no physical address. Generally, the property is bounded by residential use on the north (including an apartment complex), church property on the west, residential properties and W. Columbia Street on the south, and Kelsey Street on the east. The current use is an informal ballfield, which is used by the community. The District does not use it for school athletic programs or other school program uses. There are other schools in the area that provide such facilities for school-use. A number of these fields have newer all-weather surfaces allowing for additional opportunities for community use after school hours.

The site is developed with four sports fields, which includes grass ballfields and a cinder track, associated buildings, bleachers, lighting and a parking lot. The structures on site are in poor condition. The vegetation is maintained lawn with a few scattered trees along the border of the site. Sanitary sewer is available along Kelsey Street and Columbia Street. Water is also available along Kelsey Street and Columbia Street. The soils in the Monroe valley area are generally very conducive to infiltration and the site is expected to have no issues controlling stormwater runoff with future development. The site has adequate access from both Kelsey and Columbia Streets.

The District is requesting the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and rezone to allow other options to manage this site resource. While the site is no longer used for formal education programs, the location doesn’t lend itself for future school facilities. The site is located in close proximately to other schools that are developed. As the District has reviewed options for site use, the ability to process a Comprehensive Plan Amendment provides the opportunities for future development options that could provide additional funding for other needed school projects. While there are currently no plans for the site, this allows the best management of the site resource. The current Comprehensive Plan map designation of the site is “Institutional” and current implementing zoning is “Open Space”. The District is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map to the “Multifamily” designation (consistent with the adjacent area), as well as requesting a concurrent rezone to “Multifamily”.

The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The District’s proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between
12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density. While there is not a project associated with the Docket Request, the density used for review in the Environmental Checklist was at the high-end of this range. This was done to determine the full-range of the necessary infrastructure to serve any future land-use development proposal. As part of the Docket Request/Rezone application, a conceptual site layout was prepared to analyze potential impacts associated with future development if the request were to be approved. The conceptual site layout (site plan) is included in this Checklist (see Figure 3 – Conceptual Site Layout).

Please refer to the SEPA Environmental Checklist and combined application packet for additional details.

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

The Subject Site is located within the central area of the City of Monroe (see Figure 1 – Vicinity Map). The subject property is comprised of three tax parcels (#27060100100400, 27060100404500, 27060100205100), and is 12.41± acres in size. The site is developed and contains four sports fields and cinder track, associated buildings, bleachers, lighting and a parking lot. The parcels are detailed from the Snohomish County Assessor records in Table 1 – Subject Site/Parcels. Two of the parcels have physical addresses assigned (210 Kelsey Street and 449 W Columbia Street) and one parcel is described as vacant/undeveloped with no physical address. The site is within Section 01, Township 27N, Range 06E, Wm.M, and a parcel is located within the northwest, northeast and southeast quarters. Generally, the property is bounded by residential use on the north (including an apartment complex), church property on the west, residential properties and W. Columbia Street on the south, and Kelsey Street on the east (see Figure 2 – Parcel Map). Frank Wagner Elementary School is located to the south and Sky Valley Education Center to the east of the site.

Table 1 – Subject Site/Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27060100100400</td>
<td>4.75 ac</td>
<td>school-use code</td>
<td>210 Kelsey Street, Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27060100404500</td>
<td>0.7 ac</td>
<td>school-use code</td>
<td>449 W Columbia Street, Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27060100205100</td>
<td>6.96 ac</td>
<td>undeveloped land code</td>
<td>no physical address (ballfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage:</strong></td>
<td>12.41±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 – Vicinity Map
Figure 2 – Parcel Map

Source: Snohomish County Assessors, Quarter Section Maps 2018
Figure 3 – Conceptual Site Layout
B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. EARTH

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

   Topography of the property is generally flat, with the edges of the football and baseball fields slightly lower than the center of the fields.

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

   Slopes on the Subject Site are 0 to 3 percent.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

   The USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey maps the soils underlying the site as Sultan silt loam. The Sultan series consists of very deep, moderately well drained soils formed in recent alluvium on floodplains at elevations of near sea level to 120 feet. Slopes are 0 to 3 percent.

   Soils within the football field were generally dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam in the upper four inches with a layer of sand below. Soils within the baseball/softball fields were generally dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam or sandy clay loam in the upper layer with a dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) sandy loam in the sublayer.

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

   There are no known indications of unstable soils.

e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

   The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request for a comprehensive plan amendment and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Earth (including fill/excavation), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

   Development associated with the potential achieved through the requested action would result in clearing and grading the majority of the site.
f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request for a comprehensive plan amendment and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Earth (including fill/excavation), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

On-site soils are conducive to erosion and would require on-site erosion control measures during any clearing and/or site construction. Any future development would meet code requirements for grading and erosion control.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. However, future development within the densities allowed by the Multifamily designation would cover a large percentage of the site with impervious surfaces.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

As a non-project action, no construction/development is proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be subject to a separate SEPA review, which would include review of any proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to Earth.

2. AIR

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Air (including emissions), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Any future development of the site would generate emissions related to construction on the site, which would be of short duration. Any potential future residential development would create emissions typical of a residential development.
b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

Off-site emissions are mainly related to vehicles on the area roadways and those associated with residential uses. The project area is considered in attainment for all air pollutants except carbon monoxide (CO). This means air quality is generally good throughout the area, except under certain circumstances that tend to promote poor air quality for short periods of time.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Air (including mitigation measures for emissions), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

3. WATER

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Wetland Resources, Inc. (WRI) performed a site investigation on June 6, 2018 to locate and identify jurisdictional wetlands and streams on and within the vicinity of the Subject Site. The Public Land Survey System (PLSS) locator for the site is Section 01, Township 27N, Range 06E, Wm.M. Based on the results of the site investigation, there are no wetlands or streams on the site or the immediate vicinity.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including work over, in, or adjacent to), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future development would not be within 200 feet of any water bodies.
3) **Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including fill/dredge material), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

There would be no impact to surface water or wetlands with future development.

4) **Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including surface water withdrawals/diversions), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

5) **Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

6) **Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including any discharges of waste materials to surface waters), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

The site is served by public sewers with the proper extension.

b. **Ground:**

1) **Will ground water be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well? Will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**
The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including ground water withdrawal/discharges), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

There are no water wells on the site. Public water is available to the site.

2) **Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals...; agricultural; etc.).** Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including waste material discharged into the ground), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Sewer is available at the site.

c. **Water Runoff (including storm water):**

1) **Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known).** Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including runoff/collection/disposal), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Any future development would need to provide storm water facilities consistent with the requirements of the City.

2) **Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including waste materials entering ground/surface water), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.
A minimal amount of oils, grease and other pollutants from paved areas could potentially enter the ground or downstream surface waters through runoff. As part of any future development a drainage plan with water quality treatment would be provided for stormwater collected from pollution-generating surfaces.

3) **Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including alteration/affect to drainage patterns), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

d. **Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, runoff water and drainage pattern impacts, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Water (including impact mitigation measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

4. **PLANTS**

a. **Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:**

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other: _____
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other: _____
- shrubs
- grass
- pasture
- crop or grain
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other: __________
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other: __________
- other types of vegetation

Vegetation on the site consists of maintained grasses, with some areas containing creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*) and white clover (*Trifolium repens*). Large Douglas fir trees (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*; FACU) are present off-site along the southern boundary of the property.

b. **What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an
amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Plants (including vegetation removal/alterations), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future development would remove existing vegetation which would be replaced with landscaping that meets the requirements of the City.

c. **List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site:**

No Priority Habitats or Species are known to be on the site or were observed during site visits.

There is a nearby Vaux’s swift communal roost, which is designated a priority habitat per the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Per the definition of “Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas” in Monroe Municipal Code 20.05.030, priority habitats designated by WDFW are considered habitats of local importance and therefore are Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas. The communal roost is approximately 600 feet from the subject property, is within the chimney of an elementary school building, and within a developed residential area. There are currently no trees on the subject property, so any development on the site would not remove any trees or snags that may currently be utilized by the Vaux’s swift. Development or construction on the subject property would not physically affect the chimney where the roost is located. Any development on the subject property would not impact the designated priority habitat area.

d. **Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Plants (including landscaping / preservation / enhancement), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

e. **List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.**

Common dandelion is located throughout the site, as well as some areas containing creeping buttercup and white clover.

5. **ANIMALS**

a. **Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**
There is limited habitat for birds or animals on the site. The site is currently used by domestic pets and small rodents.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

WDFW Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) Mapper does not show any Priority Habitats on or immediately adjacent to the site. The closest mapped habitat feature is a communal roost of Vaux’s swift approximately 600 feet to the south on the Frank Wager Elementary School campus.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

There may be migration routes of some species that may be in the vicinity of the site.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Animals (including preservation/enhancement measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

It is likely that within the area there are rodents, mice, feral cats, etc. present on portions of the site; however, no specific species have been observed or documented on this particular site.

6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

As a non-project action, no construction/development is proposed. The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Energy and Natural Resources (including energy needs), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.
Electric and natural gas services are available to the site through extending the utilities.

b. **Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of *Energy and Natural Resources* (including solar energy), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future development consistent with the proposed designations would allow multi-story structures; code required setbacks and height limitations would be required to meet city regulations.

c. **What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List of other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of *Energy and Natural Resources* (including energy conservation/impact mitigation), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Any future development of the site would include construction materials and features typical of newer development.

7. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH**

a. **Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so describe.**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of *Environmental Health* (including hazards), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

1) **Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.**

    There is no known on-site contamination.
2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

There is no known hazardous chemicals/conditions that affect the site or in the immediate vicinity.

3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project’s development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including toxic/hazardous chemicals), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including special emergency services), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

The site is currently served by both fire and police.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including impact mitigation), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, aircraft, other?)

Existing noise generators are mainly those associated with vehicles on the adjacent road systems and residential uses. There are existing schools in the
vicinity that generate noise related to student use. The existing noise levels are not anticipated to impact any future development.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including existing noise), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

2) **What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?** Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including Noise types/levels), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Short-term noise would be generated by any future construction on the site. Noise generated from construction equipment would occur. These generators are usually of short duration and restricted to hours per Monroe Municipal Code (MMC). The short-term increase and duration of noise levels would depend on the type of construction equipment being used and the amount of time it is in steady use (demolition and redevelopment). For example purposes, at 200 feet from the area of construction, the equivalent sound level (Leq, a measure of long-term average noise exposure) for activities and equipment would be approximately the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Equipment</th>
<th>Range of Noise Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>65-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>70-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>74-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Range of Hourly Leq (in decibels*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>63-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing</td>
<td>62-77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Decibels - The **decibel** (abbreviated **dB**) is the unit used to measure the intensity of a sound.

Noise levels would vary due to the type and usage of the equipment. Construction noises are only generated during those times and are usually of short duration for each activity.

Long-term noise sources are those associated with the site use, including building functions, on-site vehicles and any recreational areas that may be provided.
3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Environmental Health (including Noise impact mitigation measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

The site is developed with four sports fields and cinder track, associated buildings, bleachers, lighting and a parking lot. Adjacent uses include a church to the west and residential uses to the north (including an apartment complex), south and east. Directly to the east, across Kelsey Street, is the Sky Valley Education Center. Also, the nearby elementary school (Frank Wagner Elementary) includes a ballfield directly south of the site.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request with a proposed concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including any affect on current uses/area properties), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

No.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

There are no working farms or forest land in the immediate area of the site.

c. Describe any structures on the site.
The site is developed with four sports fields and cinder track, associated buildings, bleachers, lighting and a parking lot. The structures are in poor condition and are not being used by the District.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including structures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future development would remove the existing structures that are currently located on the site.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The site is currently zoned PS (Public Open Space) (see Figure 4 – Zoning Map). As described in the City’s zoning code, “The purpose of the public open space zoning district is to provide areas to include public neighborhood, community and regional parks, recreational facilities, and undisturbed natural open space; public school facilities; public city facilities; and other special regional use facilities operated by the county, state, or federal government, within the city’s urban growth area.”

Areas surrounding the site contain a variety of zoning designations (Multi-family Residential, Urban Residential, and Public Open Space).

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The site is designated as Institutional in the Comprehensive Plan (see Figure 5 – Comprehensive Plan Map). Areas surrounding the site are designated primarily as Multifamily, with some High-Density SFR (to the southwest) and Institutional (to the east, south and west).

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

There are no shoreline designations on the site.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as acritical area by the city or the county? If so, specify.

There are no wetlands or other critical areas located on the site.
Figure 4 – Zoning Map
Figure 5 – Comprehensive Plan Map
i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including number of residents/workers), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Development consistent with the proposed designation would be related to residents and based on units developed per acre. Although no project is proposed with this request, development at the high-end of the multifamily designation could yield 288-296 units. Based on 2.97 persons per household, potentially 879 residents could reside on the site.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including displacement), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Potential future displacement would be related to the removal of the fields from community use.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including displacement impact mitigation measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

There are other schools in the vicinity and within the City that provide opportunities for community use of sport fields. Upgrades and new facilities that have all weather surfaces have increased the availability to use these other facilities.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

Compatibility of the proposal is measured by consistency with the existing school uses, adopted Comprehensive Plan, zoning code, Capital Facilities Plans and future environmental review. The proposed amendment request is consistent with the District’s determination that the site is no longer an athletic resource for school-use. Other district-wide facilities provide the needed facilities to operate school
athletic programs. As the District has reviewed options for site use, the ability to process a comprehensive plan amendment provides the opportunities for future development options that could provide additional funding for other needed school projects. While there are currently no plans for the site, this allows the best management of the site resource.

The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted future land use map. The proposed zoning designation would provide the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan designation. The density of 12-25 units per acre has been used for review purposes only; however, it is consistent with forecast conditions as illustrated by the City in their Land Use Element and Housing Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. Table 3.07 Land Use Designations in the Land Use Chapter discuss Multifamily as the range of 12 and 25 units per acre where public facilities and services exist. Recent trends are showing increases in multifamily developments. Higher density housing development also helps the City achieve goals of the downtown, Main Street growth and GMA supported infill development. The District does develop a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), which outlines the present and future facilities need for the District. The proposal is consistent with the District’s adopted CFP.

The concurrent rezone request is consistent with the City’s rezone criteria. As detailed within this Checklist, and specifically detailed in the Combined Application (Rezone) – Rezone Criteria:

1. This proposed zoning change shall be in keeping with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. (Explain how it meets the goals/policies.)

The proposed zoning change is in keeping with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendment request is consistent with the District’s determination that the site is no longer an athletic resource for school-use. Other district-wide facilities provide the needed facilities to operate school athletic programs. As the District has reviewed options for site use, the ability to process a comprehensive plan amendment provides the opportunities for future development options that could provide additional funding for other needed school projects. While there are currently no plans for the site, this allows the best management of the site resource.

The requested Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted future land use map. The proposed zoning designation (Multifamily) would provide the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan designation. The density of 12-25 units per acre has been used for review purposes only; however, it is consistent with forecast conditions as illustrated by the City in their Land Use Element and Housing Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. Table 3.07 Land Use Designations in the Land Use Chapter discuss Multifamily as the range of 12 and 25 units per acre where public facilities and services exist. Recent trends are showing increases in multifamily developments. Higher density housing development also helps the City achieve goals of the downtown, Main Street growth and GMA supported infill development. The District does develop a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP),
which outlines the present and future facilities need for the District. The proposal is consistent with the District’s adopted CFP.

The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation, policies and code requirements. There are no critical areas on the site. The existing infrastructure allows future development on the site with appropriate development improvements and satisfying the City development standards. The appropriate comprehensive plan amendment and rezone applications have been submitted for review by the City. The rezone has been requested to implement the comprehensive plan amendment if approved by the City.

The Docket Application is a non-project action; therefore, project compatibility would be evaluated by the City at the time of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

2. This proposed zoning change shall be in keeping with the purposes of the Zoning Code and the existing land uses of surrounding properties. (Explain how it is in keeping with Zoning Code and existing land uses.)

As a result of significant analysis, the District believes that the zoning change is in keeping with the purposes of the City zoning code and the existing neighboring land uses surrounding the Subject Site. The Multifamily zoning designation is consistent with the surrounding developments. The City is currently reviewing zoning designations to be consistent with the adopted land use map. Analysis of the conceptual site layout included review of the City’s proposed chapter on Multifamily Zoning Residential Zoning Districts, which promotes the small town character of Monroe with provision of compatible multifamily housing stock and encourages Multifamily:

...for land that is located convenient to principal arterials and business and commercial activity centers where a full range of public facilities and services to support urban development exists. Multifamily residential zoning districts are intended for areas of infill housing and housing developments for seniors and other special housing groups.

The current Comprehensive Plan map designation of the site is “Institutional” and current implementing zoning is “Open Space”. The District is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map to the “Multifamily” designation (consistent with the adjacent area), as well as requesting a concurrent rezone to “Multifamily”. The Multifamily zone is also consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, which contains a variety of zoning designations (Multi-family Residential, Urban Residential, and Public Open Space).

The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The District’s proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.
Additionally, since the District’s request is to amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map during the review cycle, City staff requested submittal of additional information. This included an environmental review, traffic study, and utilities analysis, which were based upon a conceptual site layout to provide discussion of potential environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use. The following items were prepared and have been submitted as a part of this application:

- Wetland and Stream Determination Report, Wetland Resources, Inc.
- Conceptual Site Layout, Harmsen & Associates, Inc.
- Memorandum (Transportation – Rezone Volume Analysis), Gibson Traffic Research was also conducted for a conceptual utilities analysis, which was incorporated into the application.

The Multifamily zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density. While there is not a project associated with the Docket Request, the density used for review in the Environmental Checklist was at the high-end of this range. This was done to determine the full-range of the necessary infrastructure to serve any future land-use development proposal. As part of the Docket Request/Rezone application, a conceptual site layout was prepared to analyze potential impacts associated with future development if the request were to be approved. (Please refer to the SEPA Environmental Checklist and combined application packet for additional details.)

3. This proposed rezone reflects changes in economic patterns, social customs, policy changes and other factors that affect the character of the area. (Explain how it reflects these changes.)

Response: The proposed concurrent rezone (with Comprehensive Plan Amendment) advances the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map. The proposed zoning designation would provide the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan designation.

The Multifamily density of 12-25 units per acre has been used for review purposes only; however, it is consistent with forecast conditions as illustrated by the City in their Land Use and Housing Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. Recent trends are showing increases in multifamily developments. Higher density housing development also helps the City achieve goals of the downtown, Main Street growth and GMA supported infill development.

The District does develop a Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), which outlines the present and future facilities need for the District. The proposal is consistent with the District’s adopted CFP. The proposed Docket Request is consistent with the
District’s determination that the Subject Site is no longer an athletic resource for school-use. The CFP is a measure of changing economic patterns, social customs, policy changes and other factors that affect the character of the District.

Preliminary evaluation shows adequate levels of service for area utilities with existing infrastructure, and public facilities and services to serve the Subject Site with development similar to the surrounding area (multifamily).

4. This proposal will be assessed as to its impact on safety, welfare, public health, property values and other factors. Include a comparison of such factors under the current zoning designation and under the proposed rezone.

Response: The current zoning designation is PS (Public Open Space) and the requested concurrent rezone is to Multifamily, which is consistent with the designation of the surrounding area. The request does not impact property rights of other land owners, but allows the Monroe School District to plan for a future use of the site for a non-school use, as a private property. The District, therefore, is seeking to have the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map changed to a designation and zoning consistent with a non-school site, and compatible with the adjacent zoning designation.

A detailed analysis of this non-project action is discussed within the application submittal, which includes a SEPA Environmental Checklist. Items such as safety, welfare, public health, property values and other factors are not anticipated to be impacted by the proposed Docket Request and concurrent rezone. The proposal is consistent with the effort of the City to bring development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The District’s proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

The Multifamily zoning designation is proposed at the District site because it would allow the site to develop consistent with the surrounding urban area. The area is served by urban-level public facilities and services, and existing infrastructure - including utilities – appears to be adequate. Development of the site reduces sprawl. It increases vacant land to be redeveloped into multifamily use. Through encouraging appropriate infill of high-density development within the City, a variety of residential densities and housing types would be offered. This increases the residential options, which helps to keep housing affordable and available to all economic segments and further encourages preservation of existing housing stock. Through infill high-density development within the City, transportation systems are better able to accommodate residents and commuters, who could take advantage of mass transit and alternative forms of transportation.

While approval of this concurrent rezone does remove an informal ballfield used by the community, the District does not use it for school athletic programs or
other school program uses. There are other schools in the area that provide such facilities for school-use. A number of these fields have newer all-weather surfaces allowing for additional opportunities for community use after school hours. The concurrent rezone allows the District other options to manage this site resource. While the site is no longer used for formal education programs, the location doesn’t lend itself for future school facilities. The site is located in close proximately to other schools that are developed. As the District has reviewed options for site use, the ability to process a the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and concurrent rezone provides the opportunities for future development options that could provide additional funding for other needed school projects. While there are currently no plans for the site, this allows the best management of the site resource. Multifamily development of the site in the future may be subject to parks mitigation and/or open space requirements from the City, which could further serve to mitigate the loss of the informal ballpark in the community.

The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation, policies and code requirements. There are no critical areas on the site. The existing infrastructure allows future development on the site with appropriate development improvements and satisfying the City development standards. The appropriate comprehensive plan amendment and rezone applications have been submitted for review by the City. The rezone has been requested to implement the comprehensive plan amendment if approved by the City.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Land and Shoreline Use (including compatibility), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

Not applicable as there are no agricultural or forest lands in the vicinity.

9. HOUSING

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Housing (including provision of units), would be
reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

A conceptual design and research was conducted consistent with the proposed zoning that showed a potential to allow up to 296 multifamily units on the site. This was prepared for illustrative/research purposes and does not represent any proposal for the site. It is unknown at this time what type of housing would be provided with any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

There are no housing units on the Subject Site.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Housing (including housing impacts/reduction), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Any future development of the site would have to go through various permits from the City. At that time, there would be a review of potential impacts related to traffic drainage and other site development impacts. The proposal would allow development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan future land use map and provide a consistent implementing zone.

10. AESTHETICS

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Aesthetics (including height/building material), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future building heights would have to be within code requirements.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental
elements, including any aspect of Aesthetics (including view alteration/obstruction), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Future development would potentially change the views on and to the site from field areas to developed housing.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Aesthetics (including impact mitigation measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

11. LIGHT AND GLARE

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Light and Glare (including types/times of occurrence), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

There is currently field lighting on the site. Any future development would replace this lighting with lights associated with a developed housing development.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and a concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Light and Glare (including safety hazard/view interference), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and a concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Light and Glare (including off-site sources/affect),
would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Off-site sources of light and glare would not impact the site or its potential to develop.

d. **Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Light and Glare (including impact mitigation/reduction measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

12. **RECREATION**

a. **What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

The City of Monroe Parks and Recreation Department maintains numerous parks and trails available to the public in the area of the Subject Site. Neighborhood-style smaller parks in the area include Blueberry Park (northwest of the site), to the northeast is Travelers Park, and to the southeast is Lewis Street Park. Larger City parks include the Sky River Park (with Wiggly Field, and the adjacent Rotary Field and Boys & Girls Club) to the southwest, and the large Al Borlin park system along the Skykomish River. Near the site, Frank Wagner Elementary School allows community use after school-hours, as do many schools in the area.

b. **Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**

As a non-project action, no construction/development is proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be subject to a separate SEPA review, which would include discussion of whether the proposed project would displace any existing recreational uses.

c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Recreation (including impact mitigation measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.
13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.

There were no findings of any documented historic or cultural significance for the Subject Site or immediate area.

b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation. This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

There are no historic or cultural structures on the site.

c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archaeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

Research was conducted online with the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservations’ WISSARD system, as well as the City of Monroe’s website.

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

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Historic/Cultural Preservation (including impact avoidance/minimization measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

During a recent community outreach at a school board meeting, a number of members of the community mentioned a memorial located on the site. This memorial honored those who have served our country. There is no longer a memorial marker at Memorial Stadium. The stone and plaque were removed a few years ago when the City consolidated memorials throughout the City.

14. TRANSPORTATION

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on-site plans, if any.
The City did request that potential traffic impacts be reviewed based on a conceptual site plan (see Figure 3 – Conceptual Site Layout). Gibson Traffic provided a review based on scope provided by the City. The traffic memo looks at a rezone volume analysis for 296 multi-family units in 3-story buildings. The purpose of their analysis was to document the preliminary trip generation and to compare the total entering volume of 19 study intersections to the 2035 volumes identified by the City.

The existing volumes collected in the Transportation Plan are from 2014; therefore, to grow them to the baseline 2023 volumes a growth factor of 15% was utilized. This was calculated by using 2% growth per year from 2014 to 2020 and then 1% per year from 2020 to 2023. This is consistent with State growth on US-2 in the site vicinity and City forecasting. For the two intersections that were counted by Traffic Data Gathering (TDG) in June 2018 a growth factor of 7% was utilized; 2% growth per year from 2018 to 2020 and then 1% per year from 2020 to 2023.

The year 2023 was utilized as the baseline year as it’s when the apartment buildings could be built and fully occupied. The site fronts on Kelsey and Columbia Streets. The City requested that there be a connection through the site that would parallel Columbia Street with access to Kelsey Street approximately 170 feet north of Columbia Street and connecting to Columbia Street opposite Dickinson Road.

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

Community Transit does provide public transit service to the residents of Monroe. The site is served with a bus stop located at N. Kelsey Street and W. Columbia Street. There are a number of busses serving the Monroe Park-and-Ride with routes to Seattle, Snohomish and Everett.

c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or nonproject proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Transportation (including parking additions/elimination), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal. The conceptual site layout provided approximately 600 onsite parking spaces.

Any future development of the site would have to provide new parking as required by city code.

d. Will the proposal require any new improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).
The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Transportation (including new improvements), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

The properties front on Kelsey Street and Columbia Street. The City has indicated a desire to have a street run through the site. Options are from Kelsey to Columbia through the existing gravel parking area; Kelsey to Columbia via an extension of Dickinson; and Maple to Columbia via an extension of Dickinson. All but the initial option would require obtaining off-site property for new right-of-way.

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

This site is not in the immediate vicinity of water, rail, or air transportation facilities. The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Transportation (including use/types), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

f. **How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation modes were used to make these estimates?**

As requested by the City, trip generation was reviewed based on 296 units. Traffic generation is based on national research data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 10th Edition (2017). ITE Land Use Code 223, mid-rise apartment, is utilized for the proposed use. This level of development would generate 1,610 ADT and 130 PM peak-hour trips. The trip generation is summarized on Table 2.

Trip generation calculations show the trip generation for a low-rise apartment scenario, but this would have a lower number of units which leads to fewer trips being generated. Therefore, the mid-rise trip generation was utilized as the highest potential use for the volume analysis. No credit/reduction has been taken for
existing uses on the site; therefore, this is a conservatively high analysis of new trip generation.

### Table 2 – Trip Generation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monroe School District Rezone</th>
<th>PM Peak-Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise Apartments 296 Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>0.44 per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splits</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trips have been distributed through the 19 study intersections per the distribution shown in the GTC Memorandum as Figure 1, which is based on other residential distributions in the City of Monroe. Traffic heading to the west of the development using Columbia Street could continue west to 182nd Avenue SE bypassing the intersection of King Street and Blueberry Lane/154th Street SE (Intersection #40); however, as a worst-case the westbound traffic was routed onto King Street impacting the study intersection.

**g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.**

There are no working farms or forest land in the immediate area of the site.

**h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of *Transportation* (including impact mitigation/reduction/control measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

The potential rezone, with a future development, would add vehicle trips to several City intersections that are projected to operate at level of service E or F in 2035. However, the City has established a corridor level of service for its concurrency evaluation. Based on the concurrency corridor analysis contained in the City’s operational level of service appendix of the City’s Transportation Plan the future 2035 level of service of the corridors are all expected to operate at acceptable level of service D or better with the highest corridor delay being on W Main Street East corridor that has a projected delay of 50 second per entering vehicle. The four intersections that the rezone (future development proposal) adds any measurable trips to are:
The proposed rezone would add between 0.4% to 1.55% increase in volume to those corridor intersections or an average of less than 1% increase to the highest delay concurrency corridor. The plan shows that W Main Street East corridor has a projected delay in 2035 of 50 seconds (without the rezone) while 55 seconds appears to be the threshold for LOS E (i.e., a delay increase capacity of approximately 10% before LOS E is likely to be reached).

Any future development of the site would be required to provide a traffic study based on the number of units to be developed. The study would review impacts and potential mitigation that may be necessary. Frontage and pedestrian walkway improvements would be required.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe:

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Public Services (including increased needs), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Any future development would review impacts to public services.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Public Services (including impact mitigation/reduction/control measures), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

16. UTILITIES

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

Utility providers include the following:
Electricity ....................... Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County
Natural Gas ........................................................... Puget Sound Energy
Refuse Service ...................................................... Republic Services, Inc.
Sewer/Water/Stormwater ........................................ City of Monroe
Telephone, Video, Data ................................................ Frontier Communications

A specific study on capacity was not performed. The following provides details regarding utilities (sanitary sewer, water, storm water) for the site area.

Sanitary Sewer

Sanitary sewer is available along Kelsey Street (10” line) and Columbia Street (8” line). The depth in Kelsey is approximately nine feet. The length of the site might require multiple sewer connections or a pump for the future potential projects’ western-most units.

Water

Water is available along Kelsey Street (10” line) and Columbia Street (8” line). The valley area of the City is generally known to have adequate capacity and pressure for future potential projects of this nature.

Stormwater

All stormwater would need to be handled on-site through infiltration as there are no local storm connections that offer capacity for the future subsequent potential project. The soils in the Monroe valley area are generally very conducive to infiltration and the site is expected to have no issues controlling stormwater runoff.

Surface Water Pollution Prevention / Grading

All projects need to control construction stormwater and protect it from pollutants and sediment. With the site having free draining soils, the threat of soil erosion is small. Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used during future subsequent potential project construction.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

The Docket Application request has no anticipated impact to this environmental element. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to an amendment request and concurrent rezone. Impacts on other environmental elements, including any aspect of Utilities (including type/provider), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.
C. SIGNATURE

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

Reviewed by Monroe School District No. 103  
and Brent Planning Solutions

Signature: _______________________________
Laura S. Brent, AICP  
Environmental/Permitting Consultant for the MSD

Date submitted: July 31, 2018
D. Supplemental sheet for non-project actions

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

The proposed Docketing Application is to amend the Comprehensive Plan map to allow future development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map.

There would be no increased discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise as a result of an amendment request for a change to the Comprehensive Plan future land use map and consistent implementing zone. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to this request. As a non-project action, impacts on these environmental elements (including any aspect of increased discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

There would be no impact; therefore, there are no mitigation measures being proposed.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposed Docketing Application is to amend the Comprehensive Plan map to allow future development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map.

There would be no affect to plants, animals, fish, or marine life as a result of an amendment request for a change to the Comprehensive Plan future land use map and consistent implementing zone. The Subject Site is already developed as sports fields and provides limited vegetation and habitat. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to this request. As a non-project action, impacts on these environmental elements (including affect to plants, animals, fish, or marine life), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

There would be no impact; therefore, there are no mitigation measures being proposed.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?
The proposal is unlikely to deplete energy or natural resources. The proposed Docketing Application is to amend the Comprehensive Plan map to allow future development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map.

This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to this request. As a non-project action, impacts on these environmental elements (including depletion of energy or natural resources), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

There would be no impact; therefore, there are no mitigation measures being proposed.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Research was conducted for the Docket Request proposal. A Wetland and Stream Determination Report on existing site conditions is included with this application. There were no environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection discovered on the Subject Site. This proposal is limited to an evaluation of impacts related to this request. As a non-project action, impacts on these environmental elements (including the likelihood to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection (such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands), would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

There would be no impact; therefore, there are no additional mitigation measures being proposed.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposal is likely to have a positive affect on land use by allowing and/or encouraging future development compatible with existing plans. The proposal is not anticipated to have any affect on shoreline use; nor would it create any incompatibility with existing shoreline plans.

The proposed Docketing Application is to amend the Comprehensive Plan map to allow future development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone. The Multifamily designation is consistent with the 2015-2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map.
Comprehensive Plan adopted Future Land Use Map. The District may decide in the future to surplus the property, which would require a formal surplus procedure.

As part of the Docket Request process, a site layout was prepared to analyze potential impacts associated with future development if the request were to be approved. This research was conducted to address consistency of the proposal with the existing plans and regulations of the City. Utility and transportation information was also completed on the potential of a future site development. Those results are detailed within the Environmental Checklist and show the proposal as consistent by allowing and encouraging land uses compatible with the existing plans.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

There would be no adverse impacts to shoreline and land use as a result of the proposal; therefore, there are no mitigation measures being proposed.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The proposed Docketing Application is to amend the Comprehensive Plan map to allow future development consistent with the Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone. The District may decide in the future to surplus the property, which would require a formal surplus procedure.

Research for this application determined that a future subsequent multifamily development proposal would increase demands on transportation and/or public services and utilities. Those results were studied and are detailed within this Environmental Checklist. A Memorandum on transportation impacts is included with this application, as well as supplemental utility information.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

There are no proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demands as a part of this Docket Request application. A future development proposal would be subject to required studies and potential mitigation of impacts in accordance with the rules and regulations at the time of the proposal.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposed Docket Request is to amend the Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map and provide a consistent implementing zone for the Subject Site. There would be no conflict with local, state or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment as a result of the amendment request for a change to the map and rezone. The site is already developed and the request provides consistency with the regulations and laws. A future development proposal
would be subject to requirements for the protection of the environment in accordance with the rules and regulations at the time of the proposal.
APPENDIX IV

Provide one (1) current Title Certificate and a legal description of the property. A current title certificate is defined as one dated within thirty (30) days of this application.

Response: The Monroe School District has ordered a current Title Certificate (Plat Certificate Update #1), which includes the legal description of the property. It is submitted with the application packet.
CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
a corporation, herein called the Company

GUARANTEES

Monroe School District and Brent Planning Solutions

herein called the Assured, against actual loss not exceeding the liability amount stated in Schedule A which the Assured shall sustain by reason of any incorrectness in the assurances set forth in Schedule A.

LIABILITY EXCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

1. No guarantee is given nor liability assumed with respect to the identity of any party named or referred to in Schedule A or with respect to the validity, legal effect or priority of any matter shown therein.

2. The Company’s liability hereunder shall be limited to the amount of actual loss sustained by the Assured because of reliance upon the assurance herein set forth, but in no event shall the Company’s liability exceed the liability amount set forth in Schedule A.

Please note carefully the liability exclusions and limitations and the specific assurances afforded by this guarantee. If you wish additional liability, or assurances other than as contained herein, please contact the Company for further information as to the availability and cost.

Chicago Title Insurance Company
By:

President

Attest:

Secretary

Chicago Title Company of Washington
3002 Colby Ave., Suite 200
Everett, WA 98201

Countersigned By:

Authorized Officer or Agent
### SCHEDULE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Date: July 18, 2018 at 08:00 AM

The assurances referred to on the face page are:

That, according to those public records which, under the recording laws, impart constructive notice of matter relative to the following described property:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF

Title to said real property is vested in:

Monroe School District No. 103, a Washington municipal corporation as to Parcel B and portions of Parcel A; and Monroe School District No. 402, a Washington municipal corporation as to Parcel C and the remainder of Parcel A

subject to the matters shown below under Exceptions, which Exceptions are not necessarily shown in the order of their priority.

END OF SCHEDULE A
EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

For APN/Parcel ID(s): 27060100404500, 27060100100400 and 27060100205100

Parcel A:

(1) The East 1/2 of the following described tract:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;
thence East 161.33 feet;
thence South 135 feet;
thence West 161.33 feet;
thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(2) Also a portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 1;
thence East along the North line of said subdivision 161.33 feet to the Point of Beginning;
then thence continue East along said North line 120 feet;
thence South 135 feet to the North line of West Columbia Street;
thence West along the North line of Columbia Street 120 feet;
thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(3) Also beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;
thence East 281.33 feet to the true point of beginning;
then thence continue East 25.83 feet;
thence South 135.00 feet more or less to the North line of Columbia Street;
thence West 25.83 feet;
thence North 135.00 feet more or less to the true point of beginning;

(4) Also that portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast quarter said Section 1, lying East of Parcel A(3) and West of the following described line:
Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 1;
thence East 315.00 feet to the true point of beginning of this boundary line;
then thence South 16.7 feet;
thence West 8.34 feet;
then thence South 118.3 feet, more or less, to the North line of Columbia Street and the terminus of said boundary line.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel B:

All that portion of the Lots contained within Block 23 and 24, The Monroe Land and Improvement Co's Plat of Monroe, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 3 of Plats, page 57, records of Snohomish County, Washington, which lies within the South half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, together with that portion of the streets and alleys which would attach to said premises by operation of law as vacated in Volume 8 of Commissioner's Records on page 257; Except the East 30 feet thereof conveyed to City of Monroe by deed recorded under Auditor's File No. 900110281, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel C:

All that portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:
Commencing at the Southeast corner of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning; thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet; thence Northerly 462 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet; thence due South 380 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet; thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning.

Also, all that portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West 40 rods on 1/2 Section line; thence North 28 rods; thence East 40 rods to 1/2 Section line; thence South 28 rods to the Point of Beginning;

Except Road; and

Except the following described tract:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning; thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet; thence Northerly 462 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet; thence due South 380 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet; thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning; and

Except that portion lying within certain tract of land conveyed to John Watson and Verna Watson by deed recorded under Auditor's File No. 8402070117, records of Snohomish County, Washington; and

Except any portion thereof lying within the plat of Blueberry Manor, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 42 of Plats, pages 185 and 186, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.
SCHEDULE B

GENERAL EXCEPTIONS

A. Rights or claims of parties in possession, or claiming possession, not shown by the Public Records.

B. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land.

C. Easements, prescriptive rights, rights-of-way, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.

D. Any lien, or right to a lien, for contributions to employee benefit funds, or for state workers' compensation, or for services, labor, or material heretofore or hereafter furnished, all as imposed by law, and not shown by the Public Records.

E. Taxes or special assessments which are not yet payable or which are not shown as existing liens by the Public Records.

F. Any lien for service, installation, connection, maintenance, tap, capacity, or construction or similar charges for sewer, water, electricity, natural gas or other utilities, or for garbage collection and disposal not shown by the Public Records.

G. Unpatented mining claims, and all rights relating thereto.

H. Reservations and exceptions in United States Patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof.

I. Indian tribal codes or regulations, Indian treaty or aboriginal rights, including easements or equitable servitudes.

J. Water rights, claims or title to water.
SCHEDULE B
(continued)

SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS

1. No search has been made as to property taxes and assessments. Property taxes and assessments will be searched upon request.

2. Any irregularities, reservations, easements or other matters in the proceedings occasioning the abandonment or vacation of the street/road shown below:

   Name: various
   Recording No.: Volume 8 of Commissioner's Records, page 257
   Affects: Parcel B

3. Easement(s) for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereto, as granted in a document:

   Granted to: Puget Sound Power & Light Company
   Purpose: Electric transmission and/or distribution line
   Recording No.: 628605
   Affects: Portion of Parcel C

   The exact location and extent of said easement is not disclosed of record.

4. Reservations and recitals contained in the Deed:

   Grantor: Great Northern Railway Company, a Minnesota corporation
   Recording Date: October 31, 1963
   Recording No.: 1652883
   Affects: Portion of Parcel C

5. Covenants, conditions, restrictions, recitals, reservations, easements, easement provisions, dedications, building setback lines, notes, statements, and other matters, if any, but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, familial status, marital status, disability, handicap, national origin, ancestry, or source of income, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable law, as set forth on Survey:

   Recording No: 8402245009
   Affects: Parcel C

   (Note: We find no record of a deed contained within the East 13 feet of said subdivision)

6. Covenants, conditions, restrictions, recitals, reservations, easements, easement provisions, dedications, building setback lines, notes, statements, and other matters, if any, but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, familial status, marital status, disability, handicap, national origin, ancestry, or source of income, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable law, as set forth on Survey:

   Recording No: 8911215012
   Affects: Parcel B
7. Easement(s) for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereeto, as granted in a document:

   Granted to: Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County and Verizon Northwest Inc.
   Purpose: Underground and/or overhead electric transmission and/or distribution system
   Recording Date: April 20, 2010
   Recording No.: 201004200641
   Affects: Southwesterly portion of Parcel C

8. The Company's liability for this report is limited to $1,000.00. This report is based on the company's property records, and no liability is assumed for items misindexed or not indexed in the public records, or for matters which would be disclosed by an inquiry of the parties in possession or by an accurate survey or inspection of the premises. This report and the legal description given here are based upon information supplied by the applicant as to the location and identification of the premises in question, and no liability is assumed for discrepancies resulting therefrom. This report does not represent either a commitment to insure title, an examination of, or opinion as to the sufficiency or effect of the matter shown, or an opinion as to the marketability of title to the subject premises.

END OF SCHEDULE B
SKETCHES
CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
a corporation, herein called the Company

GUARANTEES

Monroe School District and Brent Planning Solutions

herein called the Assured, against actual loss not exceeding the liability amount stated in Schedule A which the Assured shall sustain by reason of any incorrectness in the assurances set forth in Schedule A.

LIABILITY EXCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

1. No guarantee is given nor liability assumed with respect to the identity of any party named or referred to in Schedule A or with respect to the validity, legal effect or priority of any matter shown therein.

2. The Company’s liability hereunder shall be limited to the amount of actual loss sustained by the Assured because of reliance upon the assurance herein set forth, but in no event shall the Company’s liability exceed the liability amount set forth in Schedule A.

Please note carefully the liability exclusions and limitations and the specific assurances afforded by this guarantee. If you wish additional liability, or assurances other than as contained herein, please contact the Company for further information as to the availability and cost.

Chicago Title Insurance Company of Washington
3002 Colby Ave., Suite 200
Everett, WA 98201

Countsersigned By: 
Acmon Doherty
Authorized Officer or Agent

President
Attest:
Secretary
ISSUING OFFICE:

Title Officer: Builder Unit
Chicago Title Company of Washington
3002 Colby Ave., Suite 200
Everett, WA 98201
Fax: (866)827-8844
Main Phone: (425)259-8223
Email: evebuilder@ctt.com

SCHEDULE A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$48.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Date: July 16, 2018 at 08:00 AM

The assurances referred to on the face page are:

That, according to those public records which, under the recording laws, impart constructive notice of matter relative to the following described property:

SEE EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF

Title to said real property is vested in:

Monroe School District No. 103, a Washington municipal corporation as to Parcel B and portions of Parcel A; and
Monroe School District No. 402, a Washington municipal corporation as to Parcel C and the remainder of Parcel A

subject to the matters shown below under Exceptions, which Exceptions are not necessarily shown in the order of their priority.

END OF SCHEDULE A
EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

For APN/Parcel ID(s): 27060100404500, 27060100100400 and 27060100205100

Parcel A:

(1) The East 1/2 of the following described tract:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;
thence East 161.33 feet;
thence South 135 feet;
thence West 161.33 feet;
thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(2) Also a portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 1;
thence East along the North line of said subdivision 161.33 feet to the Point of Beginning;
thence continue East along said North line 120 feet;
thence South 135 feet to the North line of West Columbia Street;
thence West along the North line of Columbia Street 120 feet;
thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(3) Also beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;
thence East 281.33 feet to the true point of beginning;
thence continue East 25.83 feet;
thence South 135.00 feet more or less to the North line of Columbia Street;
thence West 25.83 feet;
thence North 135.00 feet more or less to the true point of beginning;

(4) Also that portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast quarter said Section 1, lying East of Parcel A(3) and West of the following described line:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 1;
thence East 315.00 feet to the true point of beginning of this boundary line;
thence South 16.7 feet;
thence West 8.34 feet;
thence South 118.3 feet, more or less, to the North line of Columbia Street and the terminus of said boundary line.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel B:

All that portion of the lots contained within Block 23 and 24, The Monroe Land and Improvement Co's Plat of Monroe, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 3 of Plats, page 57, records of Snohomish County, Washington, which lies within the South half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, together with that portion of the streets and alleys which would attach to said premises by operation of law as vacated in Volume 8 of Commissioner's Records on page 257; Except the East 30 feet thereof conveyed to City of Monroe by deed recorded under Auditor's File No. 900110281, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel C:

All that portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:
EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

Commencing at the Southeast corner of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning; thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet; thence Northerly 462 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet; thence due South 380 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet; thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning.

Also, all that portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West 40 rods on 1/2 Section line; thence North 28 rods; thence East 40 rods to 1/2 Section line; thence South 28 rods to the Point of Beginning;

Except Road; and

Except the following described tract:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1; thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning; thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet; thence Northerly 462 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet; thence due South 380 feet; thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet; thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning; and

Except that portion lying within certain tract of land conveyed to John Watson and Verna Watson by deed recorded under Auditor's File No. 8402070117, records of Snohomish County, Washington; and

Except any portion thereof lying within the plat of Blueberry Manor, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 42 of Plats, pages 185 and 186, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.
GENERAL EXCEPTIONS

A. Rights or claims of parties in possession, or claiming possession, not shown by the Public Records.

B. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land.

C. Easements, prescriptive rights, rights-of-way, liens or encumbrances, or claims thereof, not shown by the Public Records.

D. Any lien, or right to a lien, for contributions to employee benefit funds, or for state workers' compensation, or for services, labor, or material heretofore or hereafter furnished, all as imposed by law, and not shown by the Public Records.

E. Taxes or special assessments which are not yet payable or which are not shown as existing liens by the Public Records.

F. Any lien for service, installation, connection, maintenance, tap, capacity, or construction or similar charges for sewer, water, electricity, natural gas or other utilities, or for garbage collection and disposal not shown by the Public Records.

G. Unpatented mining claims, and all rights relating thereto.

H. Reservations and exceptions in United States Patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof.

I. Indian tribal codes or regulations, Indian treaty or aboriginal rights, including easements or equitable servitudes.

J. Water rights, claims or title to water.
SCHEDULE B
(continued)

SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS

1. No search has been made as to property taxes and assessments. Property taxes and assessments will be searched upon request.

2. Any irregularities, reservations, easements or other matters in the proceedings occasioning the abandonment or vacation of the street/road shown below:

   Name: various
   Recording No.: Volume 8 of Commissioner's Records, page 257
   Affects: Parcel B

3. Easement(s) for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereto, as granted in a document:

   Granted to: Puget Sound Power & Light Company
   Purpose: Electric transmission and/or distribution line
   Recording No.: 626605
   Affects: Portion of Parcel C

   The exact location and extent of said easement is not disclosed of record.

4. Reservations and recitals contained in the Deed:

   Grantor: Great Northern Railway Company, a Minnesota corporation
   Recording Date: October 31, 1963
   Recording No.: 1652883
   Affects: Portion of Parcel C

5. Covenants, conditions, restrictions, recitals, reservations, easements, easement provisions, dedications, building setback lines, notes, statements, and other matters, if any, but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, familial status, marital status, disability, handicap, national origin, ancestry, or source of income, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable law, as set forth on Survey:

   Recording No: 8402245009
   Affects: Parcel C

   (Note: We find no record of a deed contained within the East 13 feet of said subdivision)

6. Covenants, conditions, restrictions, recitals, reservations, easements, easement provisions, dedications, building setback lines, notes, statements, and other matters, if any, but omitting any covenants or restrictions, if any, including but not limited to those based upon race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, familial status, marital status, disability, handicap, national origin, ancestry, or source of income, as set forth in applicable state or federal laws, except to the extent that said covenant or restriction is permitted by applicable law, as set forth on Survey:

   Recording No: 8911215012
   Affects: Parcel B
7. Snohomish County Regional Recreation Task Force Interlocal Agreement including the terms, covenants and provisions thereof

   Recording Date: March 4, 1998
   Recording No.: 9803040645

8. Easement(s) for the purpose(s) shown below and rights incidental thereto, as granted in a document:

   Granted to: Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County and Verizon Northwest Inc.
   Purpose: Underground and/or overhead electric transmission and/or distribution system
   Recording Date: April 20, 2010
   Recording No.: 201004200641
   Affects: Southwesterly portion of Parcel C

9. The Company's liability for this report is limited to $1,000.00. This report is based on the company's property records, and no liability is assumed for items misindexed or not indexed in the public records, or for matters which would be disclosed by an inquiry of the parties in possession or by an accurate survey or inspection of the premises. This report and the legal description given here are based upon information supplied by the applicant as to the location and identification of the premises in question, and no liability is assumed for discrepancies resulting therefrom. This report does not represent either a commitment to insure title, an examination of, or opinion as to the sufficiency or effect of the matter shown, or an opinion as to the marketability of title to the subject premises.

   END OF SCHEDULE B
Appendix A
Legal Description
EXHIBIT "A"
Legal Description

For APN/Parcel ID(s): 27060100404500, 27060100100400 and 27060100205100

Parcel A:

(1) The East 1/2 of the following described tract:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;

thence East 161.33 feet;

thence South 135 feet;

thence West 161.33 feet;

thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(2) Also a portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 1;

thence East along the North line of said subdivision 161.33 feet to the Point of Beginning;

thence continue East along said North line 120 feet;

thence South 135 feet to the North line of West Columbia Street;

thence West along the North line of Columbia Street 120 feet;

thence North 135 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(3) Also beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian;

thence East 281.33 feet to the true point of beginning;

thence continue East 25.83 feet;

thence South 135.00 feet more or less to the North line of Columbia Street;

thence West 25.83 feet;

thence North 135.00 feet more or less to the true point of beginning;

(4) Also that portion of the Northwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter said Section 1, lying East of Parcel A(3) and West of the following described line:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 1;

thence East 315.00 feet to the true point of beginning of this boundary line;

thence South 16.7 feet;

thence West 8.34 feet;

thence South 118.3 feet, more or less, to the North line of Columbia Street and the terminus of said boundary line.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel B:

All that portion of the lots contained within Block 23 and 24, The Monroe Land and Improvement Co's Plat of Monroe, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 3 of Plats, page 57, records of Snohomish County, Washington, which lies within the South half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, together with that portion of the streets and alleys which would attach to said premises by operation of law as vacated in Volume 8 of Commissioner's Records on page 257; Except the East 30 feet thereof conveyed to City of Monroe by deed recorded under Auditor's File No. 900110281, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.

Parcel C:

All that portion of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:
EXHIBIT "A"

Legal Description

Commencing at the Southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1;
then thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning;
then thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet;
then thence Northerly 462 feet;
then thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet;
then thence due South 380 feet;
then thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet;
then thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning.

Also, all that portion of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 1, Township 27 North, Range 6 East of
the Willamette Meridian, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 1;
then thence West 40 rods on 1/2 Section line;
then thence North 28 rods,
then thence East 40 rods to 1/2 Section line;
then thence South 28 rods to the Point of Beginning;

Except Road; and

Except the following described tract:

Beginning at the Southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 1;
then thence West along the East and West center line of said Section 1, 13 feet to the true point of beginning;
then thence continuing West, along said East and West center line 647 feet;
then thence Northerly 462 feet;
then thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 319 feet;
then thence due South 380 feet;
then thence Easterly parallel to said East and West center line, 328 feet;
then thence due South 82 feet of the true point of beginning; and

Except that portion lying within certain tract of land conveyed to John Watson and Verna Watson by deed recorded under
Auditor's File No. 8402070117, records of Snohomish County, Washington; and

Except any portion thereof lying within the plot of Blueberry Manor, according to the Plat thereof recorded in Volume 42 of
Plats, pages 185 and 188, records of Snohomish County, Washington.

Situate in the County of Snohomish, State of Washington.
Wetland Resources, Inc. performed a site investigation on June 6, 2018 to locate and identify jurisdictional wetlands and streams on and within the vicinity of the subject site located at 449 West Columbia Street in the City of Monroe, Washington. The Public Land Survey System (PLSS) locator for the subject property is Section 01, Township 27N, Range 06E, W.M.

The 12.41-acre subject site is currently developed with four sports fields, associated buildings, bleachers, and a parking lot. Vegetation on the site consists of maintained grasses, with some areas containing creeping buttercup (Ranunculus repens) and white clover (Trifolium repens). Topography of the property is generally flat, with the edges of the football and baseball fields slightly lower than the center of the fields.

**METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS**

Prior to conducting the site reconnaissance, public resource information was reviewed to gather background information on the subject property and the surrounding area in regards to wetlands, streams, and other critical areas. These sources included the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory (NWI), USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey, Snohomish County PDS Map Portal interactive mapping tool, WDFW Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) Interactive Map, and the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WA DNR) Forest Practices Application Mapping Tool (FPAMT).

- The National Wetlands Inventory does not show any wetlands on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. The closest mapped feature is a wetland associated with Woods Creek, about a half mile east of the site.

- USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey maps the soils underlying the site as Sultan silt loam.
• Snohomish County PDS Map Portal does not show any wetlands on or in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. The closest mapped feature is a wetland over 1,000 feet to the northeast of the site.

• WDFW PHS Mapper does not show any Priority Habitats or on or immediately adjacent to the subject site. The closest mapped habitat feature is a communal roost of Vaux’s swift approximately 600 feet to the south on the Frank Wager Elementary School campus.

• WA DNR FPAMT does not show any streams on or in the immediate vicinity of the site. The closest water body displayed is Woods Creek, over a half mile to the east of the site.

The ordinary high water marks (OHWM) of streams and waterbodies, if present, were identified using the methodology described in: Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington State (Anderson et al 2016).

Wetland areas, if present, were determined using the routine determination approach described in the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory 1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Version 2.0) (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2010). Under the routine methodology, the process for making a wetland determination is based on three steps:

1.) Examination of the site for hydrophytic vegetation (species present and percent cover);

2.) Examination of the site for hydric soils;

3.) Determining the presence of wetland hydrology

Dominant vegetation on-site consists of maintained grasses with some creeping buttercup (Ranunculus repens; FAC) and white clover (Trifolium repens; FAC). Large Douglas fir trees (Pseudotsuga menziesii; FACU) are present off-site along the southern boundary of the property. Soils within the football field were generally dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam in the upper 4 inches with a layer of sand below. Soils within the baseball/softball fields were generally dark brown (10YR 3/3) sandy loam or sandy clay loam in the upper layer with a dark yellowish brown (10YR 4/4) sandy loam in the sublayer. Soils were dry at the time of the June 6 site investigation, and no redoximorphic features were observed in the sampled soils. No evidence of previously ponded water, algal mats, scoured soils, or sorted cobble was observed on the property. Based on the results of the site investigation, there no wetlands or streams on the subject site.

Vaux’s Swift
The Vaux’s swift communal roost is designated a priority habitat per WDFW. Per the definition of “Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas” in Monroe Municipal Code 20.05.030, priority habitats designated by WDFW are considered habitats of local importance and therefore are Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas. The communal roost is approximately 600 feet from the subject site, is within the chimney of an elementary school building, and within a developed residential area. There are currently no trees on the subject property, so any development on the site will not remove any trees or snags that may currently be utilized by the Vaux’s swift. Development
or construction on the subject property would not physically affect the chimney where the roost is located. Any development on the subject property would not impact the designated priority habitat area.

**USE OF THIS REPORT**

This Wetland and Stream Determination Report has been prepared for the Monroe School District #103 to assist with identifying on-site and nearby critical areas as required by the City of Monroe. This report is based largely on readily observable conditions and, to a lesser extent, on readily ascertainable conditions. No attempt has been made to determine hidden or concealed conditions.

The laws applicable to critical areas are subject to varying interpretations and may be changed at any time by the courts or legislative bodies. This report is intended to provide information deemed relevant in the applicant's attempt to comply with the laws now in effect.

This report conforms to the standard of care employed by ecologists. No other representation or warranty is made concerning the work or this report and any implied representation or warranty is disclaimed.

*Wetland Resources, Inc.*

Meryl Kamowski  
*Senior Ecologist*

Enclosures:  
- Wetland Determination Data Sheets  
- Determination Map (Sheet 1/1)
**WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region**

Project/Site: 18175 - Monroe SD  
City/County: Monroe / Snohomish  
Sampling Date: 6/6/18

Applicant/Owner: Monroe School District  
State: WA  
Sampling Point: S1

Investigator(s): Meryl Kamowski  
Section, Township, Range: S1,T27N,R06E

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.):  
Local relief (concave, convex, none):  
Slope (%):  

Subregion (LRR): LRR-A  
Lat: 47.8560433  
Long: -121.9793551  
Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Sultan Silt Loam  
NWI classification: none

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year?  Yes[✔]  No[ ]  (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed?  
Are "Normal Circumstances" present?  Yes[✔]  No[ ]

Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally problematic?  
(If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?</th>
<th>Yes[✔]  No[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydric Soil Present?</td>
<td>Yes[✔]  No[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Hydrology Present?</td>
<td>Yes[✔]  No[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?  Yes[✔]  No[ ]

Remarks:
Southern portion of football field

**VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.**

**Tree Stratum** (Plot size: 5m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sapling/Shrub Stratum** (Plot size: 3m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>= Total Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Herb Stratum** (Plot size: 1m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>various grasses (mowed)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifolium repens</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>= Total Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Woody Vine Stratum** (Plot size: 3m²)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>= Total Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Remarks:**

Unable to identify grass species since the field is regularly mowed. Grass was very short and lacking inflorescence. Given the lack of hydric soils or hydrology, the grasses are not hydrophitic.
**SOIL**

**Profile Description:** (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Color (moist)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-12</td>
<td>10YR 5/3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hydric Soil Indicators:** (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)

- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

**Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:**

- 2 cm Muck (A10)
- Red Parent Material (TF2)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Restrictive Layer (if present):**

- Type: __________________________
- Depth (inches): ____________________

**Hydric Soil Present?** Yes [ ] No [ √ ]

**Remarks:**

---

**HYDROLOGY**

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)
- Drift Deposits (B3)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- Iron Deposits (B5)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)
- Salt Crust (B11)
- Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)
- Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1) (LRR A)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Geomorphic Position (D2)
- Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
- Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

**Field Observations:**

- Surface Water Present? Yes [ ] No [ √ ]
- Water Table Present? Yes [ ] No [ √ ]
- Saturation Present? Yes [ ] No [ √ ]

**Wetland Hydrology Present?** Yes [ ] No [ √ ]

**Remarks:**

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:
### VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>% Cover</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree Stratum</td>
<td>5m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sapling/Shrub Stratum</td>
<td>3m²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Stratum</td>
<td>1m²</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>various grasses (mowed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ranunculus repens</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hypochaeris radicata</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FACU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Vine Stratum</td>
<td>3m²</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>= Total Cover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum | 0 |

### Remarks:
Unable to identify grass species since the field is regularly mowed. Grass was very short and lacking inflorescence. Given the lack of hydric soils and hydrology, the grasses are not hydrophitic.
### SOIL

**Profile Description:** (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Matrix Description</th>
<th>Redox Features</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Clay Loam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-16</td>
<td>7.5YR 4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Type:** C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.
2. **Location:** PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix.

### Hydric Soil Indicators:

- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Eppedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

### Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:

- 2 cm Muck (A10)
- Red Parent Material (TF2)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

### Restrictive Layer (if present):

- Type:________________________________
- Depth (inches):________________________

**Hydric Soil Present?** Yes [ ] No [x]

**Remarks:**

---

### HYDROLOGY

**Wetland Hydrology Indicators:**

- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)
- Drift Deposits (B3)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- Iron Deposits (B5)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- Salt Crust (B11)
- Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)
- Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)
- Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

**Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):**

- Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Geomorphic Position (D2)
- Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
- Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

**Field Observations:**

- **Surface Water Present?** Yes [ ] No [x] Depth (inches):__________
- **Water Table Present?** Yes [ ] No [x] Depth (inches):__________
- **Saturation Present?** Yes [ ] No [x] Depth (inches):__________

**Wetland Hydrology Present?** Yes [ ] No [x]

**Remarks:**

---

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

**Remarks:**

---
WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project/Site: 18175 - Monroe SD  City/County: Monroe / Snohomish  Sampling Date: 6/6/18
Applicant/Owner: Monroe School District  State: WA  Sampling Point: S3
Investigator(s): Meryl Kamowski  Section, Township, Range: S1,T27N,R06E

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.):  Local relief (concave, convex, none):  Slope (%):  
Subregion (LRR): LRR-A  Lat: 47.8559563  Long: -121.9810241  Datum: NAD83
Soil Map Unit Name: Sultan Silt Loam  NWI classification: none

Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes  No  (If no, explain in Remarks.)
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed?  Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes  No
Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology naturally problematic?  (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes  No  
Hydric Soil Present? Yes  No  
Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes  No  
Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes  No  
Remarks: Northern portion of baseball fields

VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Stratum (Plot size: 5m²)</th>
<th>Absolute % Cover</th>
<th>Dominant Species?</th>
<th>Indicator Status</th>
<th>Dominance Test worksheet:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Dominant Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Species Across All Strata: (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Species That Are OBL,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACW, or FAC: (A/B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence Index worksheet:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total % Cover of: Multiply by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OBL species x 1 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACW species x 2 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC species x 3 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FACU species x 4 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPL species x 5 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Column Totals: (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevalence Index = (B/A)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Vegetation Indicators:

- Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- Dominance Test is >50%
- Prevalence Index is ≤3.0
- Morphological Adaptations (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- Wetland Non-Vascular Plants
- Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation (Explain)

Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes  No  

Remarks:

Unable to identify grass species since the field is regularly mowed. Grass was very short and lacking inflorescence. Given the lack of hydric soils and hydrology, the grasses are not hydrophitic.
### Soil Profile Description:
(Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (inches)</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Color (moist)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>10YR 3/3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-16</td>
<td>10YR 4/4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Loam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.)
- Histosol (A1)
- Histic Epipedon (A2)
- Black Histic (A3)
- Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1)
- Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils:
- 2 cm Muck (A10)
- Red Parent Material (TF2)
- Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- Other (Explain in Remarks)

Restrictive Layer (if present):
- Type: __________
- Depth (inches): __________

Hydric Soil Present? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Remarks:

### Hydrology

#### Wetland Hydrology Indicators:
**Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply):**
- Surface Water (A1)
- High Water Table (A2)
- Saturation (A3)
- Water Marks (B1)
- Sediment Deposits (B2)
- Drift Deposits (B3)
- Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- Iron Depots (B5)
- Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)

**Secondary Indicators (2 or more required):**
- Water-Stained Leaves (B9) (except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)
- Drainage Patterns (B10)
- Dry-Season Water Table (C2)
- Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- Geomorphic Position (D2)
- Shallow Aquitard (D3)
- FAC-Neutral Test (D5)
- Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)
- Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)

#### Field Observations:
- Surface Water Present? Yes [ ] No [ ] Depth (inches): __________
- Water Table Present? Yes [ ] No [ ] Depth (inches): __________
- Saturation Present? Yes [ ] No [ ] Depth (inches): __________

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes [ ] No [ ]

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:
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MEMORANDUM

To: Laura Brent, Brent Planning Solutions
From: Matthew Palmer, P.E.
Subject: Rezone Analysis for Mid-rise Apartments
Date: July 12, 2018
Project: Monroe School District Rezone, GTC #18-166

Gibson Traffic Consultants, Inc. (GTC) has been retained to provide a rezone volume analysis for 296 multi-family units in 3-story buildings located north of Columbia Street between S Kelsey Street and Dickinson Road in the City of Monroe. The purpose of this memorandum is to document the preliminary trip generation and to compare the total entering volume of 19 study intersections to the 2035 volumes identified in the City’s Appendix A: Traffic Operations Level of Service of the Transportation Plan.

ASSUMPTIONS

The existing volumes collected in the Transportation Plan are from 2014; therefore, to grow them to the baseline 2023 volumes a growth factor of 15% was utilized. This was calculated by using 2% growth per year from 2014 to 2020 and then 1% per year from 2020 to 2023. This is consistent with State growth on US-2 in the site vicinity and city forecasting. For the two intersections that were counted by Traffic Data Gathering (TDG) in June 2018 a growth factor of 7% was utilized; 2% growth per year from 2018 to 2020 and then 1% per year from 2020 to 2023.

The year 2023 was utilized as the baseline year as it’s when the apartment buildings could be built and fully occupied. The development would create a connecting roadway that would parallel Columbia Street with access to Kelsey Street approximately 170 feet north of Columbia Street and connecting to Columbia Street opposite Dickinson Road.

TRIP GENERATION

Traffic generation for the development is based on national research data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 10th Edition (2017). ITE Land Use Code 223, mid-rise apartment, is utilized for the proposed use. There will be a total of 296 apartment units under a 3-story scenario. This would generate 1,610 ADT and 130 PM peak-hour trips. The trip generation is summarized on Table 1.
Trip generation calculations in the attachments also shows the trip generation for a low-rise apartment scenario, but this would have a lower number of units which leads to fewer trips being generated. Therefore, the mid-rise trip generation was utilized as the highest potential use for the volume analysis. No credit/reduction has been taken for existing uses on the site therefore this is a conservatively high analysis of new trip generation.

### Table 1: Trip Generation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monroe School District Rezone</th>
<th>PM Peak-Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise Apartments 296 Units</td>
<td>Rate 0.44 per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splits</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trips have been distributed through the 19 study intersections per the distribution shown in Figure 1 which is based on other residential distributions in the City of Monroe. Traffic heading to the west of the development using Columbia Street could continue west to 182nd Avenue SE bypassing the intersection of King Street and Blueberry Lane/154th Street SE (Intersection #40); however, as a worst case the westbound traffic was routed onto King Street impacting the study intersection.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The potential rezone would add vehicle trips to several City intersections that are projected to operate at level of service E or F in 2035. However, the city has established a corridor level of service for its concurrency evaluation. Based on the concurrency corridor analysis contained in the City’s operational level of service appendix of the City’s Transportation Plan the future 2035 level of service of the corridors are all expected to operate at acceptable level of service D or better with the highest corridor delay being on W Main Street East corridor that has a projected delay of 50 second per entering vehicle. The four intersections that the rezone adds any measurable trips to are:

- Main Street/Frylands Blvd (Int #9)
- Main Street Ramps with SR-522 (Int #10, 11)
- Main Street/179th Street (Int #29)

Table 2 shows that the proposed rezone would add between 0.4% to 1.55% increase in volume to those corridor intersections or an average of less than 1% increase to the highest delay concurrency corridor. The plan shows that W Main Street East corridor has a projected delay in 2035 of 50 seconds (without school rezone) while 55 seconds appears to be the threshold for LOS E i.e. a delay increase capacity of approximately 10% before LOS E is likely to be reached.
The rezone has the highest increase in trips % to the intersection of King Street and Blueberry Lane/154th Street SE i.e. 6.06% (Comp Plan Int #40) that is within the 154th Street SE concurrency corridor. The other intersections in that corridor experience a 2-3% increase in intersection volumes or approximately a 3-4% corridor increase. The intersection of King Street and Blueberry Lane is forecast in the city plan to operate at LOS B and the corridor a LOS C with 33 seconds of delay i.e. over 40% delay increase capacity before reaching corridor threshold.

All corridors are projected to be operating approximately 10-45% within the capacity of the 2035 capital facilities plan level of service projections. Therefore, GTC concludes that the City concurrency corridors with just a 1-4% average increase in volumes from school traffic would still operate at acceptable level of service with the proposed rezone.
### Table 2: Volume Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing TEV</th>
<th>Baseline TEV</th>
<th>School Rezone PM Peak Trips</th>
<th>With School TEV</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative (2035) with Capital Plan</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative (2035) with Capital Plan</th>
<th>% Increase With School (2035)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int Letter</td>
<td>Int No.</td>
<td>Int Name</td>
<td>Existing TEV</td>
<td>Baseline TEV</td>
<td>With School TEV</td>
<td>Preferred TEV</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>154th St SE &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>1,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Fryelands Blvd</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; East SR 522 RAB</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,537</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; West SR 522 RAB</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>3,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Main St &amp; Lewis St</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>2151</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>2,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; E Main St</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>3,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N Lewis St &amp; SR 2</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,148</td>
<td>5,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chain Lake Rd &amp; Tjerne Pl SE</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>2,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tjerne Pl SE &amp; N Kelsey St</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N Kelsey St &amp; Chain Lake Rd</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Blueberry Ln &amp; N Kelsey</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>4805</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4,838</td>
<td>6,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>3,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>2,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>King St &amp; 154th St/Blueberry</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>179th Ave SE &amp; 147th St SE</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia St &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trip Generation
## Trip Generation for: Weekday (a.k.a.): Average Weekday Daily Trips (AWDT)

**NET EXTERNAL TRIPS BY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USES</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITE LU code</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>% IN</th>
<th>% OUT</th>
<th>% of Gross Trips</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Ext. Trips</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Ext. Trips</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Ext. Trips</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>PASS-BY</th>
<th>DIVERTED LINK</th>
<th>NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>296 units</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1610.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Low-Rise)</td>
<td>225 units</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1647.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monroe School District Rezone
GTC #18-166
Trip Generation for: Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, One Hour between 4 and 6 PM
(a.k.a.): Weekday PM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USES</th>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>ITE LU code</th>
<th>Trip Rate</th>
<th>% IN</th>
<th>% OUT</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Gross Trips</th>
<th>Trips In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Ext. Trips</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
<th>% of Ext. Trips</th>
<th>In+Out (Total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>296 units</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Low-Rise)</td>
<td>225 units</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET EXTERNAL TRIPS BY TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN BOTH DIRECTIONS</th>
<th>DIRECTIONAL ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PASS-BY</td>
<td>DIVERTED LINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (Low-Rise)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>New ADT</td>
<td>New PM Peak Hour Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64.40</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>80.50</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>96.60</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>112.70</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>128.80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>144.90</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>161.00</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>177.10</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>193.20</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>209.30</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>225.40</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>257.60</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>273.70</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>290.80</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>305.90</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>322.00</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>338.10</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>354.20</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>370.30</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>386.40</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>402.50</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>418.60</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>434.70</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>450.80</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>466.90</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>483.00</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>499.10</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>515.20</td>
<td>16.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>531.30</td>
<td>16.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>547.40</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>563.50</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>579.60</td>
<td>18.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>595.70</td>
<td>18.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>611.80</td>
<td>19.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>627.90</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>644.00</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>660.10</td>
<td>20.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>676.20</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>692.30</td>
<td>21.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>708.40</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>724.50</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
<td>740.60</td>
<td>23.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>756.70</td>
<td>23.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>772.80</td>
<td>24.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>788.90</td>
<td>24.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>805.00</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 – PM Trip Distribution
Counts
FOR INTRS. 3.8%

PHF = Peak Hour Factor
HV = Heavy Vehicle

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
<td>#N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRS.</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woodinville, WA
## Traffic Data Gathering

### Intersection Turning Movements Reduction Sheet

**Location:** W Columbia Street @ N Kelsey Street  
**Date of Count:** Wed, 6/13/18  
**Counted By:** TDG  
**Time of Count:** 2:00 PM - 6:00 PM  
**Date of Reduction:** 6/13/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Interval Ending</th>
<th>From North On</th>
<th>From South On</th>
<th>From East On</th>
<th>From West On</th>
<th>Interval Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peds</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>HV</td>
<td>U-Turn</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4:00 PM - 6:00 PM Peak Hour:** 4:45 PM to 5:45 PM

### Rolling Hour Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Interval Ending</th>
<th>From North On</th>
<th>From South On</th>
<th>From East On</th>
<th>From West On</th>
<th>Interval Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peds</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>HV</td>
<td>U-Turn</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TURNING MOVEMENTS DIAGRAM

4:00 PM - 6:00 PM PEAK HOUR: 4:30 PM TO 5:30 PM

Main Street @ Dickinson Street
Woodinville, WA

COUNTED BY: TDG
DATE OF COUNT: Wed. 6/13/18
REDUCTION DATE: Wed. 6/13/18
TIME OF COUNT: 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM

PHF = Peak Hour Factor
HV = Heavy Vehicle
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME INTERVAL</th>
<th>FROM NORTH ON</th>
<th>FROM SOUTH ON</th>
<th>FROM EAST ON</th>
<th>FROM WEST ON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM - 3:00 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 PM - 3:15 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM - 3:30 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM - 3:45 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM - 4:00 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM - 4:15 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM - 4:30 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM - 4:45 PM</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM - 5:00 PM</td>
<td>4 0 4 0</td>
<td>9 0 9 0</td>
<td>13 0 13 0</td>
<td>15 0 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM - 5:15 PM</td>
<td>2 0 2 0</td>
<td>7 0 7 0</td>
<td>12 0 12 0</td>
<td>15 0 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>2 0 1 0</td>
<td>5 1 5 1</td>
<td>13 0 13 0</td>
<td>13 0 13 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM - 5:45 PM</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>2 1 2 1</td>
<td>9 0 9 0</td>
<td>9 0 9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM - 6:00 PM</td>
<td>1 0 1 0</td>
<td>4 1 4 1</td>
<td>8 0 8 0</td>
<td>11 0 11 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4:00 PM - 6:00 PM PEAK HOUR:**

- FROM SOUTH ON: 501
- FROM NORTH ON: 19
- FROM EAST ON: 22
- FROM WEST ON: 22

**4:00 PM - 6:00 PM PEAK HOUR FACTOR:**

- FROM SOUTH ON: 0.61
- FROM NORTH ON: 0.53
- FROM WEST ON: 0.93
- FROM EAST ON: 0.92

**ROLLING HOUR COUNTS:**

- 4:00 PM - 6:00 PM: 880
- 4:00 PM - 5:00 PM: 447
- 5:00 PM - 6:00 PM: 433

**INTERSECTION TURNING MOVEMENTS REDUCTION SHEET**

- Main Street & Dickinson Street
- Dickinson Street
- Main Street
- Dickinson Street
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor/Subarea</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Existing (2014)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TEV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Fryelands Blvd SE</td>
<td>1 Foothills Rd &amp; Roosevelt Rd</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 SR 2 &amp; Fryelands Blvd</td>
<td>2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Fryelands Blvd &amp; Tye St</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Fryelands Blvd &amp; 146th St SE</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Fryelands Blvd &amp; Wales St</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Fryelands Blvd &amp; 154th St SE</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 W Main St &amp; Fryelands Blvd</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-1</strong> US 2 West</td>
<td>2 SR 2 &amp; Fryelands Blvd</td>
<td>2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 SR 2 &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>2,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-2</strong> US 2 East</td>
<td>26 SR 522 off and on ramps to US 2</td>
<td>2,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 SR 2 &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 N Lewis St &amp; SR 2</td>
<td>3,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 SR 2 &amp; E Main St</td>
<td>2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-1</strong> Chain Lake Rd North</td>
<td>39 Chain Lake Rd &amp; Brown Rd</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 Chain Lake Rd &amp; Country</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Chain Lake Rd &amp; Rainier View Rd</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-2</strong> Chain Lake Rd South</td>
<td>20 N Kelsey St &amp; Chain Lake Rd</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 Chain Lake Rd &amp; Tjerne Pl SE</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 N Lewis St &amp; SR 2</td>
<td>3,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-3</strong> S Lewis St</td>
<td>37 Hill St &amp; Lewis St</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Main St &amp; Lewis St</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34 S Lewis St &amp; McDougall St</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 S Lewis St &amp; Powell St</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 S Lewis St &amp; Sumac Dr</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor/Subarea</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Existing (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEV¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1 N Kelsey St North</td>
<td>N Kelsey St &amp; Chain Lake Rd³</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1 N Kelsey St North</td>
<td>N Kelsey St &amp; Galaxy Way</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1 N Kelsey St North</td>
<td>Tjerne Pl SE &amp; N Kelsey St</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1 N Kelsey St North</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2 N Kelsey St South</td>
<td>Blueberry Ln &amp; N Kelsey</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2 N Kelsey St South</td>
<td>N Kelsey St &amp; W Hill St</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2 N Kelsey St South</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 154th St SE</td>
<td>Fryelands Blvd &amp; 154th St SE</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 154th St SE</td>
<td>154th St SE &amp; Currie St</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 154th St SE</td>
<td>154th St SE &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 154th St SE</td>
<td>King St &amp; 154th St/Blueberry Ln</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 154th St SE</td>
<td>Blueberry Ln &amp; N Kelsey</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>2,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>179th Ave SE &amp; 147th St SE</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>179th Ave SE &amp; 149th St SE</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>154th St SE &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 W Main St West</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Fryelands Blvd</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 W Main St West</td>
<td>W Main St on and off ramp from 522³</td>
<td>1,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 W Main St West</td>
<td>W Main St roundabout at NB SR 522</td>
<td>1,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 W Main St West</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; 177th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1 W Main St West</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; 179th Ave SE</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 W Main St East</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Kelsey St</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 W Main St East</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; S Madison St⁴</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4 6**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor/Subarea</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Weekday PM Peak Hour Traffic Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing (2014)</td>
<td>Preferred Alternative (2035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEV(^1) Delay LOS(^2)</td>
<td>TEV(^1) Delay LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W Main St &amp; Fremont St(^4)</td>
<td>966 17 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Main St &amp; Lewis St</td>
<td>1,870 27 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR 2 &amp; E Main St</td>
<td>2,587 27 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>21 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Woods Creek Rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Woods Creek Rd &amp; Ingraham Rd</td>
<td>628 9 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Woods Creek Rd &amp; Country Crescent Blvd</td>
<td>732 13 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Woods Creek Rd &amp; Tjerne Pl SE(^5)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Weighted Average</strong></td>
<td>11 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Intersections Not Part of a Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Columbia Street &amp; King Street</td>
<td>210 10 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 TEV = Total Entering Volume (PM peak hour)  
2 LOS = Level of Service  
3 Currently being converted to roundabout  
4 Mitigation assumes conversion to roundabout as part of Main Street Gateway project. Alternately, the final redesign of these intersections could also include the installation of a traffic signal. A traffic signal would operate at LOS A/B for each intersection.  
5 New signalized intersection with Tjerne Pl SE extension from Chain Lake Rd to Woods Creek Rd
DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

File Number: SEPA 2018-15

Name of Proposal: City of Monroe 2018-2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket

Description of Proposal: Consideration of applications for proposed revisions to the City of Monroe 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan to be reviewed as part of the 2018 - 2019 annual amendment cycle. The proposed amendments include the following:

CA2018-01 – Monroe School District # 103 is proposing a citizen-initiated Comprehensive Plan amendment and associated rezone for the 12.4 acre Memorial Stadium and Marshall Field site. The current Comprehensive Plan map designation of the site is Institutional and the current zoning district is Institutional. The School District is requesting to modify the site’s Future Land Use Map designation from Institutional to Multifamily. The applicant is also requesting a rezone of the subject property from Institutional to Multifamily Residential - R25.

Proponent(s): City of Monroe, 806 West Main Street, Monroe, WA 98155

Location(s) of Proposal: The subject site is identified by Snohomish County Assessor’s tax parcel numbers 27060100205100, 27060100100400, and 270601000404500. The subject property is situated approximately south of West Maple Street, west of north Kelsey Street, north of West Columbia Street, and east of St. Mary of the Valley Church.

Lead Agency: City of Monroe

Threshold Determination: The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) IS NOT required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public for review upon request at Monroe City Hall, 806 West Main Street, Monroe, WA 98272 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

☐ There is no comment period for this DNS.

☐ This DNS is issued after using the optional DNS process in WAC 197-11-355. There is no further comment period on the DNS.

☒ This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date below.

Responsible Official: Ben Swanson, Community Development Director

SEPA Responsible Official
(360) 863-4544
Monroe City Hall
806 West Main Street
Monroe, WA 98272
bswanson@monroewa.gov
Date: 7/1/19       Signature: ____________________________

Date of Issuance: July 3, 2019

Deadline for Submitting Comments: No later than 5:00 p.m. on July 17, 2019

Appeals: You may appeal this determination to the City of Monroe Hearing Examiner at Monroe City Hall, which is located at 806 West Main Street, Monroe, WA 98272, no later than 5:00 p.m. on July 17, 2019. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections; and you shall set forth the specific reason, rationale, and/or basis for the appeal. Appeals must be made in person on City appeal forms, which are available through the Community Development Department at Monroe City Hall. Appeals must be filed in original form in accordance with MMC Chapter 22.84. Payment of the appeal fee, as specified in the city’s fee resolution, shall occur at the time the appeal is filed. Please contact Kim Shaw, Land Use Permit Supervisor, by email at kshhaw@monroewa.gov or by phone at (360) 863-4532 to read or ask about the procedures for SEPA appeals.

Staff Contact: Questions about the proposal may be directed to Shana Restall, Principal Planner, at srrestall@monroewa.gov or (360) 863-4608.
October 8, 2019

Ben Swanson
Community Development Director
City of Monroe
806 West Main Street
Monroe, WA 98272

RE: Monroe Docketing (CPA2018-01/RZ2018-01)
Monroe School District – Marshall Field & Memorial Stadium Historic Information

Dear Mr. Swanson,

The Monroe School District (MSD) has received supplemental information for the historic field (Marshall Field and Memorial Stadium) from the Historic Society. A number of articles were located which contain historic details for the acquisition of the property and later the relocation of a new veterans memorial marker.

The articles discuss the purchase of the field in 1929, the naming of the field in 1946 and the placement of the bronze plaque in 1951. The articles highlight the efforts of the Arthur Kincaid Post of the America Legion in the lighting of the field and the bronze plaque. The intent of the plaque was to honor Monroe High School students lost during World War II. In 2013 an effort began to refurbish the memorial and collect names that were missing. As a result of that effort by community members, a new monument was constructed and located at Lake Tye Park. A groundbreaking ceremony was held on June 2, 2016. The brass plaque from the original monument was transferred to the new memorial.

The listing below is the articles outlining these events. All of the articles are included in the attachment to this letter.

Monroe Schools Out For Vacation, The Monroe Monitor, June 7, 1929

Hibbit’s Property Last Available Site In Monroe For School Purposes; Can Buy 4.85 Acre Tract For $3000, The Monroe Monitor, June 21, 1929

Dedicate Athletic Field In Honor Of Students Who Died In Service, The Monroe Monitor, September 12, 1946
http://mhs.stparchive.com/Archive/MHS/MHS09121946p01.php?tags=memorial|athletic|field

http://mhs.stparchive.com/Archive/MHS/MHS09261946p01.php?tags=memorial|field
Legion To Dedicate War Memorial May 30, The Monroe Monitor, March 15, 1951
http://mhs.stparchive.com/Archive/MHS/MHS03151951P01.php?tags=memorial|field|dedication

Monroe veterans monument unveiled, Tribune, November 9, 2016
Photo – New Veterans Memorial Marker with Original Plaque; Source: Monroe School District, 2019

This additional information is provided in response to comments related to the Monroe School District “Docket Application”. If you have questions related to this information, please contact me at 425.971.6409.

Sincerely,

Laura S. Brent

cc: John Mannix, Monroe School District
    Dr. Fredica Smith

Attachments (as described)
Monroe veterans monument unveiled

Eagle Scout Sam Thomas, 18, of Sultan (right) and American Legion Post 53 Chaplin Boyd Boze unveil the Veterans Memorial monument at Lake Tye Park in Monroe on Saturday, Nov. 5. Despite the rain, a group of Skykomish Valley residents along with veterans from throughout Snohomish County gathered for the dedication and unveiling ceremony.
American Legion Plans Three-Day Celebration Here on Fourth of July

Barbecue Will Feature Street Dance, Nighttime Entertainment

Interest and support of the American Legion are indicated by the large crowd that gathered here on Saturday night to enjoy the entertainment provided by the Legionnaires and their guests. The event included a street dance, a fireworks display, and a twilight concert, providing a memorable experience for all who attended.

The American Legion has announced plans for a three-day celebration to be held on the Fourth of July. The celebration will feature a parade, a community picnic, and a fireworks display. The exact details of the event are still being finalized, but it is expected to be a fun-filled weekend for everyone in the area.

Phil G. Warnock Makes Fine Talk Before Kiwanians

The Kiwanis Club of this city held their regular weekly meeting last night at the Masonic Temple. Following a brief business meeting, a dinner was served to the members and guests. After dinner, the club's speaker for the evening, Mr. Phil G. Warnock, delivered an address on the subject of "The Importance of Community Service." The speech was well received by the audience, who appreciated Warnock's insights and enthusiasm for community involvement.

Robert Shannahan Dangerously Hurt in 12-Foot Fall

A report from the local hospital indicates that Mr. Robert Shannahan, who was injured in a fall from a height of 12 feet while working on a construction site, is in critical condition. The fall occurred during the afternoon, and Mr. Shannahan was rushed to the hospital immediately. The hospital staff has reported that he is in a coma and that his condition is currently unstable. The hospital is seeking donations to help cover the medical expenses associated with his care.

State Auditor Approves Heartly of School Management in District No. 323

The state auditor has approved the financial statements of District No. 323, showing a surplus of $80,000. The auditor's report was received with enthusiasm by the school board, who thanked the auditor for his hard work and dedication to ensuring the financial integrity of the district.

New Motor Code to Be Effective Soon

Information to be Available at Garages and Tyre Stores

The new motor code, which will go into effect soon, will require all motor vehicles to be equipped with a certain type of safety feature. The code is expected to improve road safety and reduce the number of accidents. The code will be enforced by local authorities, and non-compliance will result in fines.

Yellow Cab Nine Loses to Monroe

Seattle Yacht Club Defeated by Poacher's sinking This Weekend

The Seattle Yacht Club has suffered a setback in their bid to compete in the upcoming regatta. The team lost to the Monroe Yacht Club in a close race that went down to the wire. The poachers were unable to make up for their early advantage, and the Monroe team crossed the finish line first.

Caterpillar Horses May Destroy Fruit

Worn Invasion Unusually Serious This Year

This year's infestation of caterpillar hordes has been particularly severe, with the insects destroying a large amount of fruit in the area. The infestation has been attributed to the unusually warm and humid weather conditions, which provide ideal conditions for the caterpillars to thrive.

Monroe Schools Out for Vacation

School Authorities Busy With Plans for Reopening of High School

The Monroe school district is currently closed due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The school authorities are busy with plans to reopen the high school in the near future, and they are working closely with local health officials to ensure that the reopening is done safely and responsibly.

SWEDISH CHURCH WILL PRODUCE MUSICAL PROGRAM

A musical program is being planned by the Swedish Church in honor of the 50th anniversary of the church. The program will feature a combination of classical and contemporary music, and it is expected to be a highlight of the celebration.

V HOSPITAL SUBMITS REPORT

The hospital submitted its monthly report to the local health department. The report covers the number of patients admitted, discharged, and the number of cases treated. The hospital is currently working to improve its quality of care and to enhance patient satisfaction.

NO WAY TO PREVENT IT

John Cummings is a member of the city council and is currently working on a proposal to address the issue of litter in the city. The proposal includes measures to reduce the amount of litter and to improve the cleanliness of the city's streets and parks.

Pharmacist

John Cummings is a pharmacist and is currently working on a proposal to address the issue of drug abuse in the city. The proposal includes measures to reduce the availability of drugs and to provide treatment options for those struggling with drug addiction.
Sen. H. Mitchell
Favors Schools

Sen. Hugh H. Mitchell while en
route to the national capital for the
last Thursday afternoon declared that
the State Senate should provide
reorganization, the education of Wash-
ington's children merited one of its
first places.

"In all of the cities and towns I
have been in, I have found that the
people are anxious to have the
school facilities in their communities
improved, and that the time is inau-
quate to meet these demands," he said.

"School people have been doing the
best they could under the conditions,
and all through Central Washington,
we have had the best schools in the
State."

Senator Mitchell is commenting on
the report issued recently by Dr.
Franklin E. Child, who is chairman of
the Education Committee of the
State Senate.

Mr. Child said that the spirit of the
legislature in providing for the
school improvement is not
adequate, and that the people of
Washington State have a war-
evolution to be carried out to
complete the work that has been
begun.

The people of the State have
been told that the materials which
were won in the war are now
required and that new and inexhaustible
sources of materials must be
found. The people of the State
must be ready to meet the needs of
the children and to make the
schools as good as they can.

Mitchell advocated a public works
program, including railway
construction, and said that there
was a large amount of federal
money available for the purpose.

"We have a great and growing
population of children, and we
must do something for them," he
said. "Our obligation is to provide for
them the best education possible.

PURCHASE MODERN HOME ON BLAKELY STREET

Mr. and Mrs. M. N. Mason, Olympia, have purchased a modern four-
room home on Blakely street from the
Northwest Farmer's Cooperative Union, recently acquired property. The sale
was to be completed within the week.

OF MONROE MEMORIAL ATHLETIC FIELD

With lights shining brightly from
over 120 feet, the stadium was
packed to capacity yesterday, as
the official dedication of the
Monroe Memorial Athletic Field
took place. The dedication was
the first step in a program to
very important to the community.

The dedication was held on
Saturday evening at 8:30 o'clock
at the Legion Field. The
Monroe Memorial Athletic
Field forever, as the community
of Monroe is, taking great pride
in its new athletic facility.

HORSEWORTHY OLD ROOSTER MAKES AMusing pet for Monroe

A horse-worth old rooster has made
a new home in the Monroe
Kerguson. It was purchased
by the Kergarten, which is
a project of the local school
board.

The rooster is used as a
keepsake by the children,
and it is expected to be
an enjoyable pet for
the future.

Registered for General Election

With the general election a little
more than a month away, every
group in the region who has not
registered has a great deal to lose.
it is believed that the majority of
the electorate is the one that has
failed to qualify for the ballot.

A number of returns from the
service centers are available, and
they are being used by the
registrars to educate the people
of the community on the
registration procedure.

LOCAL BUSINESS MAN BUYS LEWIS T. PROPERTY

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Morris
announced the purchase of the
property of Mr. R. L. Morris
in the city of Monroe.

Make Plans For Boy Scout Region

Pleasantly surprised at the
response of the community to the
Boy Scout program, two
leaders of the region, Robert
Boyle and John Sleeper, are
planning a number of events for
the coming months.

They are planning to
conduct a series of meetings
in the region to discuss the
future of the program.

TULALO COM. CLUB GIRLS ASK TO REGISTER

The Tulaloc Club of the
Tulaloc Community Club
is asking for volunteers for
the coming season.

The club is under the
leadership of H. B. Smith,
who is the president of
the club.

The club is planning a number
of events for the season, and
the members are looking forward
with anticipation to the
event.

MONROE OLD FOLLOWS VISIT SHOBBING LODGE

Members of the Monroe Old Folks
Home were guests of the Shoebobbing Lodge
last Wednesday, and enjoyed
the activity thoroughly.

The trip was a success, and
the members of the lodge
congratulated the Old Folks
on their good time.

HORSEWORTHY OLD ROOSTER MAKES AMusing pet for Monroe

A horse-worth old rooster has made
a new home in the Monroe
Kergarten. It was purchased
by the Kergarten, which is
a project of the local school
board.

The rooster is used as a
keepsake by the children,
and it is expected to be
an enjoyable pet for
the future.

REGISTER NOW FOR GENERAL ELECTION

With the general election a little
more than a month away, every
group in the region who has not
registered has a great deal to lose.
it is believed that the majority of
the electorate is the one that has
failed to qualify for the ballot.

With the election less than
three months away, the
registrars are encouraging all
eligible citizens to register.

The registrar's office is
located at the Courthouse,
and is open daily from 9 o'clock
in the morning until 5 o'clock
in the afternoon.

RELIGIOUS TRANSITION HEAD DEPARTMENT

Hoskins Family Services, Inc.

GROU PHOSPITAL TO MEET FRIDAY, APRIL 13

The directors of the Community
Hospital will meet on Friday,
April 13, at 8:30 o'clock in the
Hospital. All members of the
hospital staff and the public are
invited to attend.

RAT TERRIER PUPPY BORN WITH SIX LEGS AND TWO TAILS

Vera Buss, 115 North Second
street, was in for a surprise on
Saturday, when she found a
terrier puppy with six legs and
two tails. The puppy was
reported by her neighbors to
be in good health.

TULALO CLUB H olds INTERESTING MEETING

The Tulaloc Club held a
meeting at the Chateau Hotel
last Wednesday, and was
well attended.

Guests of the meeting included
members of the Cherry Blossom
Club, and the meeting was well
attended.

METH. CHURCH HOLDS SPECIAL SERVICE

The Methodist Church will
hold a special church
service on Sunday, April 15.

The service will be
conducted by Rev. John
Johnson, and will be
attended by a large crowd.

Among the Boy Scout
officials who attended the
meeting were Mrs. R. L. Morris,
who is the head of the
chapter, and Mrs. H. B. Smith,
who is the president of the
club.

The meeting was
conducted by Rev. John
Johnson, and was
attended by a large crowd.
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Ground broken for new veterans memorial by Lake Tye

By MELANIE RUSSELL

MONROE — Last week at Lake Tye Park, ground was broken for the new and improved Veteran’s Memorial Monument, to be built by veteran volunteers and an Eagle Scout by November.

Fact-finding and paying for the monument came from multiple avenues.

The old monument, built in the late 1940s, had fallen into disrepair and forgotten about in a field along Kelsey Street until a Park Place Middle School eighth grade U.S. History class researched it and kickstarted an effort to create a new monument to honor fallen Monroe veterans. The brass plaque bearing those men’s names will be relocated to the new monument, which will stand on a hill for all to see.

“I had read about (the old monument) from the Monroe Historical Society, and at the time, nobody even knew where it was so we talked to the students and they began a research project on it and the boys’ names on it,” Dottie Simoni said at the Thursday, June 2, groundbreaking.

Simoni is one of the eighth grade U.S. History teachers that spear-headed the effort. Simoni and the other teacher, Tonia Boyle, attended the groundbreaking ceremony with three of the 15 students that began the project.

“I think it’s great, to renew the monument and remember our veterans,” Alex McCartney, 15, who was part of the student effort.

Each student researched the biography of a veteran named on the old monument. But when they went to see the monument in person, they found the old monument was in need of attention.

The city and the American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post No. 58 were notified and set to work to correct this in order to honor the fallen.

“We just felt like it was so important,” Simoni said. “I couldn’t be prouder of the kids, because when we started all this, we were two teachers in over our heads.”

The community came together, Mayor Geoffrey Thomas said, to bring the class’s efforts to a great outcome everyone can share.

“This is a broad-based community effort,” Thomas said. “But we are so thankful to the students, Ms. Simoni and Ms. Boyle for helping bring light to the old monument with their research.”

Since last fall, the city parks department has been coordinating with the American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post 58’s Russ Dean.

“We’re all going to benefit from this and will enhance the community experience at Lake Tye Park,” city parks director Mike Farrell said, adding, “The Legion is doing the volunteer labor and they’re still soliciting donations from the community.”

The new monument will be built by volunteer veterans from American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post 58 and local soon-to-be Eagle Scout Sam Thomas. The project will help Thomas reach his Eagle Scout status. They hope to start construction as soon as possible for the memorial to be completed in time for Veterans Day 2016.

Features of the new monument will include the old brass plaque with the veterans’ names on it, a solar-lighted flagpole that will fly the American flag and POW/MIA flag and a 5-foot tall concrete pad.

The Monroe Public School District and the Monroe Historical Society are among the project contributors.
This plaque was originally
at Arthur Kincaid Memorial Field
(Union High School on Kelsey Street)
Dedicated during a special ceremony
On May 30, 1951

Names courtesy of Park Place Middle School
Eighth grade class of 2015
Monroe Veterans Memorial team receives honors

County Council providing award during state fair opening

By Chris Hendrickson
Monitor staff writer

Monroe's American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post No. 58, the Monroe Historical Society, Park Place Middle School and Boy Scout Troop 53 have been identified as recipients of the 2016 Community Stewardship Award, an annual honor presented by the Snohomish County Council and Republic Services.

All four organizations were honored in a joint resolution read during the Snohomish County Council meeting on Wednesday, Aug. 17, at the Snohomish County administration building in Everett. The Community Stewardship Award recognizes the group's contribution to the ongoing Monroe Veterans Memorial project, and will be presented at 2 p.m. Thursday, Aug. 25, during the Evergreen State Fair opening day ceremonies at the Evergreen State Fairgrounds.

The stewardship award comes with a $3,000 grant from Republic Services that will be used to help fund the project, which is currently under construction at Monroe's Lake Tye Park.

Founded in 2011, the Community Stewardship Award is a collaborative effort between Republic Services and the county council, which work together to identify an individual, organization or coalition focused on community-building through either one-time or ongoing stewardship efforts. When Councilmember Hans Dunshee learned about Monroe's new Veterans Memorial, he submitted the project to Republic Services Director Joe Casalini for consideration.

"It really is the community-building part of this that touched on me," Dunshee said. "A healthy community is a great place to live, and this is building a great community." Casalini was immediately on board with the idea.

"When Councilmember Dunshee brought this effort to our attention, we thought it was a perfect fit for the community field to former Monroe High School students who lost their lives in World War II, naming it Memorial Field. Five years later, a modest cement monument was installed at the field and topped with a bronze plaque. The legion always intended to add the names of each soldier lost during the war, but for whatever reason, the stone relic remained incomplete.

Over the years, the monument rested there, forgotten, tucked away behind a chain-link fence. And then in 2013, Monroe Historical Society president Tami Kinney started asking questions. She wanted to know the story of the monument and why it was never finished. Most importantly, she wanted to know the names of the Monroe soldiers who had died, so they could finally be honored. Park Place Middle School teachers Tonia Boyle and Dottie Simon got involved, thinking it would be a perfect project for their eighth-grade humanities students.

But they needed to collect the names, so the students would have something to research. Enter Monroe Historical Society volunteer Tom Parry, who engaged in a massive research project to acquire a complete list of the Monroe soldiers who died in WWII.

Students, along with the historical society, began raising money to refurbish the monument and have the names added, but it was eventually decided that constructing a new monument in a more visible location would be a better way to honor members of the U.S. Armed Forces. The new memorial is designed to honor veterans from all branches of the military, with special recognition given to the 18 soldiers who died in WWII.

The legion approached the Monroe City Council about the idea, receiving overwhelming support. It then worked with the Monroe Parks Department to identify a suitable location.

Next, the legion needed somebody to spearhead the construction, so it approached Sultan resident Sam Thomas, a member of Boy Scout Troop 53. Thomas agreed to tackle the memorial project in hopes of obtaining the rank of Eagle Scout, the highest rank a scout can achieve. An official groundbreaking ceremony was held in early June, and the project is currently underway.

"Really great to see so many people get involved in honoring our vets, building our community and making connections. The impact will be felt for years to come," said Dunshee in
Monroe’s monumental support

By: Chris Hendrickson  June 6, 2016  Monroe News News  1388 Views

Photos by Chris Hendrickson
Approximately 75 people turned up at the Lake Tye Park last week to celebrate the ground-breaking of the American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post No. 58’s new Veterans Memorial.

Thanks to a widespread community effort involving multiple agencies, the city of Monroe is one step closer to having a new veterans memorial honoring those who bravely served.

The memorial ground-breaking ceremony was held Thursday, June 2, at Lake Tye Park in Monroe. In attendance were county, state and local elected officials, plus members of the American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post No. 58, teachers and students from the Monroe School District, representatives from the Monroe Historical Society, the Monroe Police Department, Boy Scout Troop 53, the Monroe Army Recruiting Office and the community at large.

American Legion Arthur Kincaid Post No. 58 and aspiring Eagle Scout Sam Thomas are spearheading the project, which is expected to be completed by Veterans Day.

The new ADA-accessible monument will be located in the grassy area west of Fryelands Boulevard and east of the Lake Tye concession stand and will include a 30-foot solar-powered lighted flagpole. The 8-inch wide black granite memorial will measure roughly 50 inches long, 4 feet tall and rest on top of a larger base.

The new memorial will replace the Legion’s forgotten stone World War II monument at Memorial Field, which was dedicated during a special ceremony in 1951. The new memorial will honor all veterans, rather than those from any specific military conflict.

The front will be inscribed with words honoring those who served in the United States Armed Forces, and the back will be adorned with the names of the 18 soldiers from Monroe who fought and died in World War II. The brass plaque from the Legion’s original monument will be transferred to the new memorial, which credits eighth-grade students from Park Place Middle School for uncovering the names of Monroe’s war heroes.

http://www.monroemonitor.com/2016/06/06/monroes-monumental-support/
Dedicate Athletic Field In Honor Of Students Who Died In Service

Adding color to the first football game under the new lighting system, game officials asked athletic field school to provide more information. The dedication ceremony was held on Monday, September 22, at the new athletic field.

The ceremony included speeches by various dignitaries, including the principal and head football coach. The field was dedicated in honor of students who had died in service.

The athletic field was completed earlier this year and has become a popular gathering place for students. The dedication ceremony is expected to bring together the community and celebrate the hard work and dedication that went into creating the new facility.

Western Auto Holds Big Sale

The Western Auto store recently opened a new location in the city center. The store offers a wide range of automotive services and products, including tires, oil changes, and auto parts.

The opening ceremony included speeches by the store owner and local officials. The store is expected to bring new jobs to the community and contribute to the local economy.

Survey Shows Housing Shortage Is Retarding Monroe's Progress

The survey revealed that the shortage of housing is one of the main challenges facing the city. The report calls for the development of new housing projects to meet the needs of the growing population.

ADD TWO NEW MEMBERS TO MONROE Kiwanis CLUB

Two new members, Mr. and Mrs. Smith, were recently admitted to the Monroe Kiwanis Club. The club is an active community organization that promotes service and leadership.

Furniture Store Gets NewQuarters

The building formerly occupied by the Globe Furniture Company in downtown Monroe has been transformed into a new furniture store. The new store is expected to bring new jobs and contribute to the local economy.

To Investigate Parking Meters

The city council has approved a plan to investigate the parking meter system in downtown Monroe. The investigation will be conducted to ensure that the system is fair and equitable for all users.

Special Events At Field Organizer's FAIR

The Field Organizer's Fair is scheduled for September 22nd and 23rd. The fair will feature a variety of activities, including a parade, a carnival, and a fireworks display.

The fair is expected to bring together the community and celebrate the rich history of the city.

In addition to the events listed, the city council has approved a plan to renovate the city hall. The renovation will include new windows, a new roof, and a new HVAC system.

The plan is expected to improve the comfort and efficiency of the building and reduce energy costs.

The city council has also approved a plan to develop a new park in the downtown area. The park will include a playground, a walking trail, and a community garden.

The park is expected to provide new green space for the community and encourage outdoor activities.

In conclusion, the city council has approved a number of plans to improve the quality of life for residents. These plans include a variety of new facilities, activities, and services that will benefit the community for years to come.
Sen. H. Mitchell Favors Schools

Senator Hugh H. Mitchell while on a tour of the state last Thursday afternoon declared that all of the many proposed problems of recreation were due to the fact that the state's children occupy too much time.

"In all of the states and towns I have visited, the problem has been the outburn, industrial and public school plant, with" he declared vanish. "School people have been studied and passed away for years. This is something that can be done easily in a school plant designed to teach 1970 needs.

The statement of the report issued recently by Dr. A. J. Jackson, president of the Kansas State Board of Education, was a fine example of the spirit of the legislature in providing for the needs of the children. "What we need in the state's school system is a new and imaginative approach to the problem of education and a new and imaginative approach to the responsibility we have to our children."

Mitchell advocates a public works program for school construction and the building of new schools. A basis of two dollars for each student, or 6 cents per child per day, will pay the job and adequate salaries.

"We have a great and growing state," Mitchell said. "Our children will demand a better school system and we must provide for them."

PURCHASE MODERN HOME ON BLAKLEY STREET

Mr. and Mme. N. M. Mason, Olympia, have purchased the former Driscoll house at 1371 Blakely street. They have acquired two acres of land recently acquired property. This is a good location in the vicinity of the Mason residence. The house is of modern construction and is well adapted to the purpose for which it has been purchased.

Trafic Enforcement Regulations in Monroe

Proposed meter installation condemned at caucus

With the resumed interest of traffic enforcement regulations in Monroe, there is a feeling among the residents of the town that more rigorous measures should be taken to prevent traffic violations. There is a general agreement among the people of the town that the school board should adopt a more stringent policy in traffic enforcement. The school board is also urged to take steps to prevent traffic violations on the streets in the vicinity of the school. The residents of the town are convinced that more vigorous enforcement of traffic regulations is needed to prevent accidents and to improve the safety of the streets.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE TO LAUNCH CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AT CITY HALL

Bearcats Victors in First Game

By Dick Roughton

The Bearcats opened their season with a victory over the Huskies, 38-18, at the University of Washington. The Bearcats were led by their star quarterback, Tommy Johnson, who threw three touchdown passes. The Bearcats also won the game against the Huskies, 19-12, in overtime.

HOSPITAL GROUP TO MEET FRIDAY AT 8 P.M.

The directors of the Community Hospital of Burien will meet at 8 p.m. on Friday to discuss the matters that will be decided for the future. The directors will be elected on the board of directors and the nominations will be made on the board of directors. The election will be held on March 15th.

Tulalip Community Club holds its annual turkey dinner at the Methodist church. The dinner will be held on Thanksgiving Day. The club will be represented by Mr. and Mrs. H. B. Smith.

Chamber of Commerce to hold construction program at City Hall

Mr. and Mrs. N. M. Mason, Olympia, have purchased the former Driscoll house at 1371 Blakely street. They have acquired two acres of property recently acquired property. This is a good location in the vicinity of the Mason residence. The house is of modern construction and is well adapted to the purpose for which it has been purchased.
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The proposed addition to the Monroe High School, which was under way for the 1923-1924 school year, was made possible by the interest and support of the community. The Board of Education had presented a plan for the addition in 1922, and the community had shown overwhelming support for the project. The project was expected to be completed in time for the start of the school year in the fall of 1923, and it was hoped that the addition would provide more space for the growing student population.

The proposed addition would include new classrooms, a new auditorium, and a new gymnasium. The auditorium would be equipped with state-of-the-art acoustics and stage lighting, and the gymnasium would be equipped with modern athletic facilities. The new classrooms would provide additional space for the growing student population, and the new auditorium and gymnasium would provide new facilities for the school's performing arts and athletic programs.

The project was expected to cost approximately $250,000, and the community had approved a bond issue to fund the project. The bond issue was expected to be fully funded through the sale of bonds, and the community had already sold a significant portion of the bonds.

The start of the school year was less than two months away, and the community was eager to see the new addition to the Monroe High School. The Board of Education had worked hard to ensure that the project was completed on time, and the community was confident that the new addition would provide the school with the facilities it needed to meet the needs of its growing student population.
Dear Kim,

I would like to be put on the official list of interested parties regarding the rezone of the old school district football field on Kelsey. I understand that it is part of the docket process. I'm a member of St. Mary's Church right next door and I've been tasked with following the process. Here is all my info:

Jim McDaniel
11604 Trombley Rd.
Snohomish WA 98290

425-418-8298

jimmbobb9217@gmail.com

Sincerely,

JIM McDaniel / Principal Surveyor
Harmsen & Associates LLC / www.HarmsenInc.com

OFFICE: (360) 794-7811 / FAX: (360) 805-9732
DIRECT: (360) 282-3053

Anticipate / Understand / Guide / Deliver
LAND SURVEYING / CIVIL ENGINEERING

SNOHOMISH COUNTY 125 East Main Street, Ste 104 Monroe, WA 98272 / (360) 794-7811
ISLAND COUNTY 840 SE 8th Ave., Ste 102 Oak Harbor, WA 98277 / (360) 675-5973
SKAGIT COUNTY 603 South First Street Mount Vernon, WA 98273 / (360) 336-9199

We hold records for Harmsen & Associates, Inc., Fakkema & Kingma, Inc., and Evergreen Surveying, Inc.
Mr. Trivett,

Thank you for your comments regarding the proposed amendment to the City’s Compressive Plan. City staff will add your name to the notification list.

The proposal is currently under review by City staff. Following this, the proposal will undergo review by the City’s Planning Commission. After Planning Commission holds the public hearing, the proposal and Planning Commission’s recommendation will then go to the City Council for final action.

If you would like to discuss ideas for the Sky Valley Education Center, I’ve attached the School District contact for this project.

Thank you,

Ben

NOTE: This email is considered a public record and may be subject to public disclosure.

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Geoffrey Thomas <GThomas@monroewa.gov>
Date: November 28, 2018 at 16:43:17 PST
To: Ben Swanson <BSwanson@monroewa.gov>
Cc: Deborah Knight <DKnight@monroewa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Note from Randall Trivett to your Facebook Page Mayor Geoffrey Thomas.
Mr. Mayor,

With the news of the school district requesting rezoning by the city and expressing interest in selling Memorial Field, I wanted to let you know that I share the concerns of others that this is a enormous mistake. That field was bought for $3000.00 in 1929 and was memorialized to carry the memory of all those who fought and died in WWII. While the memorial has been relocated to Lake Tye, it does not reduce the connection residents have with the place. To sell it and allow it to be converted to low income housing would be poor use of that strategically located site. Alternative uses are available and appropriate.

Why don't we use it to build a new Sky Valley Education Center? There is more than enough space to do so and we need a new campus. Put the parking for it across the street at the old site and connect the two sides with a skybridge. Razz the old structures and in the remaining space build a MAC, Monroe Aquatics Center. This could share the parking lot with SVEC.

This is something Monroe desperately needs. It would benefit the entire community, and all students could swim there. The High School needs a pool... done. The Middle Schools need pools... done. It can have community rooms like the SAC does so events can be hosted there and it can make money like the SAC does. Put in a wave rider so people can surf and slides so kids can play and be inspired to learn to swim.

This is a no brainer in my opinion. Please don't allow the District to sell Memorial Field for the short term gain of profit. I know the YMCA and their representatives will oppose this but Monroe needs this badly. The School District did this in Snohomish, why don't we do the same here?

Sincerely,

Randall Trivett
Dear Kim,

As Pastoral Assistant for St. Mary of the Valley I would like to be included on your email list regarding land use action of the School District Property located on Kelsey Street (The Old Football Field). Thank you very much.

--Anita D. Maceda
Pastoral Assistant for Administration

Office Hours
Tuesday-Thursday 10:00 a.m-3:00 p.m

360.794.8945 ext. 10
Fax: 360.805.0201
www.stmaryvalley.org

601 West Columbia Street
P.O. Box 279
Monroe, WA 98272
I have recently learned of the proposal by Monroe School District to the city to rezone Marshall Field and Memorial Stadium to multifamily and I am dismayed by this decision for the following reasons:

-This stadium was a gift to Monroe School District as a memorial and as a trust that it would not ever be sold for development. It was to remain as a resource for the school.
-The school district could use this space for current or future needs for students. Examples: a new SVEC, new schools, additional track, field, baseball, sports fields, an aquatics center that could be used by the local schools, administration/district buildings, meeting space, multiuse facility, etc.
-The school district currently uses this space for PE classes and other student activities such as STEM projects.
-The community benefits from having this available for use as a green space and is used by local sports organizations/leagues/camps, many regular walkers and joggers.
-The traffic infrastructure in this part of town is not equipped to handle this sizeable increase in traffic from the high density housing.
-Multifamily housing will degrade the character/community of Monroe.

Thank you for taking these ideas into consideration.

Sincerely, Ashley Floyd
I contend selling Memorial field is a violation of the public trust. An Aquatics Center, Meeting Area and new District Offices on a 2nd floor is what the youth, leaders and residents of our city need now more than ever. The cost is virtually irrelevant given the positive effects it would bring with it. Here in Monroe we lack a pool for all of our school teams to swim at and meeting areas for birthday parties and other healthy activities Building a MAC would give the city a focal point it has lacked for decades. Putting it at the field would be the perfect location as it is walking distance for everyone living in Monroe. The school already owns the land, just like Snohomish did and our demolition costs will be fractional to theirs as there are only grandstands to remove. Save even more money, use the plans they built the SAC with, why not! If we sell this now the location and the opportunity will be gone for good. Adding a 2nd floor over the operations portion of the facility gives our district offices a new home. Take that current eyesore, health hazard and maintenance nightmare of a structure they are in now and sell it and the land to developers, it's in an equally good location for residential structures and it costs us too much to operate every year as it is dilapidated. Doing these things despite the cost is responsible. This idea has NOT even been officially put forward to the residents. The notice given was poor at best, a flyer should have been in every water bill to bring attention to this matter and generate health discussion on the matter. Try bonding it first with our people here. I have little doubt it would not pass with an overwhelming majority of voters. If it doesn't then and only then discuss selling it or other options. Right now the desire and covert long term plan to sell this property is pretty clear and borders on collusion from the sudden desire to dememorialize the field a couple years ago by moving the war memorial snd others to Lake Tye to this action of trying to sell off the site now. Anyone can connect the dots and many are. I am seriously disappointed in this series of decisions by our leadership. Not developing this resource as someting to benefit our entire community as I have outlined is a massive violation of the public trust. I have spoken with Board Members, Directors, Leadership, and members of this new planning board and the lackluster response across the bandwidth of all of these entrusted leaders is dismaying and quite telling that being any other idea than the sale of this property is unwanted noise. Well, I am here to make some noise as I hope are others because too much has occurred in quiet to now. Show you care, support this property not being sold and instead turned into something, like a MAC or other facility that contributes to our community, that Monroe needs and will benefit everyone. THIS IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY!

Randall Trivett
Shana Restall

From: Ben Swanson  
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 7:53 AM  
To: Amy K Martin  
Cc: Shana Restall  
Subject: RE: Memorial field  

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged  

Amy,  

Thank you for your comment. City staff will add it to the public record. I encourage you to also contact the Monroe School district with your concerns. As the owner/applicant for the project, your input is important to District.  

Thanks again,  
Ben  

Ben Swanson | Community Development Director  
806 West Main Street | Monroe, WA 98272  
360-863-4544 | bswanson@monroewa.gov  

NOTE: This email is considered a public record and may be subject to public disclosure.

From: Amy K Martin [mailto:amykm122@gmail.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2019 8:42 PM  
To: Ben Swanson <BSwanson@monroewa.gov>  
Subject: Memorial field  

I wish to go on the record of being extremely against the change of zoning / down zoning of this school field so it can be developed. We live on South Kelsey st, a few homes south of w. Main st. Traffic heading north, from west Main to Rte 2 can often get backed up past the school. Between the 200 car trains and the people turning left at blueberry this is a regular occurrence. I strongly believe adding a housing development to this property as proposed is a very serious mistake. The infrastructure cannot handle it, much less the danger posed by emergency services being unable to use Kelsey as an access road to the many calls they answer each day. I truly hope you do not allow this very populated area to be over built by some developer at great cost to our community. Our school tax dollars already pay for this field and it should be used as passive open space or as a space that can be used for community events on occasion. Having open space downtown is a quality of life necessity.  
Sincerely,  
Amy Martin  
--  
Amy  

Amy Martin
TO Whom it may concern:

These properties were purchased on July 6th, 1929 from Arthur J Hibbits (WWI Veteran) and Margaret Hibbits in the amount of $3,000. The 3 properties per the Property Account Summary dated 7/30/2019 lists the current market land value as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Market Land Value</th>
<th>Market Improvement value</th>
<th>Market Total Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27060100404500</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$308,400</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$357,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27060100100400</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,543,400</td>
<td>$188,800</td>
<td>$1,732,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27060100205100</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$1,666,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,666,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,518,100</td>
<td>$237,800</td>
<td>$3,755,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Monroe School District is proposing that the 12.41± Acre Memorial Stadium and Marshall Field site be rezoned from the current 681 (Nursery, Primary & Secondary School) and 910 (Undeveloped {Vacant} Land) zoning to R25 (Multifamily Residential). The 2 properties listed as 681 are the football field (4.75 Acres) and vacant lot (.7 Acres) to the south of the field. The property listed as Undeveloped is where the current baseball field is (6.96 Acres).

The School district is requesting the change stating that the site is no longer used for formal education programs, the location doesn’t lend itself for future school facilities. The site is located within proximity to other schools that are developed and that it is currently used as informal ball field, which is used by the community. Per the meeting notes from the City of Monroe Planning Commission Minutes of July 8th, 2019 “Mr. Jim Langston the President of Monroe’s School Board stated that the school board is very frugal in their dollars and that the District currently does not have the resources to maintain the 12.5 acres of property.”

Since 1929 the Monroe School District have owned this property and maintained it, why is it that all of a sudden, the school district does not have the resources to maintain the property? With all of the Levy and Tax money the school district gets per year this would-be part of the yearly budget covered under maintenance of the school grounds. The Levy and Tax concerns will be noted below. The only thing being maintained would be the fields themselves. This cost impact is very minimal considering that the only people utilizing the fields are citizens of Monroe. It is my understanding that the use by the community is not well taken by the Monroe School District.

Planning Commission Concerns

The proposal drafted and submitted by Brent Planning Solutions has a few concerns stating that the property will be used for multi-family use for development. The high end of the multifamily designation could yield between 288-296 units, using the basis of 2.97 persons per household could yield 879 residents for the site. As of 2018, the U.S. Census Bureau counted about 83.09 million families in the United States. The average family consists of 3.14 persons in 2018, using that average the site could potentially see 926 residents for the site. With roughly 600 onsite parking spaces on the site it would be insufficient for the number of residents in the area.

The Stormwater would need to be handled on-site through infiltration since there are no local storm connections that offer capacity for the future subsequent potential project. **How would this prevent the pollution from motor vehicles after storms?** This is a huge impact to not only
current city facilities for drainage but also an ecological impact. **If pumps are required who will be maintaining these?**

The report also goes on to state that any future development of the site would have to go through various permits from the city and that at that time there would be a review of potential impacts related to traffic, drainage and other site developmental impacts. Before anything should be approved for zoning a comprehensive impact plan should be drafted to show what the impacts for traffic, drainage, utilities, sewer, water and other developmental impacts. The 10” sewer lines on Kelsey Street and 8” lines on Columbia street would be insufficient to handle the 296 additional units without improvements. The 10” water lines on Kelsey Street and 8” lines on Columbia would restrict current pressure to all residents without improvements.

The thoughts of adding between .4% to 1.55% increase in volume to the corridor intersections or an average of less than 1% increase to the W Main Street corridor is incorrect. As of 2017 the current population of Monroe is listed at 18,789 residents. Population has quadrupled since 1990 and has almost doubled in the last 20 years. Since 2010 Monroe has grown by almost 5,000 residents. Assuming a 1% increase would justify only 188 additional vehicles on the road due to this improvement, however looking at the trend this site would account for almost 1/5th of the city’s growth over the last 9 years. This study is likely based on the current population and not what the previous trends have shown. This also doesn’t take into account of the new housing development being created down the street from the current Monroe School District Office which will impact Main street as well.

**Too many times throughout the United States new construction goes up without a complete traffic plan to account for the impacts. The suggestion should be to have all of the traffic construction completed prior to any building construction beginning to lessen the impact of current residents in the area.**

The report states that encouraging the affordable housing at this site would appropriate infill of high-density development within the city. While this statement is true, it would drive more vagrants to the area thus driving up crime and would likely drive to a higher property value that would be difficult for anyone to afford. There are current problems throughout the city that would need to be addressed before allowing new properties to be developed in the area prior to this approval.

Open space and recreation to retain open space, and enhance recreational opportunities would be taken away from the citizens of Monroe who have grown up in the area and utilized the fields for years with different sports. While the current building on the sports field no longer serves the programming needs of the school students there are alternatives to this proposal that would benefit the community as well as a few non-profits. It is not listed as a public park, but as a school property, more importantly it was dedicated as a Memorial field in 1946.

**Taxes, Levy’s and Bond Measures**

An article written in April 2019 states that in the 2012 Supreme Court’s McCleary decision the historic bill made two important change in school funding, first was the state property tax which greatly increased state funding for all schools. Secondly it reduced local dependence on levies to ease the burden on taxpayers, to increase fairness and reduced inequity between property rich districts and property poor ones.
As a result of this Monroe School District jumped from $9,000 per student a few years ago to $14,000 per student in 2018-2019 which is more than tuition at most private schools. Total spending went from $64 Million in 2012 to $93 Million today, an increase of 45%. Forecasted students K-12 for Monroe School District (Page 1/1 of FY enrollment and staff counts forecasts 6,541 at $14,000 each equates to $91,574,000).

The Monroe taxpayers just saw property taxes increase, in some cases paying 27% more to provide the added money. Kim Mead the WEA Union president says the district should get even more money and is pressing lawmakers to raise property taxes again at the local level. She wants the lawmakers to break the promises they made to taxpayers and to undermine the constitutional requirement that the state provide ample and equitable funding for the education of every child.

The Monroe School District now has ample money to provide every student a top-notch education, without increasing property taxes for the second time in two years.

Proposition No 1 for the Monroe School District No. 103 to replace the expiring school program and Operations Levy was approved in the 2018 vote with a 53.64% yes vote compared to a 46.36 No vote. With the yes Vote being approved the Monroe School District cannot collect more than $10,350,062 for 2019, $11,902,571 for 2020, $13,687,957 in 2021 and $15,741,150 in 2022. This proposition was for school safety and security, athletics and extracurricular activities, student transportation, special education programs, student support programs, profession learning for staff, **district operations and maintenance**, and instructional supplies and materials.

The Average Washington Property tax for the city of Monroe with a median assessed home value of $462,000 and an average Snohomish County tax rate is 1.098%. This results in an average property tax of $5,073 per household in taxes. Monroe saw a 17.8% increase in property taxes from the 2017 to 2018 year with about an extra 82 cents per $1,000 worth of assessed property value to pay for state education.

**Current Voter Approved Property Tax Measure for Monroe School Districts to expand Elementary and Middle Schools Etc. over 20 years is $110,970,000 that was passed in 2015 and goes from tax years 2016-2035.**

Assessed values, Levy rates & taxes for tax year 2019 are listed as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/Levy</th>
<th>Excess Value</th>
<th>Timber Value</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Real &amp; Pers. Tax</th>
<th>Timber Tax</th>
<th>Total Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Bonds</td>
<td>$6,760,712,455</td>
<td>$5,373,112</td>
<td>$0.978</td>
<td>$6,613,260</td>
<td>$5,255</td>
<td>$6,618,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>$6,760,712,455</td>
<td>$2,686,556</td>
<td>$1.500</td>
<td>$10,141,068</td>
<td>$4,030</td>
<td>$10,145,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>$6,760,712,455</td>
<td>$2,663</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
<td>$18,005,661</td>
<td>$10,280</td>
<td>$18,015,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$6,760,712,455</td>
<td>$2,663</td>
<td>$2.663</td>
<td>$18,005,661</td>
<td>$10,280</td>
<td>$18,015,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monroe School District Budget 2019-2020

Based upon the current 2019-2020 school budget the following Revenues and other financial sources are:

**Current Revenue for Monroe School District 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes</td>
<td>$11,081,953</td>
<td>$12,856,835</td>
<td>$14,784,908</td>
<td>$15,739,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local non-tax support</td>
<td>$1,989,685</td>
<td>$2,009,582</td>
<td>$2,029,678</td>
<td>$2,049,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Gen Purpose</td>
<td>$61,975,434</td>
<td>$62,620,739</td>
<td>$63,559,880</td>
<td>$64,625,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Special Purpose</td>
<td>$15,503,973</td>
<td>$15,658,306</td>
<td>$16,140,877</td>
<td>$16,552,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal, Gen Purpose</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from other School Districts</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from Other entities</td>
<td>$532,726</td>
<td>$532,726</td>
<td>$532,726</td>
<td>$532,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$94,384,244</td>
<td>$97,405,873</td>
<td>$100,392,267</td>
<td>$102,853,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current expenditures for Monroe School District 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Instruction</td>
<td>$55,338,488</td>
<td>$56,935,307</td>
<td>$58,439,749</td>
<td>$59,949,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed Instruction</td>
<td>$11,581,233</td>
<td>$11,480,417</td>
<td>$11,767,619</td>
<td>$12,056,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Instruction</td>
<td>$4,170,234</td>
<td>$4,286,321</td>
<td>$4,373,416</td>
<td>$4,460,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensatory Education Instruction</td>
<td>$3,872,060</td>
<td>$3,958,274</td>
<td>$4,055,206</td>
<td>$4,152,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional Programs</td>
<td>$1,723,149</td>
<td>$1,347,590</td>
<td>$1,363,402</td>
<td>$1,379,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>$329,120</td>
<td>$367,955</td>
<td>$374,635</td>
<td>$381,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>$17,856,207</td>
<td>$18,851,900</td>
<td>$19,147,755</td>
<td>$19,448,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$94,870,761</td>
<td>$97,227,764</td>
<td>$99,521,782</td>
<td>$101,829,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Beginning fund balance of the General fund budget page 2/3 on form F195 is $8,896,089. The unassigned to minimum fund policy amount to spend out of this fund for the 2019-2020 year is $5,833,426. The unassigned fund balance is $296,416 would be more than enough to fund upkeep of the memorial field. What is the general fund for?
Previous Property transactions to Monroe School District

**Dec 22, 1993** Grantor Burke and Mary B Hales gifted property to the Monroe School District. Document # 201805220435 for Tax parcel # 27061900400800 stating that: that portion of the Southeast quarter of the Southeast quarter lying west of the west line of Siler Logging Company Railroad right of way in Section 19, Township 27 North, Range 6 East, W.M.

**October 30, 2018** Grantor Monroe School District as successor in interest to Monroe Union High School District No. 103 to Monroe School District. Document #201811090384 for Tax Parcel number 27060100402600 states that: Portion of the Northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 1, Township 27 north, Range 6 East, W.M.

**October 30, 2018** Grantor Monroe School District as successor in interest to Monroe Union High School District No. 103 to Monroe School District. Document #201811090384 for Tax Parcel # 27060100402600 states that: Portion of the Northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 1, township 27 north, range 6 east, W.M.

I have found more questions than answers as to why the Monroe School District cannot maintain this property from permitting, to budgeting, to properties. The Memorial Stadium was dedicated in 1946 shortly after WWII where there was between 800 and 1000 people to witness the dedication in honor of the former students who have made the supreme sacrifice during the recent war. The Arthur Kincaid Post 91 of the American Legion was on hand for the dedication as well as Arthur J Hibbits a WWI Veteran. Even though the original monument no longer exists at this location since it was moved in 2016 to the current location at Lake Tye Park, getting rid of this field would take away from those that paid the ultimate sacrifice and would be an insult to all current veterans and those who have paid the price. Any Development of this site other than the purpose in 1946 would take away from the historic value of this site.

The Recommendation of the Monroe VFW Post 7511 Commander is that any future development should include a Veterans memorial park to list both current and former Veterans of Monroe and should be worked in conjunction with the Monroe Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7511.

Thank you for taking the time to read my letter pertaining to the concerns of not only myself but to preserve the history of the Monroe Veterans who have served this great community.

Drew James  
Commander VFW Post 7511  
District 1 Jr. Vice Commander  
Department of Washington Iraq/Afghanistan Committee Chair
Thank you Shana.

-David Irwin

---

Shana Restall | Principal Planner
> 806 West Main Street | Monroe, WA 98272
> 360-863-4608 | srestall@monroewa.gov

---

NOTE: This email is considered a public record and may be subject to public disclosure.
utilize the facility. If I have not found the right person to reach out to, please let me know who I should contact and forward my message along.

> Thanks for your time,
> 
> David Irwin
> 425-293-2635
ATTACHMENT 17

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Planning Commission Recommendation
2018 – 2019 Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number(s):</th>
<th>CPA2018-A, CPA2018-B, and CPA2018-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Project Summary: | In accordance with Chapter 22.74 MMC, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, the City accepts amendment proposals annually from interested parties. Upon receipt of applications, the City Council holds a public hearing to select those proposed amendments to be placed on a docket for further consideration. The docketed Comprehensive Plan amendment applications are evaluated by the Planning Commission, which forwards to the City Council a recommendation regarding their approval. On the docket for the 2018 – 2019 amendment cycle, there are two City-initiated applications and one citizen-initiated application for the Planning Commission to review. These applications include the following proposals for amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan: CPA2018-A and CPA2018-B – Two (2) City-initiated requests to adopt the Monroe School District and Snohomish School District Six-Year Capital Facilities Plans CPA2018-01 – A site-specific, citizen-initiated request to change the land use designation established by the Comprehensive Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and to concurrently rezone property owned by the Monroe School District |

| Location(s): | CPA2018-A and CPA2018-B – These proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 City of Monroe Comprehensive Plan are non-project actions that are not site-specific. The amendments do not apply to a specific property or properties, but rather to the entire area within the limits of the City of Monroe. CPA2018-01 – The Memorial Stadium and Marshall Field site, identified by Snohomish County Assessor’s tax parcel numbers 27060100205100, 27060100100400, and 27060100404500 |

| Public Hearing Date: | Monday, October 28, 2019 at 7:00 PM Monroe City Hall Council Chambers 806 West Main Street Monroe, WA 98272 |

| Staff Contact: | Shana Restall, Principal Planner City of Monroe 806 West Main Street Monroe, WA 98272 (360) 863-4608 srestall@monroewa.gov |
B. BACKGROUND

The Annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process provides an opportunity for interested parties, including members of the public, to propose revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, and to monitor and evaluate the progress of the implementation strategies and policies incorporated therein. Submitted amendment proposals may:

- Propose new sections, elements, appendices, goals, and/or policies of the plan
- Amend existing sections, elements, appendices, goals, and/or policies of the plan
- Be site-specific
- Correct errors
- Edit language
- Adopt other documents by reference
- Change the Future Land Use Map (FLUM)

The City accepts annual Comprehensive Plan amendment applications continuously. However, amendments proposed by the public after the last working day in July will not be considered until the following amendment cycle. With the exception of a few specific situations, Comprehensive Plan amendments shall be considered by the City no more than once a year. Additionally, all Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals are required to be considered concurrently so that their cumulative impacts can be determined.

C. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT REVIEW PROCESS

1. Overview

Chapter 22.74 MMC, Comprehensive Plan Amendments, delineates the procedure for reviewing annual Comprehensive Plan amendment applications. All proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments must be consistent with the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan, all other City Codes and applicable regulations, and the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) in RCW 36.70A. Plan amendments are considered concurrently on an annual basis so that the cumulative effects of all proposed amendments can be analyzed for consistency and the overall effect on the remainder of the Plan. The annual Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle is subject to the requirements for public participation, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.140. The review process shall proceed as described below.

2. Amendment Review Procedures

   a. Phase I - Selection of Amendments to be Considered
      i. Applications Forwarded by Staff: City of Monroe staff submits to the City Council all proposed amendments received prior to the last working day in July, along with an analysis of the proposed amendment in relation to the selection criteria and the application checklist.
      ii. Public Hearing for Docket Selection: The City Council holds a public hearing to select those proposed amendments that should be considered for further review.
      iii. Modifications: The City Council may modify a proposed amendment during the selection process.
      iv. Schedule for Review: When selecting the proposed amendments to be considered, the City Council will adopt a schedule for completion of the review and amendment adoption process.

   b. Phase II - Review and Action for Selected Amendments
      i. Staff Review: For each amendment selected by Council for the amendment cycle, staff will prepare a written analysis.
ii. **Environmental Review**: Review under SEPA shall be conducted and a threshold determination issued.

iii. **Planning Commission Review**: The Planning Commission shall conduct one or more public hearings to solicit comments; develop language for definitions, policies, and goals; and provide recommendations for proposed amendments.

iv. **Criteria for Recommendation of Approval**: The Planning Commission shall use the following criteria in considering whether or not to recommend approval, or approval with modification, of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments:

   a) Each amendment:
   
   1) Shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way;
   2) Shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan, as amended by the proposals;
   3) Shall be in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws; and
   4) Must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

   b) In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:
   
   1) The proposed amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole, or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances;
   2) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts;
   3) Is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations;
   4) Is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable; and
   5) Is consistent with other plan elements as amended by the proposals.

   c) Any compelling reasons relied upon to justify adopting an amendment without meeting the above criteria must be specified in the ordinance adopting the amendment. When an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan also requires a subsequent rezone or amendment to the development regulations both may be considered concurrently.

v. **Concurrent Land Use Applications**: When an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan also requires a subsequent rezone or amendment to the development regulations both may be considered concurrently.

vi. **Council Public Hearing and Notice**: The City Council will review the recommendation of the Planning Commission and may hold a public hearing for the purpose of receiving public comment regarding the merits of proposed amendment(s).

vii. **Council Action**: Upon receipt of a recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall adopt, adopt as modified, deny, or remand the application(s) to the Planning Commission for further consideration.

viii. **Map Revisions**: If the City Council approves a change to the Comprehensive Plan that changes the land use designation of parcels within the Urban Growth Area, the City Council shall adopt an ordinance that amends the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and authorizes the Mayor to sign the revised map.

ix. **Revocation**: The Comprehensive Plan amendment may be reversed by the City Council outside of the regular amendment period, upon finding of any of the following:
a) The approval was obtained by fraud or other intentional or misleading representation;
b) The amendment is being implemented contrary to the intended purpose of the amendment or other provisions of the comprehensive plan and City ordinances; or
c) The amendment is being implemented in a manner that is detrimental to the public health or safety.

x. Transmittal to State – Proposed Amendments: City staff shall transmit a copy of each proposed amendment of the Plan to the State of Washington Department of Commerce at least sixty (60) days prior to the expected date of final Council action on proposed amendments.

xi. Transmittal to State – Adopted Amendments: Staff will transmit a copy of all adopted amendments to the Department of Commerce within ten (10) days after the adoption by the Council.

c. Appeals

Per MMC Table 22.84.060(B)(2): Decision-Making and Appeal Authorities, the Council’s decision is the City’s final action on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. The decision may be appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board.

D. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan docket includes two City-initiated and one citizen-initiated proposals. The Planning Commission will evaluate the proposed 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket during a public hearing scheduled for October 28, 2019. Subsequent to the public hearing, the Planning Commission will forward to the City Council a recommendation concerning whether or not the docketed amendments should be approved. Upon receipt of the recommendation from the Planning Commission, the City Council shall adopt, adopt as modified, or deny the proposed amendments. Council also has the option of remanding the application(s) back to the Planning Commission for additional review.

The following applications to amend the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan will be considered by the Planning Commission at the October 28, 2019 public hearing:

- Application CPA2018-A

- Application CPA2018-B

- Application CPA2018-01
  Amendment to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan and concurrent rezone to allow other land use options on property owned by the Monroe School District.

MMC 22.74.040(D), Criteria for Recommendation of Approval, provides the following criteria for review of a docketed Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal. When deciding whether or not to recommend approval of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Planning Commission shall review the applications for consistency with the following criteria:

1. Each amendment:
   a. Shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.
b. Shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.

c. Shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws; and

d. Must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

2. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:

a. Addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

b. Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

c. Is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

d. Is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable; and

e. Is consistent with other plan elements as amended by the proposals.

The following Findings of Fact have been made about the proposed comprehensive plan amendments, and the resulting Conclusions of Law were established from the Findings of Fact:

1. CPA2018–A: City-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Adopt the Monroe School District’s Capital Facilities Plan

   a. Description: The application proposes an amendment to the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan to adopt the 2018–2023 Monroe School District Capital Facilities Plan. As the Monroe School District adopts a Capital Facilities Plan biennially, the City must revise its Comprehensive Plan every two years to adopt the School District’s Capital Facilities Plan by reference. These are essentially comprehensive plan “housekeeping” amendments required of the City.

   b. Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D): For an analysis, please see section 2.b. below.

2. CPA2018–B: City-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Adopt the Snohomish School District’s Capital Facilities Plan

   a. Description: The application proposes an amendment to the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan to adopt the 2018–2023 Snohomish School District Capital Facilities Plan. As the Snohomish School District adopts a Capital Facilities Plan biennially, the City must revise its Comprehensive Plan every two years to adopt the School District’s Capital Facilities Plan by reference. These are essentially comprehensive plan “housekeeping” amendments required of the City.

   b. Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D): The applications described above (CPA2018-A and CPA 2018-B) are for the same comprehensive plan amendment from two separate agencies. Therefore, the following analysis is applicable to both proposals.

   i. Each amendment shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.

      a) Findings of Fact: The proposed amendments adopt the School Districts’ Capital Facilities Plans by reference and updates the City’s fee schedule to reflect the amendments. The amendments have neither a direct relation to nor an impact public health, safety, and/or welfare.

      b) Conclusions of Law: The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment will not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.
ii. Each amendment shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan, as amended by the proposals.

a) Findings of Fact: The Capital Facilities Element of the 2015 - 2035 Comprehensive Plan incorporates both the Monroe and Snohomish School Districts’ CFPs by reference. The Vision and Policy Framework in Chapter 2 of the Plan contains specific goal and policy statements including:

i) P.106: Require development proponents to mitigate service and utility impacts, ensuring that proportional costs are borne by new development rather than present residents and ratepayers, and that level of service standards are not degraded.

ii) P.107: Develop and adopt new, or refine existing GMA compliant impact fees as part of financing public facilities, balancing between impact fees and other sources of public funds.

b) Conclusions of Law: The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan, as amended by the proposals.

iii. Each amendment shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

a) Findings of Fact: Of the fourteen Planning Goals in RCW 36.70A.020, the proposals address the following:

- Urban Growth
- Reduce Sprawl
- Economic Development
- Citizen Participation and Coordination
- Public Facilities and Services

The proposals facilitate the collection of the School Districts’ current impact fees, as authorized by RCW 82.02.050(5)(a):

*Impact fees may be collected and spent only for the public facilities defined in RCW 82.02.090 which are addressed by a capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive land use plan adopted pursuant to the provisions of RCW 36.70A.070 or the provisions for comprehensive plan adoption contained in Chapter 36.70, 35.63, or 35A.63 RCW...*

Pursuant to RCW 82.02.050(5)(a), the City of Monroe adopted Ordinance 1205, which established the authority to collect school impact fees and created a school mitigation program under GMA. Provisions for impact fees must be in the Comprehensive Plan’s Capital Facilities Element to allow for their collection. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments would permit this to occur. The proposed amendments are in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

b) Conclusions of Law: The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan complies with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

iv. Each amendment must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

a) Findings of Fact: All proposed amendments on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle docket have been noticed and reviewed concurrently. All of the proposed amendments have been weighed in light of their potential cumulative effects.
b) **Conclusions of Law:** Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan was weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.

v. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:

a) Each amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

i) **Findings of Fact:** The proposed amendments would allow for the collection of the current impact fee amount, which is presently inconsistent with the City’s adopted fee amount.

ii) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

b) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

i) **Findings of Fact:** Regarding file no. CPA2018-A, the Monroe School District conducted a review of the proposal under SEPA and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on June 26, 2018. The Snohomish School District conducted a review of file no. CPA2018-B under SEPA and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) on June 27, 2018. The proposed amendments meet the requirements of MMC Chapter 20.04 MMC, RCW43.21C, and Chapter 197-11 WAC.

ii) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes that potential environmental impacts from the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

c) Each amendment is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

i) **Findings of Fact:** These proposals are consistent with growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan. Every net new residential unit incurs impact fees. The Comprehensive Plan assumes a future residential capacity at build-out. The School Districts use the calculated capacity to approximate future revenue from impact fees. The proposal would not change the growth projections.

ii) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan amendment is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

d) Each amendment is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.

i) **Findings of Fact:** The proposed amendments are not site-specific. This does not apply.

ii) **Conclusions of Law:** The proposed amendments are not site-specific. This does not apply.
3. **CPA2018-01**: Citizen-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendment from the Monroe School District for an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Concurrent Rezone (File No. RZ2018-01)

   a. **Description**: The Monroe School District is proposing an amendment to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) to change the designation of the site known as Marshall Field and Memorial Stadium (Snohomish County tax parcel numbers 27060100100400, 27060100205100, and 27060100404500) from an “Institution” designation to a “Multifamily” designation. Concurrent with the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, the applicant submitted a rezone request to change the site’s zoning from “Institutional (IN)” to “Multifamily Residential (R25).”

   **Project Site Land Use and Zoning Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan FLUM Designation(s)</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Multifamily Residential (R25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Marshall Field / Memorial Stadium)</td>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject site is approximately 12.41 acres in area, is situated in the vicinity of N. Kelsey Street and West Columbia Street, and is currently accessed from West Columbia Street. The subject properties are largely surrounded by single-family residential uses with St. Mary of the Valley church to the west and Sky Valley Educational Center to the east. The site is largely vacant and was formerly used as a sports fields for the Monroe School District. However, according to the District, the site is no longer used for formal education programs, and does not lend itself to future school facilities. The District does not use the site for school athletic programs of other school program uses.

   b. **Analysis for Consistency with Approval Criteria per MMC 22.74.040(D):**

      i. **Each amendment shall not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.**

      a) **Applicant Response**: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

      The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

      Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the
Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b) **Findings of Fact:** If the proposed amendment and concurrent rezone are approved by the City, multifamily residential development is anticipated on the subject site. The construction of high-density, multifamily dwelling units on a site that is presently underutilized will increase transportation demands. Although traffic volumes would increase, the traffic analysis submitted to the City by the applicant maintains that roads would still operate at an acceptable level of service. The subject site is fully served with utilities, and any anticipated increase in demand is likely to fall within the capacity range for the City’s sanitary sewer, water, and stormwater systems. Nevertheless, the potential increase in population density within the area of the proposal may generate a greater need for public safety services, which are not likely to be increased or expanded prior to development of the site.

c) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive will not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way.

**ii. Each amendment shall be consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.**

a) **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b) **Findings of Fact:** The proposed amendment has the possibility of providing up to 288-296 multifamily dwelling units to the City. Where the residential housing stock is 75-percent single family, the proposal is consistent with Goal 5 of the comprehensive plan by providing for a wide range of housing types for all Monroe residents.

c) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the comprehensive plan as amended by the proposals.

**iii. Each amendment shall comply with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.**

a) **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.
The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b) **Findings of Fact:** RCW 36.70A.020, Planning Goals, establishes objectives under the Growth Management Act to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and development regulations. The Monroe School District proposal identified by file no. CPA2018-01 potentially advances the following GMA objectives:

i) **RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 1: Urban growth.** Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.

ii) **RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 2: Reduce sprawl.** Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.

iii) **RCW 36.70A.020 – Planning Goal # 4: Housing.** Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.

c) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan complies with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws.

iv. **Each amendment must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.**

a) **Applicant Response:** The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would not adversely affect public health, safety, or welfare in any significant way. It is consistent with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan. It is in compliance with the Growth Management Act and other State and Federal laws. When weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered, the proposal continues to provide a benefit to the Monroe School District and the City of Monroe.

The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

Impacts on environmental elements, including public health, safety, or welfare, and the compatibility and consistency with the overall goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan, would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of environmental impacts of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

b) **Findings of Fact:** All proposed amendments on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle docket have been noticed and reviewed concurrently. All of the proposed amendments have been weighed in light of their potential cumulative effects.

c) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan was weighed in light of cumulative effects of other amendments being considered.
v. In addition to the above mandatory requirements, any proposed amendment must meet the following criteria unless compelling reasons justify its adoption without meeting them:

a) Each amendment addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.
   i) Applicant Response: The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments. The Subject Site is in an area of high-density multifamily development.

   The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment addresses the needs and changing circumstances of the City as a whole because the Monroe School District is a public service provider. The District is the provider of public school education service within the City and has determined this Docket Request is necessary. The District routinely evaluates their facilities and properties for long-term viability and to evaluate necessity. The Subject Site is no longer serving the program needs of students in the District. It was therefore decided to pursue a plan for the future use of the site for a non-school use.

   ii) Findings of Fact: As discussed above, 75-percent of the residential housing stock in the City is single family. New multifamily residential development is essential to establishing diversity in housing types, which would make Monroe more accessible to a wider segment of the population. The School District’s proposal has the potential to mitigate these concerns.

   iii) Conclusions of Law: The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan addresses needs or changing circumstances of the City as a whole or resolves inconsistencies between the Monroe Comprehensive Plan and other city plans or ordinances.

b) Environmental impacts have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.
   i) Applicant Response: The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is a non-project action. The Monroe School District prepared a SEPA Environmental Checklist, which discusses the anticipated potential environmental impacts. Project-level environmental impacts would be reviewed in conjunction with the review of any future subsequent land-use proposal.

   ii) Findings of Fact: As each proposed amendment on the 2018 – 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment docket must be weighed in light of cumulative effects of the other amendments being considered, the City conducted a review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to identify potential environmental impacts in the aggregate. However, as discussed above, SEPA review on CPA2018-A and 2018-B was conducted by their respective applicants, the Monroe School District and the Snohomish School District, acting as lead agencies. Consequently, this comprehensive plan amendment proposal from the Monroe School District for a concurrent FLUM amendment and rezone, identified by file no. CPA2018-01, was the only docket proposal identified on the Determination of Nonsignificance, issued July 3, 2019. The deadline for both submitting public comments and appealing the
DNS was July 17, 2019. As stated in the applicant’s response above, any potential project-related environmental impacts will be addressed at the time of permit review. During the SEPA DNS concurrent comment and appeal period, no appeals were received. However, written comments were received from the following parties:

- Ashley Floyd (email received 7/16/2019)
- Randall Trivett (email received 7/16/2019)
- Amy Martin (email received 7/17/2019)

iii) **Conclusions of Law**: The Planning Commission concludes that potential environmental impacts from the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan have been disclosed and/or measures have been included that reduce possible adverse impacts.

c) **Each amendment is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.**

i) **Applicant Response**: The proposed Docket Request would be consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations. Granting the appropriate non-school designation (multifamily) adds buildable land for high-density residential infill in the City, which is consistent with the Housing, Land Use Assumptions, which rely on land use strategies to accommodate the City’s housing unit needs through 2035. Some objectives include:

- Encouraging infill opportunities within existing City limits
- Encouraging the provision of diverse housing types in all areas of Monroe
- Encouraging housing growth near existing services, including park facilities

The request is necessitated because of changing circumstances as the sport fields are no longer useful or viable for the Monroe School District. In order to consider a future surplus of the properties, the Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning for the Subject Site need to be for non-school use. That action would provide increased residential (multifamily) infill land within the City, thereby meeting the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

ii) **Findings of Fact**: The comprehensive plan amendment application and associated rezone propose to change the future land use designation and zoning of the subject properties to accommodate multifamily residential development. At present, the site is zoned Institutional, which generally does not allow for residential development.

To ensure consistency with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designations that were adopted as part of the City’s state-mandated periodic update of the Comprehensive Plan in 2015, the zoning of many properties within the City, including the subject site, changed when the Unified Development Regulations (UDR) went into effect on May 1, 2019. Prior to the 2015 update, the property had been designated by the FLUM as Public Facilities School (PFS), and was compatibly zoned Public Open Space (PS). However, the FLUM changed substantially during the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update. The future land use of the subject properties was designated as Institutional. When the UDR was adopted, an Institutional zone was created. Consequently, upon adoption of the UDR, all properties designated as Institutional by the 2015 FLUM were zoned Institutional for consistency with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.
The Comprehensive Plan assumes a future residential capacity at build-out. Residential capacity calculations for the 2012 buildable lands analysis were predicated on the zoning in place at the time. As detailed above, the subject property was zoned Public Open Space (PS) at the time of the buildable lands inventory. Therefore, the properties were not included in the evaluation of the City’s residential capacity to accommodate growth. Any residential development in an area that did not previously permit such residential land uses will presumably result in an increase in population capacity.

Approving the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment will add buildable land for high-density residential infill in the City, as consistent with the Housing and Land Use Elements. The City has capacity to accommodate a greater population than is established by its growth targets. This is generally a nonissue for larger cities that have sufficient resources to take on additional growth. Nevertheless, it can prove problematic for cities like Monroe that are unable to offer similar benefits, such as greater connectivity to high-capacity transit. The Puget Sound Regional Council’s draft Vision 2050 plan concentrates most projected growth along major transportation routes such as Interstate 5. It is likely that small cities, such as Monroe, will not be expected to take on the same amount as population growth. Under these circumstances, the allocated growth targets for Monroe are to be considered more of a ceiling than a floor.

iii) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the land uses and growth projections that were the basis of the comprehensive plan and/or subsequent updates to growth allocations.

**d) Each amendment is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods, if applicable.**

i) **Applicant Response:** The proposed Docket Request is to provide future consistency with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods. The City is currently in the process of bringing development regulations into compliance with the land use designation in the adopted 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan. The “Multifamily” zoning designation would provide a range of density between 12 and 25 dwelling units per acre where the infrastructure can support the density, and be consistent with the surrounding developments.

The sports fields no longer serve the programing needs of school students in the Monroe School District. Preliminary evaluation shows adequate levels of service for area utilities, and public facilities and services to serve the Subject Site with development similar to the surrounding area (multifamily). Approval of the Docket Request would provide future flexibility to the District, a public service provider, and follows the timing and regulations of the City planning processes.

ii) **Findings of Fact:** The proposal put forth by the Monroe School District is to amend the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to change the land use designation of the subject site from an “Institution” designation to a “Multifamily” designation. Concurrent with the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, the applicant submitted a rezone request to change the site’s zoning from “Institutional (IN)” to “Multifamily Residential (R25).” Information regarding adjoining land uses and zoning districts is provided in the following table:
### Land Uses and Zoning Districts Adjoining the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction from Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use(s)</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan FLUM Designation(s)</th>
<th>Zoning District(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **North**           | • Multifamily residences  
                     • Single-family residences                                                       | • Multifamily                           | • Multifamily Residential (R25)         |
| **East**            | • N. Kelsey St. right-of-way  
                     • Sky Valley Education Center (across N. Kelsey St.)                              | • Institutional  
                     • Multifamily                                                                         | • Institutional (IN)  
                     • Multifamily Residential (R25)                                                     |
| **South**           | • Single-family residences  
                     • W. Columbia St. right-of-way                                                      | • High Density Single-Family Residential  
                     • Institutional  
                     • Multifamily                                                                         | • Institutional (IN)  
                     • Multifamily Residential (R25)                                                     
                     • Single-Family Residential – 15 Units per Acre (R15)                               |
| **West**            | • St. Mary of the Valley Church  
                     • Single-family residences                                                           | • High Density Single-Family Residential  
                     • Institutional                                                                         | • Institutional (IN)  
                     • Single-Family Residential – 15 Units per Acre (R15)                               |

As indicated by the table above, the proposed comprehensive plan amendment appears to be compatible with neighboring land uses.

**iii) Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is compatible with neighboring land uses and surrounding neighborhoods.

**e) Each amendment is consistent with other plan elements, as amended by the proposals.**

i) **Applicant Response:** The proposed request would allow potential development consistent with the 2015-2035 Comprehensive Plan and land use densities consistent with GMA requirements.

ii) **Findings of Fact:** The proposed Docket Request is consistent with the overall intent of the Comprehensive Plan as demonstrated within the application packet (including attachments and appendices), the SEPA Environmental Checklist and the Monroe School District’s Capital Facilities Plan.

iii) **Conclusions of Law:** The Planning Commission concludes the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with other plan elements, as amended by the proposals.
E. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis and findings included herein, the Planning Commission recommends the following:

Move that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, **AUTHORIZE** the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council **APPROVE** the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket.

______________________________________________________  ________________________
Bridgette Tuttle, Planning Commission Chair                     Date
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Based on the analysis and findings included herein, the Planning Commission recommends the following:

Move that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, **AUTHORIZE** the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council **APPROVE** the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket, to be modified as follows: [list modifications].
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Bridgette Tuttle, Planning Commission Chair  Date
E. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis and findings included herein, the Planning Commission recommends the following:

Move that the Planning Commission ADOPT these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, AUTHORIZE the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council APPROVE proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] and DENY proposed amendment(s) [file numbers] to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket.

____________________________________________________
Bridgette Tuttle, Planning Commission Chair
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E. PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

Based on the analysis and findings included herein, the Planning Commission recommends the following:

Move that the Planning Commission **ADOPT** these Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, **AUTHORIZE** the Planning Commission Chair to sign the Findings on behalf of the Commission, and recommend that the Monroe City Council **DENY** the proposed amendments to the 2015 – 2035 Comprehensive Plan included in the 2018 – 2019 amendment docket.

__________________________________________________________________________
Bridgette Tuttle, Planning Commission Chair                        Date