



CITY OF SNOHOMISH

Founded 1859, Incorporated 1890

116 UNION AVENUE · SNOHOMISH, WASHINGTON 98290 · TEL (360) 568-3115 FAX (360) 568-1375

UGA Expansion – SR-9 and US-2 Responses to Questions Asked During April 29, 2008 Meeting June 4, 2008

Question 1: a. There has been no mention of how the LLC figures in. b. This proposal doesn't meet growth management laws. c. It is too soon.

Response: a. *Some property owners within the UGA expansion area have a contractual relationship with SR9/US2 LLC for the eventual purchase of those properties. The City of Snohomish and SR9/US2 LLC have a written agreement by which the LLC reimburses the City for expenses incurred in the evaluation of the proposal to expand the UGA.*

The application to amend the County's Comprehensive Plan to move the UGA line was originally submitted by the LLC. Later, the City determined it would be prudent to become a co-applicant with SR9/US2 LLC on the request to expand the City's UGA. If the County Council decides to expand Snohomish's UGA, then the City will assume responsibility for land use planning for the additional UGA land.

Throughout the land use planning process, the City will accept input from interested stakeholders and citizens. No doubt, the LLC will advocate adoption of land use plans and policies which are consistent with the conceptual land use plan provided with the original application to Snohomish County. The City will evaluate those objectives within the context of public opinion, community values, the City's adopted Strategic Plan, and the forthcoming technical and financial studies.

b. The Growth Management Act (GMA) calls for urban development only within UGAs. This proposal is to expand the City of Snohomish UGA boundary to allow for new, urban development. According to GMA, urban development should occur only where adequate urban services are available. The City and the LLC are presently studying the feasibility of extending sanitary sewer service to the new UGA. Virtually all urban services are readily available to accommodate urban-level land uses here. Snohomish County has, by designating the area between Snohomish and Lake Stevens RUTA (Rural Urban Transition Area), concluded that urbanization in this area should be expected.

c. The City is studying this area now, before urbanization actually occurs. If the UGA boundary is adjusted as proposed, market forces (not the City) will determine when urbanization may occur.

Question 2: I am concerned about keeping the wetlands pristine – the children from Riverview put salmon fry into Mosier Creek on 36th last week – will this annual event be able to continue in the future?

Response: *The City of Snohomish's Critical Areas regulations will apply after the area is annexed. The City requires preservation of all wetlands and streams, and requires a natural buffer be preserved around these areas. Throughout the Puget Sound region, school-age children are releasing salmon fry to urban streams.*

Question 3: If housing doesn't pay for costs of serving it, why not increase business park and commercial uses?

Response: *City staff supports the notion of maximizing the area's potential generating retail sales tax revenue, and also the attraction of new family-wage jobs. The City has not yet decided whether the amount of commercial and business park land within the UGA should be increased, decreased, or remain as shown in the bubble-diagram land use map.*

From an investment/development standpoint, construction of speculative homes has less financial risk than the construction of speculative commercial, office, or manufacturing buildings. Without the commitment of some major businesses to locate here, it is unlikely that investors will build a regional employment center in this area as the first phase of development. City staff believe it is reasonable to include some amount of residential development in this area because such construction can help bring commercial and business park investment to the area. Also, including some number of dwellings in the land use plan will help support our efforts to have good jobs close to home. The City has not yet determined how many dwellings should ultimately be allowed here.

Question 4: I am concerned about the new "Common Themes" Map (4/29/08). What is the logic of a business park on the corner of 87th Avenue SE and Tom Marks Road? What is the expected maximum population of the development when completed?

Response: *The Common Themes Map reflects the conclusions and recommendations of the small groups. This area has relatively good access to Bickford Avenue via 87th Avenue SE, and is currently home to EQUIFriends. Maximum population of this area is expected to be approximately 5,000 persons.*

Question 5: A clover leaf access to US-2 could be made at the US-2 overpass of 87th Avenue SE. It would be less expensive than an overpass for westbound traffic at west end of Bickford Avenue.

Response: *Thank you for the suggestion. This will be considered further.*

Question 6: What are the projected water, sanitary sewer, and garbage rates for Snohomish versus Lake Stevens in 3 years?

Response: *Some of this requested information is difficult to provide because some critical facts are not known. Accordingly, the City would be reluctant to estimate future rates of utility providers that may or may not ultimately serve this area under consideration.*

WATER: It is not known whether water service for this area will be provided by the City of Snohomish Water Utility or by PUD. Solid waste rates are typically not increased or

decreased because of additional population growth. State Law allows existing licenses for solid waste service to remain in effect for seven years after annexation.

SANITARY SEWER: The City is currently studying the ramifications of extending sanitary sewer to this area. That work was called for by City of Snohomish Resolution 1145. This study will determine whether it will be economically-feasible to extend sanitary sewer service north of US-2. This includes economic feasibility for the City’s sanitary sewer utility as well as for developers and future homeowners/businesses north of US-2. Because the City’s sewer treatment plant must undergo expensive upgrades whether or not this area is added to the City, the addition of new connections/ratepayers north of US-2 may reduce the magnitude of future rate increases for existing rate payers. The study is being prepared by FCS Group, the consulting firm most familiar with the City’s utility infrastructure and rates. Forecasted sanitary sewer rates (assuming no UGA expansion) can be summarized as follows:

Comparison of Monthly Sewer Rates

	<i>City of Snohomish</i>	<i>Lake Stevens Sewer District</i>
2008	\$43.87 (+ \$3.10/100 cu. ft. overage if applicable)	50.00
2009	\$52.50 (+ \$3.91/100 cu. ft. overage if applicable)	not provided
2010	\$63.00 (+ \$4.89/100 cu. ft. overage if applicable)	53.00
2011	to be determined	not provided
2012	to be determined	\$56.70

SOLID WASTE: There should no change in solid waste rates within this timeframe. State law allows existing solid waste franchises in unincorporated areas to remain in effect for up to seven years after annexation. Most collection licenses and franchises for solid waste have very similar service standards. Accordingly, any difference future solid waste rates should be minor.

Question 7: What is the process for paying for sewer hookup? Can it be paid off within 20 years, like the PUD? How much will the hookup cost, and how long will someone have to pay the entire amount?

Response: Exact answers to these questions are dependent upon the specific circumstances. A generalized answer is provided here. See chapter 15.04 of the Snohomish Municipal Code for regulations that apply.

The City of Snohomish offers a payment plan for sewer connection charges to low income senior citizens and disabled persons. In all other circumstances, full payment of the connection charge is required at the time of connection.

City regulations require that existing homes connect to the City’s sanitary sewer utility within five years of annexation—if the sewer system is available and within 200 feet.

The UGA area will ultimately need to be served by a new sewer transmission line and the cost of that infrastructure will be recouped through some financing method, such as developer extensions or connection fees. Since this new transmission line has not been designed, the amount of the special fees cannot yet be determined.

For comparison purposes, the connection fee within the Cemetery Creek Trunk Line Special Development Area (south of US 2) is \$13,317 per single family residence. The City requires the connection to the City's water utility when sewer connection is made. The connection charge for water is \$3,229. The cost of installing the necessary service lines to the home is in addition to these connection charges, and is the responsibility of the homeowner.

Question 8: What is the status of the Environmental Impact Statement for this project?

Response: *The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being prepared by Snohomish County is currently "on-hold" until decisions are made on the items to be included as part of Docket XIII. Decisions on the Docket are expected in June, and subsequent decisions on EIS funding are expected in July.*

The City has called for detailed analysis of the financial, environmental, and service impacts of this proposed expansion of the UGA. See City of Snohomish Resolution 1145. This analysis is of a broader scope and greater specificity than will be provided in the County's EIS. This is mentioned here only to clarify that there are separate studies being conducted by the County and for the City.

Question 9: How are Lake Stevens and Snohomish working to resolve the overriding issue of who will govern this area?

Response: *The two Cities met with Snohomish County leaders on June 3, 2008 to begin a new negotiation/mediation process. The City of Snohomish is hopeful that Lake Stevens will participate in an earnest effort to identify one or more options for boundaries between the two communities. Lake Stevens prefers that both UGA requests be removed from Docket XIII until all planning issues are resolved. The City of Snohomish prefers that analysis and processing of its UGA expansion request continue during the negotiation/mediation process.*

Question 10: Does more density bring in more crime? Is there a way for the community to work to minimize crime? When/if we build, are there certain measures that we can look at to minimize crime?

Response: *Links between multi-family development and crime are a popular misconception. According to the Urban Land Institute (ULI), various studies have shown that multi-family development actually generates equivalent or lower police calls, per unit, than single family development. The ULI notes that higher density and mixed-use development minimize crime potential by providing a 24 hour population and more "eyes on the street."*

Additional information can be found on the ULI website at <http://www.uli.org/Content/ContentGroups/PolicyPapers/MFHigher010.pdf>

The keys to minimizing crime are public involvement in the neighborhood and considered site and building design. Neighborhoods are encouraged to organize block watches and to foster a relationship with the Police Department. The placement of lighting, buildings and landscaping on a site to create view lines, limit hidden areas, and create “defensible spaces” are all environmental design measures that can be implemented in development to minimize crime. Clear identification of addresses from the street also aids in minimizing response time for police and fire. The Snohomish Police Department is included in project reviews to encourage the use of such design elements in new development.

Question 11: If we’re going to stay in this area, which fire/police department is going to best serve us?

Response: “Best” is a subjective term. All public service agencies in the area work hard to deliver superior service. See Question 12 below.

Question 12: Can you give us some response times for fire/police/rescue services?

Response: *POLICE: The City of Snohomish Police Department has determined that travel time to the UGA study area is 3-7 minutes, when traveling with traffic (no lights or siren used). This test was conducted during weekday, afternoon traffic conditions (3:10 p.m.). The City has not determined travel time needed for response to a high-priority call. With lights and sirens, travel time would be less than the 3-7 minute drive time mentioned above.*

Official emergency response records for the County Sheriff’s Office were obtained by the City. Those records indicate that County Sheriff response time to the UGA for a Code One call (highest priority, with lights and siren) is 15+ minutes.

FIRE/EMT: The Snohomish Fire District (District 4) provides both fire response and emergency medical response (EMT). All property annexed to the City of Snohomish becomes part of District 4’s service area. District 4 could provide service to this north area itself, or it could chose to contract for service through another agency such as District 8. Potentially, Districts 4 and 8 could jointly operate a new station at the north end of the proposed UGA that would allow District 8 to serve land to the north and District 4 to serve land to the south. Once it becomes clear whether this area will become part of Snohomish’s UGA, detailed discussions to address service issues will begin.

The fire and EMT response times from District 4’s Station 43 are as follows:

From 1525 Ave D (Fire Station 43) to: (by way of 87th Ave.)

<i>Tom Marks Rd & 87th Ave</i>	<i>3:25 minutes</i>
<i>3800 87th Ave</i>	<i>4:00 minutes</i>
<i>36th ST & 87th Ave</i>	<i>4:30 minutes</i>
<i>45th ST & Tom Marks Rd</i>	<i>4:15 minutes</i>
<i>4000 of Tom Marks Rd</i>	<i>5:00 minutes</i>

From 1525 Ave D (Fire Station 43) to: (by way of SR 9.)

SR9 @ SR2	2:20 minutes
SR9 @ approx. 4400 Blk.	2:35 minutes

NOTE: Driving times were derived from a passenger car driving without light and siren and following posted speed limits. Time waiting for traffic lights was not included.

District 8 has provided the following response times:

**LAKE STEVENS FIRE DEPARTMENT
 3 YEAR AVERAGE RESPONSE TIME FOR GRID 1218**

Figure 1. Represents the total number of calls and the average response time of the first arriving apparatus for 2005, 2006 and 2007 in grid 1218.

	# of calls	First Arriving Apparatus Response Time
Priority Response	18	8min:13sec Avg
Non-Priority Response	14	10min:18sec Avg

Grid 1218: Represents the area within the boundaries of the Lake Stevens Fire Department south of 36th Street SE to the border of Fire District #4 and east from 87th Ave SE to 98th Dr SE.

First Arriving Apparatus Response Time: Starts at the point when the dispatcher begins notifying the fire department and ends at the point when the first responding apparatus arrives at the scene.

Priority Response: Includes all call types where the first arriving apparatus responds with emergency lights and sirens.

Non-Priority Response: Includes all call types where the first arriving apparatus responds with no emergency lights and sirens. The responding apparatus complies with all signal, traffic flow and speed limit laws.