

CITY OF MARYSVILLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR ACTION

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: November 28, 2016

AGENDA ITEM: PA 16011 – WSDOT ROW Annexation	AGENDA SECTION: Public Hearing	
PREPARED BY: Chris Holland, Planning Manager	APPROVED BY:	
ATTACHMENTS: 1. PC Recommendation, dated 10.25.16 2. PC Minutes, dated 10.25.16 3. DRAFT – Annexation Notice of Intent	MAYOR	CAO
	BUDGET CODE:	
BUDGET CODE:		AMOUNT:

DESCRIPTION:

The WSDOT ROW Annexation is approximately 70.9-acres in size and is contiguous to Marysville city limits along the north, east and west boundaries. The annexation follows an irregular boundary, generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough.

The Planning Commission (PC) held a duly advertised public hearing on October 25, 2016 to consider pre-zoning the properties located within the CMA consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. Attached hereto is the Planning Commission Recommendation, dated 10.25.16, Planning Commission Minutes, dated 10.25.16, recommending Marysville City Council pre-zone the properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation as General Industrial (GI), consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan.

Pursuant to RCW 35A.14 when a municipality intends to establish zoning regulations concurrently upon annexation, the legislative body is required to hold a minimum of two (2) public hearings held a minimum of 30-days apart. The first public hearing is scheduled on Monday, November 28, 2016 and the second is scheduled on Monday, January 9, 2017.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive testimony from the public, subsequent to final action at a second public hearing scheduled on January 9, 2017.
COUNCIL ACTION:



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
80 Columbia Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8100 ♦ (360) 651-5099 FAX

PC Recommendation - WSDOT ROW Annexation Pre-Zoning

The Planning Commission of the City of Marysville, having held a public hearing on October 25, 2016, to consider pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with an implementing zoning designation of General Industrial (GI), and having considered the exhibits and testimony presented, does hereby enter the following findings, conclusions and recommendation for consideration by Marysville City Council:

FINDINGS:

1. The Planning Commission held a public work session to consider pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with an implementing zoning designation of General Industrial (GI) on October 11, 2016.
2. The Community Development Department issued Addendum No. 25 to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan for the NON-PROJECT action pre-zoning of properties consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan, on October 18, 2016, in accordance with WAC 197-11-625. No additional significant impacts beyond those identified in the FEIS are expected to occur with pre-zoning properties consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan.
3. The Planning Commission held a duly-advertised public hearing on October 25, 2016 to consider pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with an implementing zoning designation of General Industrial (GI).
4. No public comments were received in advance of the public hearing.


CONCLUSION:

At the public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with an implementing zoning designation of General Industrial (GI), as reflected in the Planning Commission Minutes, dated October 25, 2016, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, and depicted on the zoning map attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

RECOMMENDATION:

Forwarded to City Council as a Recommendation of pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map with an implementing zoning designation of General Industrial (GI), by the Marysville Planning Commission this 25th day of October, 2016.

By:


Steve Leifer, Planning Commission Chair

PLANNING COMMISSION



MINUTES

October 25, 2016

7:00 p.m.

City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Leifer called the October 25, 2016 meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. noting the excused absence of Commissioners Andes and Thetford. He noted that Commissioner Richards had informed them he would be arriving late.

Roll Call

Chairman: Steve Leifer

Commissioners: Roger Hoen, Kay Smith, Brandon Whitaker, Kelly Richards¹

Staff: Planning Manager Chris Holland, Community Development Director Dave Koenig

Absent: Jerry Andes, Tom Thetford

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 11, 2016

Motion made by Commissioner Hoen, seconded by Commissioner Whitaker, to approve the October 11 Meeting Minutes.

Chair Leifer referred to page 3, the first full paragraph, and noted that the second *Lake Stevens* in the first sentence should be corrected to **Lakewood**.

Motion passed unanimously (4-0) to approve the minutes as corrected.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

¹ Commissioner Richards arrived at 7:15 p.m. and left at 8:20 p.m. due to family obligations.

PUBLIC HEARING

WSDOT ROW Annexation –Pre-Zone

Chair Leifer opened the hearing at 7:03 p.m. and noted there was no one in the audience. Planning Manager Holland commented that they had received no comments on this item. He stated that staff was seeking a recommendation of approval for the Council.

Commissioner Hoen asked if there were any residences involved in this. Planning Manager Holland replied that there were not.

Public Comment – None

Motion made by Commissioner Hoen, seconded by Commissioner Whitaker, to forward this to the City Council with a recommendation for approval. **Motion** passed unanimously (4-0).

The public hearing was closed at 7:06 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

Lakewood Neighborhood Master Plan

Planning Manager Holland commented that the City received a letter today from Bailey, Duskin, and Peiffle regarding the estate of Margaret Hanson. He stated that there are some misconceptions in the comments and noted he has not had a chance to speak to these people yet. There is no overlay within the plan. It just talks about how the areas could function based on proposed developments. Any mixed use zone within the Lakewood area has the same rules and requirements for development as anything along 172nd including the Hanson estate. The City is not applying any additional regulations to this property. Any project action would be subject to the Design Guidelines based on the type of use. He clarified that there is nothing in the plan that is more stringent on the Hanson property than any other mixed use parcel in the area. He stated he would be following up with a letter to representatives of this estate explaining that.

Chair Leifer asked how the “Lakewood Community Overlay” verbiage in the Plan might have played into this misunderstanding. Planning Manager Holland explained it just highlights the assets of the area and identifies what *could* happen in the area, not necessarily what *will* happen. Chair Leifer asked if there is any intent to somehow make that area different than the rest of the areas zoned mixed use in the zone from I-5 to 19th. Planning Manager Holland replied there is not. He stated that he thinks a simple conversation with the estate will clear up this matter.

Chair Leifer asked about the other letter. Planning Manager Holland stated there was a pre-application today for the Sayani property. As part of the pre-application review, staff

met with them regarding future road alignments. Based on that, they wanted to submit something via email quickly for the Planning Commission's consideration about financing those road improvements. They are not contesting the connectivity; they are just concerned about the cost and would rather participate in some kind of an LID. They also had concerns about the sewer. Planning Manager Holland said he encouraged them to meet with their neighbors to discuss this so they might be able to come to an agreement about how to finance these improvements. He explained to them that the Plan itself is not a financing document. He also informed them that amendments to the Transportation Element will be made to include the arterials within the Lakewood Neighborhood to be on the traffic impact fee calculation. This could result in the possibility of land dedication for right of way that can be credited against traffic impact fees.

Chair Leifer recommended staff talking with the owners of the Hanson property before the Planning Commission takes any action. He commented that the letter regarding the Sayani property had also been received and noted.

Chair Leifer asked if the Level of Service in that area could be problematic for some of the development they are trying to improve the roads for. Planning Manager Holland explained that right now it isn't, but that could change as future development occurs. The acceptable Level of Service of 172nd is Level of Service D. Chair Leifer asked how this might impact development in that area. Planning Manager Holland replied that would be up to the traffic engineers to determine. If a development would impact any intersections to a Level of Service that's unacceptable then they need to propose improvements to bring it up to an acceptable Level of Service. Community Development Director Koenig explained that the City could also look at the interchange in anticipation of it being built and factor that into a conditional approval.

Planning Manager Holland presented the Draft Design Guidelines and solicited comments from the Planning Commission. He explained this expands on what is currently in place for the City. The overlay area encourages adaptive reuse of existing building over time to maintain a rural crossroad character. It requires buildings orient to the human-scale local streets. It provides for Pedestrian-Oriented Public Areas Designations, including commercial areas and streets, trails and parks. It requires high-quality common open space for new multi-family development. It requires comfortable pedestrian routes that connect to a Lakewood-wide "active transportation" network.

Commissioner Richards asked if this could open things up for more crime. Planning Manager Holland noted that could be, but more eyes in an area also acts as a deterrent. This also allows police to drive by and be able to see what is going on.

He continued to explain that the guidelines would require commercial buildings to provide a well-defined streetscape; pedestrian oriented facades; weather protection over building entries; pedestrian sidewalks required between parking lots and storefronts; smaller builder elements near the entries of large buildings in order to maintain a human scale; façade modulation and articulation; and detail elements. It

would build on the existing character and would require an active ground floor on specific street sections.

Chair Leifer commented these seem like a regurgitation of what was developed for downtown. Planning Manager Holland agreed that the design regulations expand upon the East Sunnyside-Whiskey Ridge, and Downtown Design Guidelines.

Chair Leifer referred to the letter regarding the estate of Margaret Hanson where they expressed concern about the guidelines being modified at the discretion of the Community Development Director. He asked what the likelihood is of that happening. Planning Manager Holland explained that they would all be reviewed administratively, and no one wants it to go to a design review board.

Director Koenig explained that the discretion of the Community Development Director allows for some flexibility to modify and try different things when it makes more sense. Chair Leifer referred to the letter from Sayani and asked if they would be required to stub sewers through their property so they can be continued on to the north. Director Koenig replied they would look at that and see where the sewer should be and what would be needed for that development. If there are increased costs, such as increased sewer size or water size, those would be credited to their fees.

Planning Manager Holland reviewed the Draft Vehicular Network Map for the Lakewood Neighborhood Master Plan. He noted that these are all concepts, and it really will depend on the development that happens. He also reviewed the Land Technologies Road Connection Proposal, the Leifer Road Connection Proposal, and the Andes Road Connection Proposals

Chair Leifer referred to the Lakewood "Triangle" and noted it allows for sort of a beltway concept with the opportunity to make some lateral connections. He agrees with the idea that all the traffic will be hitting the roundabout at 19th and come down the right-of-way along the railroad if they're not going to the shopping center. He also thinks that the people coming south on 23rd are going to get off on 19th and head down the railroad if they want to get on the freeway or go to over the overpass. Planning Manager Holland replied that the residential people would not be likely to go west to go south. They would just head south. These residential people would mainly be coming from the Wakefield and Vintage complexes. Chair Leifer discussed how he sees potential traffic patterns of drivers and commented that he feels 23rd Avenue would be redundant. He also stated that the confluence of the railroad right-of-way arterial and 23rd down by the lower end of the property by the mobile home park would create kind of a choke point. He asked if staff has taken a closer look at how that would be resolved. Planning Manager Holland replied that it is likely to be a roundabout at that location.

Chair Leifer summarized that he would be supportive of this road plan if there was a designation on the section south of 169th on 23rd to allow access to the property owners there on the basis of a collector arterial based on what he thinks will actually happen with that section of road. He agrees that Wakefield and that development will use it, but doesn't think that is a big number of trips in a day relative to what an arterial can carry.

Planning Manager Holland referred to section 4.1.3 which states that specific alignments have not been identified for the planned collector roads. Alignments will be defined as part of future corridor studies or as adjacent properties are developed. Some of the other planned collector roads also may be classified as arterials in the future depending on specific design and access requirements at the time the corridor is developed. Chair Leifer commented that this would allow for the concept of local access. Planning Manager Holland agreed. Planning Manager Holland commented that this is the kind of language he would like to put in the plan. Chair Leifer commented that he thinks the arterial going down the railroad would probably be a minor or a primary arterial. Planning Manager Holland thought it could carry quite a bit of traffic, but it definitely needs to be looked at.

Chair Leifer commented that when you're going north on 30th Avenue NE with a truck and trailer, it's impossible to get around the corner without going into the other lane. This is the reason he proposed his initial plan to connect there in order to provide a greater width.

There was consensus to hold a hearing for the Capital Facilities Plans for the school districts on November 9.

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEMS AND MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Whitaker, to adjourn the meeting at 8:31 p.m. **Motion** passed unanimously.

NEXT MEETING – November 9


Chris Holland, Planning Manager for
Laurie Hugdahl, Recording Secretary

NOTICE OF INTENTION COVER SHEET

SNOHOMISH COUNTY BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
ADMINISTRATIVE EAST BUILDING
3000 ROCKEFELLER, M/S 409
EVERETT, WASHINGTON 98201

CITIES AND TOWNS

AS REQUIRED BY RCW 36.93, A NOTICE OF INTENTION IS HEREBY SUBMITTED FOR PROPOSED ANNEXATION/INCORPORATION TOWN/CITY OF Marysville, A Code City.

PROCEEDINGS WERE INITIATED UNDER AUTHORITY OF RCW 35A.14.

- BY: (X) PETITION METHOD: 100% ASSESSED VALUE OF LAND OWNED BY PETITION SIGNERS.
 _____ % OF ASSESSED VALUE OWNED BY PETITION SIGNERS.
 () ELECTION METHOD: N/A NUMBER OF VOTES CAST AT LAST ELECTION IN AREAS TO BE ANNEXED OR INCORPORATED.
 _____ N/A % OF ABOVE FIGURE REPRESENTED BY SIGNERS
 () RESOLUTION FOR ELECTION BY CITY WITH NO PETITION

IS ASSUMPTION OF EXISTING INDEBTEDNESS TO BE REQUIRED? YES
 WILL SIMULTANEOUS ADOPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BE REQUIRED? YES
 WILL ANNEXATION INCLUDE ANNEXATION OF, OR ASSUMPTION OF, OR CONTROL OF ALL OR PART OF A WATER, SEWER, OR FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT? NO
 IF SO, WHICH DISTRICTS N/A

NAME EACH GOVERNMENTAL UNIT HAVING JURISDICTION WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSAL:

THE FOLLOWING OTHER PERSONS (ATTORNEYS, ETC. SHALL RECEIVE COMMUNICATION REGARDING PROPOSAL):

Snohomish County
Snohomish County PUD No. 1
Marysville School District No. 25

SIGNATURES ON PETITION: 100%
 RESIDENCES IN AREA: N/A (Right-of-Way)
 POPULATION OF AREA: N/A (Right-of-Way)
 ACREAGE: 70.9-acres

ASSESSED VALUATION: \$600
 TOPOGRAPHY: Relatively Flat
 BOUNDARIES: Generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough

	<u>PRESENT</u>
SEWERS	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>
WATER	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>
ROADS	<u>WSDOT Interstate 5, SR 529</u>
FIRE DISTRICT	<u>Marysville Fire District No. 12</u>
POLICE	<u>Snohomish County</u>
GROWTH POTENTIAL	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>

	<u>PROPOSED</u>
SEWERS	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>
WATER	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>
ROADS	<u>WSDOT Interstate 5, SR 529</u>
FIRE DISTRICT	<u>Marysville Fire District No. 12</u>
POLICE	<u>City of Marysville</u>
GROWTH POTENTIAL	<u>N/A (Right-of-Way)</u>

ATTACHMENTS: Vicinity Map, Comprehensive Plan Map, Legal Description, Certificate of Sufficiency, City Council Resolution, \$50.00 Fee.

PETITIONER: Chris Holland
80 Columbia Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8207

INITIATOR: City of Marysville
 REP. SIGNATURE: Chris Holland

FILE NO. _____ FILED EFFECTIVELY THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2017.

BY BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD CHIEF CLERK: _____

II. BACKGROUND/MAPS

EXHIBIT A - Description

The WSDOT ROW Annexation follows an irregular boundary, generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough, being a portion of the Northwest Quarter AND the Southwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 5 East, WM (see attached annexation boundary map).

The annexation boundary encompasses approximately 70.9-acres, and is contiguous to Marysville city limits along the north, east and west boundaries.

Per RCW 35A.01.040, the Snohomish County Assessor's Office has reviewed the petitions and has submitted a Certificate of Sufficiency verifying that the value of signed petitions represents 100% of the assessed value of the annexation area.

In accordance with the State Growth Management Act, Snohomish County established an Urban Growth Area (UGA) for the Marysville area on July 22, 1995. The proposed annexation is located within the UGA boundary and fills in a puzzle piece of Marysville's urban growth area which is currently unincorporated Snohomish County and is surrounded 95% by Marysville corporate limits.

Snohomish County's GMA Comprehensive Plan – Future Land Use Map designates the area as a Cadastral Easement. The City of Marysville's 2015 Comprehensive Plan map designates the area General Industrial. It is the City's intention to prezone the property at the time of annexation to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan designation with an implementing zone of GI (general industrial).

EXHIBIT B – LEGAL DESCRIPTION

**I-5 ANNEXATION
(March, 2016)
Legal Description**

Those portions of the Northwest Quarter AND the Southwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 5 East, WM, described as follows:


Commencing at the southwest corner of said Section 33; thence easterly, along the south line of said Section 33, to the westerly right-of-way line of S.R. 529 (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), being the true point of beginning, also being the southeast corner of Parcels B, C, and D of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 817, effective date 5/18/1974; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes East, along the easterly line of said Ordinance NO. 817 and along said right-of-way line parallel with the centerline of said S.R. 529, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles from the centerline at Highway Station 40+50 (all Highway Engineer's Stations to be hereinafter referred to as "Station"); thence northwesterly 10 feet to a point, when measured at right angles, 60 feet distant from said Station 40+50; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes east 191.4 feet, more or less, parallel with said centerline to a point 60 feet westerly, when measured at right angles to Station 38+58.6; thence westerly to a point 50 feet distant, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 0+00 P.C. (= 38+58.6 P.O.T. Existing Road, 19.0 foot offset); thence northwesterly and concentric with said centerline "D", 285.6 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 3+01.4 P.T. to a point of intersection with a line projecting westerly and at right angles with Station "A" = 0+00 T.S.; thence westerly along said projecting line to a point 16 feet distant from the easterly right-of-way line of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad; thence northeasterly, parallel with said Railroad right-of-way line, to a point of intersection with the westerly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant, when measured at right angles from survey centerline "L"; thence North 21 degrees 24 minutes West, parallel with said centerline, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the northeast corner of Parcels B, C and D, of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the south line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 193, effective date 3/08/1915;

thence easterly, along said north line and along the south line of said Ordinance No. 193, to the easterly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant easterly from and parallel with the centerline survey of said Highway, Snohomish River to Marysville, designated as "L" Line, also being the northwest corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence South 21 degrees 24 minutes East (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheet 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71) to the north right-of-way line of the access to Old P. S.H. No. 1, said right-of-way being 50 feet distant and parallel with the centerline survey "D" Line of said Old P.S.H. No. 1, to the most southerly angle point of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence North 35 degrees 55 minutes East 81.7 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet northwesterly when measured at right angles to and/or radial from "D" Line Survey at Highway Engineer's Station "D" 18+65.9 P.C.; thence northeasterly 77.4 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant northwesterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 19+47.6 P.T.; thence North 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds East, along the right-of-way line of Old P.S.H. No.1, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, being the northeast corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the northeasterly bank of Ebey Slough; thence southeasterly, along said northeasterly bank, being the southwesterly line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 541, effective date 5/15/1965, to the easterly right-of-way line of Old Primary State Highway No.1, being 50 feet southeasterly of, as measured at right angles to and parallel with, the centerline of said Road; thence South 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds West, along the westerly line of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817 and along said right-of-way line, to a point 50 feet distant when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B" Line at Station "B" 20+49.3 P.T. (=19+72.0, Old P.S.H. No. 1); thence southwesterly to a point 50 feet distant when measured radial from "B2" Line at station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southeasterly 25 feet to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said Station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southerly, along the easterly right-of way line, being 75 feet easterly from and parallel with said "B2" Line, to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said "B2" Line at station "B2" 17+00; thence southerly to a point distant 125 feet southeasterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B2" line Station "B2" 16+26.88 P.C.;

thence southerly to a point 155 feet distant easterly when measured radial from the centerline survey of Primary State Highway No. 1 (Plan P.S.H. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), at Station 505+00; thence southerly to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 500+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 498+50; thence southwesterly to a point 75 feet distant easterly when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 497+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 75 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 496+12; thence easterly 75 feet to a point distant 150 feet when measured at right angles from said Station 496+12; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline, to the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the southwest corner of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817; thence westerly, along the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, to the true point of beginning.



EXHIBIT C – MAPS (annexation boundary)




WSDOT ROW Annexation

3/1/2016

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|
|  | Downtown Commercial |  | Urban Growth Area |
|  | General Industrial |  | Marysville city limits |
|  | R18 Multi-Family Medium |  | Annexation area - 70.9 acres |

EXHIBIT C – MAPS (Zoning)



WSDOT ROW Annexation - Zoning

7/8/2016

- Downtown Commercial
 - General Industrial
 - R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
 - Marysville city limits
 - Annexation area - 70.9 acres

EXHIBIT D – RESOLUTION

III. PETITION/CERTIFICATION

EXHIBIT E – PETITIONS



PROPERTY OWNERS PETITION FOR ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE, WASHINGTON

TO: City Council of the City of Marysville
1049 State Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270

WE THE UNDERSIGNED, being the **OWNERS of not less than 60% in value**, according to the assessed valuation for general taxation, of the real property described on **EXHIBIT A** attached hereto or any portion thereof, lying contiguous to the City of Marysville, Washington, do hereby petition that such territory be annexed to and made a part of the City of Marysville, Washington under the provisions of RCW 35A.14, et seq., and any amendment thereto, of the State of Washington.

The territory proposed to be annexed is within Snohomish County, Washington and is described on **EXHIBIT A** attached hereto and depicted on **EXHIBIT B**, a diagram which outlines the boundaries of the property sought to be annexed, further attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned respectfully petition the Honorable City Council of the City of Marysville and ask:

1. That appropriate action be taken to entertain this petition, fixing a date for public hearing, causing notice to be published and posted specifying the time and place of such hearing, and inviting all persons interested to appear and voice approval or disapproval of such annexation; and
2. That the following such hearing, and subsequent to approval by the Snohomish County Boundary Review Board, if such is convened, the City Council determine by ordinance that such annexation shall be effective; and that property so annexed shall become a part of the City of Marysville, Washington subject to its laws and ordinances then and thereafter in force, including a Comprehensive Plan to become effective upon annexation if the same is provided pursuant to RCW 35.13.178.
3. That the zoning for the area proposed for annexation be amended consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and that said zoning be implemented and effective upon annexation.

THE PETITIONERS HERETO AGREE: ". . . that all property within the territory hereby sought to be annexed shall be assessed and taxed at the same rate and at the same basis as property within the City of Marysville for any outstanding indebtedness of said City, including assessments or taxes in payment of any bonds issued or debts contracted prior to or existing at the time of annexation," in accordance with the requirements of the City Council of the City of Marysville.

These pages are a group of pages containing an identical text and prayer intended by the signers of this Petition to be presented and considered as one Petition and may be filed with other pages containing additional signatures which cumulatively may be considered as a single Petition.

WARNING: EVERY PERSON WHO SIGNS THIS PETITION WITH ANY OTHER THAN HIS OR HER TRUE NAME, OR WHO KNOWINGLY SIGNS MORE THAN ONE OF THESE PETITIONS, OR SIGNS A PETITION SEEKING AN ELECTION WHEN HE OR SHE IS NOT A LEGAL VOTER, OR SIGNS A PETITION WHEN HE OR SHE IS OTHERWISE NOT QUALIFIED TO SIGN, OR WHO MAKES HEREIN ANY FALSE STATEMENT, SHALL BE GUILTY OF A MISDEMEANOR.

PRAYER OF PETITION:

1. Annexation of area described in **EXHIBIT A** and depicted in **EXHIBIT B**; and
2. Assumption of indebtedness of the City of Marysville; and
3. Adoption of the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan for the subject area; and
4. Adoption of zoning consistent with the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan, depicted by **EXHIBIT C**.

MINUTES FROM CITY COUNCIL MEETING: June 13, 2016 City Council Regular Meeting Minutes

Consent Item No. 10:

Consider Approval of the Annexation Boundary for Circulation of the 60% Petition, and the Annexation Boundary should be Subject to the City's Bonded Indebtedness, Comprehensive Plan and Zoning

Motion made by Councilmember Wright, seconded by Councilmember Toyer, to approve Consent Agenda items 4-12, 17, and 18. **Motion** passed unanimously (6-0).

INSTRUCTIONS TO SIGNERS AND VOLUNTEER SOLICITORS

1. Sign your name as you sign on legal documents. Married women sign "Mary D. Jones," not "Mrs. John D. Jones."
2. **Only PROPERTY OWNERS should sign.**
3. The signature of a record owner, as determined by the records of the county auditor, shall be sufficient without the signature of his or her spouse.
4. In the case of mortgaged property, the signature of the mortgagor shall be sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.
5. In the case of property purchased on contract, the signature of the contract purchaser, as shown by the records of the county auditor, shall be deemed sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.
6. Any officer of a corporation owning land within the area involved who is duly authorized to execute deeds or encumbrances on behalf of the corporation, may sign on behalf of such corporation, and shall attach to the petition a certified excerpt from the bylaws of such corporation showing such authority.
7. When property stands in the name of a deceased person or any person for whom a guardian has been appointed, the signature of the executor, administrator, or guardian, as the case may be, shall be equivalent to the signature of the owner of the property; and
8. When a parcel of property is owned by multiple owners, the signature of an owner designated by the multiple owners is sufficient.

Please submit this 'Petition for Annexation to the City of Marysville, Washington' to the City of Marysville Community Development Department located at 80 Columbia Avenue, Marysville, WA 98270 for formal processing.

If you have any questions regarding this document or a question regarding annexations, please contact Chris Holland, Planning Manager, at 360.363.8207 or by e-mail at cholland@marysvillewa.gov.

	PROPERTY OWNERS SIGNATURE	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER	PARCEL NUMBER	DATE SIGNED
1.		Kris Wright Whitehorse Ventures, LLC	2810 34 th Street Everett, WA 98201	425.259.5115	30053300300400	
2.						Oct. 3, 2016

EXHIBIT A – Perimeter Legal Description;
EXHIBIT B – Annexation Boundary Map, and
EXHIBIT C – Zoning Map, attached hereto

EXHIBIT A

I-5 ANNEXATION (March, 2016) Legal Description

Those portions of the Northwest Quarter AND the Southwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 5 East, WM, described as follows:

Commencing at the southwest corner of said Section 33; thence easterly, along the south line of said Section 33, to the westerly right-of-way line of S.R. 529 (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), being the true point of beginning, also being the southeast corner of Parcels B, C, and D of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 817, effective date 5/18/1974; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes East, along the easterly line of said Ordinance NO. 817 and along said right-of-way line parallel with the centerline of said S.R. 529, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles from the centerline at Highway Station 40+50 (all Highway Engineer's Stations to be hereinafter referred to as "Station"); thence northwesterly 10 feet to a point, when measured at right angles, 60 feet distant from said Station 40+50; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes east 191.4 feet, more or less, parallel with said centerline to a point 60 feet westerly, when measured at right angles to Station 38+58.6; thence westerly to a point 50 feet distant, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 0+00 P.C. (= 38+58.6 P.O.T. Existing Road, 19.0 foot offset); thence northwesterly and concentric with said centerline "D", 285.6 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 3+01.4 P.T. to a point of intersection with a line projecting westerly and at right angles with Station "A" = 0+00 T.S.; thence westerly along said projecting line to a point 16 feet distant from the easterly right-of-way line of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad; thence northeasterly, parallel with said Railroad right-of-way line, to a point of intersection with the westerly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant, when measured at right angles from survey centerline "L"; thence North 21 degrees 24 minutes West, parallel with said centerline, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the northeast corner of Parcels B, C and D, of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the south line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 193, effective date 3/08/1915;

EXHIBIT A


I-5 ANNEXATION
PAGE 2

thence easterly, along said north line and along the south line of said Ordinance No. 193, to the easterly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant easterly from and parallel with the centerline survey of said Highway, Snohomish River to Marysville, designated as "L" Line, also being the northwest corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence South 21 degrees 24 minutes East (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheet 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71) to the north right-of-way line of the access to Old P. S.H. No. 1, said right-of-way being 50 feet distant and parallel with the centerline survey "D" Line of said Old P.S.H. No. 1, to the most southerly angle point of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence North 35 degrees 55 minutes East 81.7 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet northwesterly when measured at right angles to and/or radial from "D" Line Survey at Highway Engineer's Station "D" 18+65.9 P.C.; thence northeasterly 77.4 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant northwesterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 19+47.6 P.T.; thence North 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds East, along the right-of-way line of Old P.S.H. No. 1, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, being the northeast corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the northeasterly bank of Ebey Slough; thence southeasterly, along said northeasterly bank, being the southwesterly line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 541, effective date 5/15/1965, to the easterly right-of-way line of Old Primary State Highway No. 1, being 50 feet southeasterly of, as measured at right angles to and parallel with, the centerline of said Road; thence South 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds West, along the westerly line of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817 and along said right-of-way line, to a point 50 feet distant when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B" Line at Station "B" 20+49.3 P.T. (=19+72.0, Old P.S.H. No. 1); thence southwesterly to a point 50 feet distant when measured radial from "B2" Line at station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southeasterly 25 feet to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said Station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southerly, along the easterly right-of-way line, being 75 feet easterly from and parallel with said "B2" Line, to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said "B2" Line at station "B2" 17+00; thence southerly to a point distant 125 feet southeasterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B2" line Station "B2" 16+26.88 P.C.;


EXHIBIT A

I-5 ANNEXATION
PAGE 3

thence southerly to a point 155 feet distant easterly when measured radial from the centerline survey of Primary State Highway No. 1 (Plan P.S.H. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), at Station 505+00; thence southerly to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 500+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 498+50; thence southwesterly to a point 75 feet distant easterly when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 497+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 75 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 496+12; thence easterly 75 feet to a point distant 150 feet when measured at right angles from said Station 496+12; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline, to the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the southwest corner of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817; thence westerly, along the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, to the true point of beginning.



April 12, 2016



WSDOT ROW Annexation

3/1/2016

- Downtown Commercial
- General Industrial
- R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
- Marysville city limits
- Annexation area - 70.9 acres





EXHIBIT B



WSDOT ROW Annexation - Zoning

7/8/2016

- Downtown Commercial
- General Industrial
- R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
- Marysville city limits
- Annexation area - 70.9 acres




EXHIBIT C



PROPERTY OWNERS PETITION FOR ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE, WASHINGTON

TO: City Council of the City of Marysville
1049 State Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270

WE THE UNDERSIGNED, being the OWNERS of not less than 60% in value, according to the assessed valuation for general taxation, of the real property described on EXHIBIT A attached hereto or any portion thereof, lying contiguous to the City of Marysville, Washington, do hereby petition that such territory be annexed to and made a part of the City of Marysville, Washington under the provisions of RCW 35A.14, et seq., and any amendment thereto, of the State of Washington.

The territory proposed to be annexed is within Snohomish County, Washington and is described on EXHIBIT A attached hereto and depicted on EXHIBIT B, a diagram which outlines the boundaries of the property sought to be annexed, further attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned respectfully petition the Honorable City Council of the City of Marysville and ask:

- 1. That appropriate action be taken to entertain this petition, fixing a date for public hearing, causing notice to be published and posted specifying the time and place of such hearing, and inviting all persons interested to appear and voice approval or disapproval of such annexation; and
2. That the following such hearing, and subsequent to approval by the Snohomish County Boundary Review Board, if such is convened, the City Council determine by ordinance that such annexation shall be effective; and that property so annexed shall become a part of the City of Marysville, Washington subject to its laws and ordinances then and thereafter in force, including a Comprehensive Plan to become effective upon annexation if the same is provided pursuant to RCW 35.13.178.
3. That the zoning for the area proposed for annexation be amended consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and that said zoning be implemented and effective upon annexation.

THE PETITIONERS HERETO AGREE: "... that all property within the territory hereby sought to be annexed shall be assessed and taxed at the same rate and at the same basis as property within the City of Marysville for any outstanding indebtedness of said City, including assessments or taxes in payment of any bonds issued or debts contracted prior to or existing at the time of annexation," in accordance with the requirements of the City Council of the City of Marysville.

These pages are a group of pages containing an identical text and prayer intended by the signers of this Petition to be presented and considered as one Petition and may be filed with other pages containing additional signatures which cumulatively may be considered as a single Petition.

WARNING: EVERY PERSON WHO SIGNS THIS PETITION WITH ANY OTHER THAN HIS OR HER TRUE NAME, OR WHO KNOWINGLY SIGNS MORE THAN ONE OF THESE PETITIONS, OR SIGNS A PETITION SEEKING AN ELECTION WHEN HE OR SHE IS NOT A LEGAL VOTER, OR SIGNS A PETITION WHEN HE OR SHE IS OTHERWISE NOT QUALIFIED TO SIGN, OR WHO MAKES HEREIN ANY FALSE STATEMENT, SHALL BE GUILTY OF A MISDEMEANOR.

PRAYER OF PETITION:

- 1. Annexation of area described in EXHIBIT A and depicted in EXHIBIT B; and
2. Assumption of indebtedness of the City of Marysville; and
3. Adoption of the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan for the subject area; and
4. Adoption of zoning consistent with the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan, depicted by EXHIBIT C.

MINUTES FROM CITY COUNCIL MEETING:

Consent Item No. 10:

Consider Approval of the Annexation Boundary for Circulation of the 60% Petition, and the Annexation Boundary should be Subject to the City's Bonded Indebtedness, Comprehensive Plan and Zoning

Motion made by Councilmember Wright, seconded by Councilmember Toyer, to approve Consent Agenda items 4-12, 17, and 18. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

INSTRUCTIONS TO SIGNERS AND VOLUNTEER SOLICITORS

- 1. Sign your name as you sign on legal documents. Married women sign "Mary D. Jones," not "Mrs. John D. Jones."
2. Only PROPERTY OWNERS should sign.
3. The signature of a record owner, as determined by the records of the county auditor, shall be sufficient without the signature of his or her spouse.
4. In the case of mortgaged property, the signature of the mortgagor shall be sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.
5. In the case of property purchased on contract, the signature of the contract purchaser, as shown by the records of the county auditor, shall be deemed sufficient, without the signature of his or her spouse.
6. Any officer of a corporation owning land within the area involved who is duly authorized to execute deeds or encumbrances on behalf of the corporation, may sign on behalf of such corporation, and shall attach to the petition a certified excerpt from the bylaws of such corporation showing such authority.
7. When property stands in the name of a deceased person or any person for whom a guardian has been appointed, the signature of the executor, administrator, or guardian, as the case may be, shall be equivalent to the signature of the owner of the property; and
8. When a parcel of property is owned by multiple owners, the signature of an owner designated by the multiple owners is sufficient.

Please submit this 'Petition for Annexation to the City of Marysville, Washington' to the City of Marysville Community Development Department located at 80 Columbia Avenue, Marysville, WA 98270 for formal processing.

If you have any questions regarding this document or a question regarding annexations, please contact Chris Holland, Planning Manager, at 360.363.8207 or by e-mail at cholland@marysvillewa.gov.

	PROPERTY OWNERS SIGNATURE	PRINTED NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER	PARCEL NUMBER	DATE SIGNED
1.		John H. White	WSDOT Northwest Region 15700 Dayton Ave North Shoreline, WA Mail: PO Box 330310 Seattle, WA 98133-9710	206.440.4695	N/A WSDOT Right-of-Way	7/2/16
2.						

EXHIBIT A – Perimeter Legal Description;
EXHIBIT B – Annexation Boundary Map, and
EXHIBIT C – Zoning Map, attached hereto

EXHIBIT A

**I-5 ANNEXATION
(March, 2016)
Legal Description**

Those portions of the Northwest Quarter AND the Southwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 30 North, Range 5 East, WM, described as follows:

Commencing at the southwest corner of said Section 33; thence easterly, along the south line of said Section 33, to the westerly right-of-way line of S.R. 529 (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), being the true point of beginning, also being the southeast corner of Parcels B, C, and D of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 817, effective date 5/18/1974; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes East, along the easterly line of said Ordinance NO. 817 and along said right-of-way line parallel with the centerline of said S.R. 529, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles from the centerline at Highway Station 40+50 (all Highway Engineer's Stations to be hereinafter referred to as "Station"); thence northwesterly 10 feet to a point, when measured at right angles, 60 feet distant from said Station 40+50; thence North 9 degrees 41 minutes east 191.4 feet, more or less, parallel with said centerline to a point 60 feet westerly, when measured at right angles to Station 38+58.6; thence westerly to a point 50 feet distant, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 0+00 P.C. (= 38+58.6 P.O.T. Existing Road, 19.0 foot offset); thence northwesterly and concentric with said centerline "D", 285.6 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant westerly, when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 3+01.4 P.T. to a point of intersection with a line projecting westerly and at right angles with Station "A" = 0+00 T.S.; thence westerly along said projecting line to a point 16 feet distant from the easterly right-of-way line of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad; thence northeasterly, parallel with said Railroad right-of-way line, to a point of intersection with the westerly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant, when measured at right angles from survey centerline "L"; thence North 21 degrees 24 minutes West, parallel with said centerline, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the northeast corner of Parcels B, C and D, of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the south line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 193, effective date 3/08/1915;

EXHIBIT A


I-5 ANNEXATION
PAGE 2

thence easterly, along said north line and along the south line of said Ordinance No. 193, to the easterly right-of-way line of P.S.H. No. 1, lying 150 feet distant easterly from and parallel with the centerline survey of said Highway, Snohomish River to Marysville, designated as "L" Line, also being the northwest corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence South 21 degrees 24 minutes East (Plan PSH No. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheet 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71) to the north right-of-way line of the access to Old P. S.H. No. 1, said right-of-way being 50 feet distant and parallel with the centerline survey "D" Line of said Old P.S.H. No. 1, to the most southerly angle point of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817; thence North 35 degrees 55 minutes East 81.7 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet northwesterly when measured at right angles to and/or radial from "D" Line Survey at Highway Engineer's Station "D" 18+65.9 P.C.; thence northeasterly 77.4 feet, more or less, to a point 50 feet distant northwesterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from Station "D" 19+47.6 P.T.; thence North 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds East, along the right-of-way line of Old P.S.H. No.1, to the north line of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 33, being the northeast corner of Parcel E of said Ordinance No. 817, also being the northeasterly bank of Ebey Slough; thence southeasterly, along said northeasterly bank, being the southwesterly line of City of Marysville Ordinance No. 541, effective date 5/15/1965, to the easterly right-of-way line of Old Primary State Highway No.1, being 50 feet southeasterly of, as measured at right angles to and parallel with, the centerline of said Road; thence South 32 degrees 23 minutes 30 seconds West, along the westerly line of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817 and along said right-of-way line, to a point 50 feet distant when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B" Line at Station "B" 20+49.3 P.T. (=19+72.0, Old P.S.H. No. 1); thence southwesterly to a point 50 feet distant when measured radial from "B2" Line at station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southeasterly 25 feet to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said Station "B2" 33+71.38 P.T.; thence southerly, along the easterly right-of way line, being 75 feet easterly from and parallel with said 'B2" Line, to a point distant 75 feet when measured radial from said "B2" Line at station "B2" 17+00; thence southerly to a point distant 125 feet southeasterly when measured at right angles and/or radial from "B2" line Station "B2" 16+26.88 P.C.;


EXHIBIT A

I-5 ANNEXATION
PAGE 3

thence southerly to a point 155 feet distant easterly when measured radial from the centerline survey of Primary State Highway No. 1 (Plan P.S.H. 1, S.R. 5, Snohomish River to Marysville, Sheets 6 and 7 of 15, dated January 3, 1962, Revised 11/26/71), at Station 505+00; thence southerly to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 500+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 180 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 498+50; thence southwesterly to a point 75 feet distant easterly when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 497+00; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline to a point 75 feet distant when measured at right angles from said centerline at Station 496+12; thence easterly 75 feet to a point distant 150 feet when measured at right angles from said Station 496+12; thence southerly, parallel with said centerline, to the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, also being the southwest corner of Parcel A of said Ordinance No. 817; thence westerly, along the south line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 33, to the true point of beginning.



April 12, 2016



WSDOT ROW Annexation

3/1/2016

- Downtown Commercial
- General Industrial
- R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
- Marysville city limits
- Annexation area - 70.9 acres





EXHIBIT B



Annexation Area
(hatched)
General Industrial



WSDOT ROW Annexation - Zoning

7/8/2016

- Downtown Commercial
- General Industrial
- R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
- Marysville city limits
- Annexation area - 70.9 acres




EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT F – CERTIFICATION



Assessor's Office

Linda Hjelle
County Assessor

Cindy Portmann
Chief Deputy

M/S #510
3000 Rockefeller Ave.
Everett, WA 98201-4046

(425) 388-3433
FAX (425) 388-3961

CERTIFICATE OF SUFFICIENCY

I, Chris Huyboom, Snohomish County Deputy Assessor, in accordance with the requirements of RCW 35A.01.040, hereby certify that the Petition for the WSDOT ROW Annexation submitted to the Assessor on October 7, 2016 is signed by the owners of property comprising 100% of the total assessed value within the area described in the petition, according to the records of the Snohomish County Assessor. The determination of sufficiency was begun on October 17, 2016.

Dated this 27th day of October 2016.

By 
Deputy Assessor

Email: contact.assessor@snoco.org
Web: www.snohomishcountywa.gov/175/assessor

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL

EXHIBIT G – SEPA



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
80 Columbia Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8100 ♦ (360) 651-5099 FAX

October 18, 2016

Dear Reader and Interested Citizen,

Addendum No. 25 to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), dated January 13, 2005, and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Marysville Comprehensive Plan, dated April 2005, has been prepared by the Marysville Community Development Department. This addendum provides additional environmental information and analysis relating to the NON-PROJECT ACTION annexation proposing incorporation of the remaining 70.9-acres of Marysville's Urban Growth Area (MUGA) along the city's southern boundary and pre-zoning properties consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. The proposed annexation area is designated General Industrial within the Marysville Comprehensive Plan with an implementing zoning designation of GI.

This addendum adds further information to the analysis contained in the DEIS and FEIS. No additional significant impacts beyond those identified in the FEIS are expected to occur. No additional programmatic action level environmental review will be required to the extent that the existing environmental documents listed in this addendum or other published documents have analyzed such changes.

Review of the proposed pre-zoning, is tentatively scheduled to occur at a public hearing before the Marysville Planning Commission on October 25, 2016, and at subsequent public hearings before Marysville City Council on November 28, 2016 and January 9, 2017.

The Community Development Department invites you to comment on Addendum No. 25 to the FEIS and the proposed pre-zoning of the annexation area. The entire file (PA 16011) is available to review at the Community Development Department, located at 80 Columbia Avenue, Marysville, WA 98270.

If you have any questions or comments regarding Addendum No. 25 to the FEIS or pre-zoning of the annexation area, please contact me at 360.363.8207 or by e-mail at cholland@marysvillewa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Holland", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Chris Holland
Planning Manager

cc: Dave Koenig, CD Director

**ADDENDUM NO. 25
TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**NON-Project Action
Pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation
consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan**

Prepared Consistent with

The Washington State Environmental Policy Act of 1971
Chapter 43.21C Revised Code of Washington
Chapter 197-11, Washington Administrative Code
Marysville Municipal Code Title 22



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
80 Columbia Avenue ♦ Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8100 ♦ (360) 651-5099 FAX

Date of Issuance: October 18, 2016

FACT SHEET

File Number: PA 16011 WSDOT ROW Annexation
PA 04024 FEIS

Project Title: WSDOT ROW Annexation

Proposed Action: NON-PROJECT ACTION pre-zoning properties located within the WSDOT ROW Annexation, consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan.

Purpose of the FEIS Addendum:

This information expands upon previously identified significant impacts of the alternatives to the Marysville Comprehensive Plan DEIS, dated January 13, 2005, and FEIS, dated April 2005, but does not substantially change the analysis.

No additional significant impacts beyond those identified in the FEIS are expected to occur. No additional programmatic action level environmental review will be required to the extent that the existing environmental documents listed in this addendum or other published documents have analyzed such changes.


This addendum is being issued in accordance with WAC 197-11-625. Additional changes to the proposal may be considered during the public hearing process. The adopted environmental documents listed in this addendum meet the City of Marysville's environmental review needs for the current proposal.

Description of Proposal:

NON-PROJECT ACTION annexation proposing incorporation of the remaining 70.9-acres of Marysville's Urban Growth Area (MUGA) along the city's southern boundary and rezoning properties consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. The proposed annexation area is designated General Industrial within the Marysville Comprehensive Plan with a implementing Zoning designation of GI.

Location of Proposal:

The WSDOT ROW annexation follows an irregular boundary, generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough (see attached map).



WSDOT ROW Annexation - Zoning

7/8/2016

- Downtown Commercial
 - General Industrial
 - R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
 - Marysville city limits
 - Annexation area - 70.9 acres



Lead Agency: City of Marysville
Community Development Department
80 Columbia Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270

Required Approval: City of Marysville Council – Ordinance Adoption

Circulation and Comment: This addendum, or notice of availability, is being sent to all recipients of the previously issued FEIS as required by WAC 197-11-625. No comment period is required for this addendum under WAC 197-11-502(8)(c).

FEIS Contact Person: Chris Holland
Planning Manager
360.363.8207
cholland@marysvillewa.gov

Date of Issuance: October 18, 2016

Responsible Official: Dave Koenig
Position: Community Development Director
Address: 80 Columbia Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270

Signature:  _____

Tentative Date of Implementation: December 2016

Public Hearings: Review of the proposed NON-PROJECT action amendments to the Marysville Comprehensive Plan is scheduled to occur at a public hearing before the Marysville Planning Commission on October 25, 2016, and at subsequent public hearings before the Marysville City Council on November 28, 2016 and January 9, 2017.

Documents: The entire file (PA 16011) is available for viewing at the Community Development Department, located at 80 Columbia Avenue, Marysville, WA 98270.

CITY OF MARYSVILLE
"WSDOT ROW Annexation"
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
RCW 197-11-960

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 Applicant:

This environmental checklist asks you to decide 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 non-project proposals:

Complete this checklist for non-project proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply". In addition, complete the *Supplemental Sheet for Non-Project Action (part D)*.

For non-project 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.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
WSDOT ROW Annexation – Prezone
2. Name of applicant:
City of Marysville
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
Chris Holland, Planning Manager
City of Marysville
Community Development Department
80 Columbia Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270
(360) 363-8207
cholland@marysvillewa.gov
4. Date checklist prepared:
October 4, 2016
5. Agency requesting checklist:
City of Marysville Community Development Department
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
The City of Marysville anticipates finalizing the WSDOT ROW annexation in January 2017.
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
The WSDOT ROW annexation proposes annexing the remaining Marysville Urban Growth Area (MUGA) along the southern portion of the MUGA. New development projects within the WSDOT ROW annexation will require project level SEPA review.
8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
City of Marysville 2015 Comprehensive Plan
City of Marysville 2005 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS (DEIS) and Final EIS (FEIS).
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.
None known
10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.
City of Marysville Council prezone approval.


Snohomish County Boundary Review Board annexation approval.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including all 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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

NON-PROJECT ACTION annexation proposing incorporation of the remaining 70.9-acres of the MUGA along the city's southern boundary and rezoning properties consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. The rezone will enact zoning consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. The proposed annexation area is designated General Industrial within the Marysville Comprehensive Plan with a implementing Zoning designation of GI.

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 topography 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 to this checklist.

The Central Marysville annexation follows an irregular boundary, generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough.



WSDOT ROW Annexation

3/1/2016

- Downtown Commercial
- General Industrial
- R18 Multi-Family Medium
- Urban Growth Area
- Marysville city limits
- Annexation area - 70.9 acres



B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (***bold/italic***): ***Flat***, rolling, hilly, ***steep slopes (along the Steamboat and Ebey Slough)***, mountainous, other.

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

Approximately 0-5% increasing to 35+% along the Steamboat and Ebey Slough

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of the agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

According to the Soil Survey of Snohomish County, the primary soil is Puget Silty Clay Loam.

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

There is no known history of unstable soils or slopes within the annexation area.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION. Future development actions occurring within the annexation will require project level review for erosion impacts.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION. Individual construction projects will be subject to project level SEPA review. The City of Marysville has adopted a stormwater management plan and ordinance, which is consistent with Department of Ecology and Puget Sound Water Quality standards and recommended model programs. Drainage and grading plans will be required to meet city standards.

2. AIR

a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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.

Steamboat and Ebey Sloughs are located within the annexation area, which are part of the Snohomish River basin and flow directly into Puget Sound

- 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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 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.


N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

Yes, portions of the annexation area are located within the floodplain.



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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground waters? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION. Methods for collection and disposal of runoff will be determined during project level review for construction within the annexation area.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

d. Proposed measure to reduce or control surface, ground and runoff water impacts, if any:

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

4. PLANTS

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site: **N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION**

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

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

Bull Trout, Chinook Salmon and Steelhead are listed as threatened species within Puget Sound and may use both Steamboat and Ebey Slough.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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: **N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION**

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

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

Bull Trout, Chinook Salmon and Steelhead are listed as threatened species within Puget Sound and may use both Steamboat and Ebey Slough.

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

Yes, Marysville is located along the Pacific Flyway.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

b. Noise

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The proposed annexation area is comprised of WSDOT ROW including Interstate 5 and SR 529.

- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

No

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Interstate 5 above grade freeway structures and bridges crossing Steamboat and Ebey Sloughs.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

The proposed annexation area is ROW and is designated as a Cadastral Easement.

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

The proposed annexation area is ROW and is designated as a Cadastral Easement.

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

High-Intensity Designation

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Both Steamboat and Ebey Sloughs are designated at a Type S Stream in MMC Chapter 22E.010, Critical Areas Management.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

9. Housing

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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?

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

11. Light and Glare

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreation opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The proposed annexation area is approximately 70.9-acres containing Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW.

- b. Is the site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Yes, Community Transit provides bus along the Interstate 5 and SR 529 Corridors.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

The rezone will not in itself require new roadways or street improvements.

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

15. Public Services

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

16. Utilities

- a. ***Bold/italic*** utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

- 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.

N/A – NON-PROJECT ACTION

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.

Signature:  Date: 10.04.16

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

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 rezone will adopt zoning consistent with the Marysville Comprehensive Plan. Project level actions which are initiated within the annexation area will be required to meet City, State and federal requirements.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

The City will conduct project level review for all projects occurring within corporate city limits and coordinate review with affected agencies and governments.

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

The proposed rezone will not have an effect on plants, animals, fish or marine life. Future project action which initiated within the annexation area will be required to meet City, State and federal requirements.

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

Project level review will require consistency with the city's stormwater management plan and Hydraulic Project Approvals (HPA) will be issued as necessary by Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposed rezone will not deplete energy or natural resources.

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

Compliance with IBC, UPC, UMC and Energy codes.

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?

The proposal will not affect these elements. Project level reviews for development projects will require compliance with the City's Shoreline Management Master Program, MMC Chapter 22E.010 Critical Areas Management, individual SEPA reviews and compliance with the City Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

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

Project level reviews for development projects will require compliance with the City's Shoreline Master Program and MMC Chapter 22E.010 Critical Areas Management, individual SEPA reviews and compliance with the City Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

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 will encourage urban development consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Development and Shoreline Master Program.

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

Adoption of zoning to implement the City comprehensive plan.

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

The proposed rezone will not increase demands on transportation, public services and utilities. Construction within the annexation area will have resulting transportation and public service impacts, as currently experienced by development in the area without annexation.

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

Project level reviews for development projects will require compliance with the individual SEPA reviews and compliance with the City Comprehensive Plan and Development Codes.

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

No known conflict. The Growth Management Act requires that development regulations be consistent with adopted GMA comprehensive plans.

Marysville Public Library
6120 Grove Street
Marysville, WA 98270

Fire District 8
1825 South Lake Stevens Road
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
lhuff@lfire.org

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue #500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
info@psrc.org

Fire District 15
7812 Waterworks Rd
Tulalip, WA 98271
etroutman@firedistrict15.org

Puget Sound Energy
John Rork
P.O. Box 90868
Bellevue, WA 98009-0868
john.rork@pse.com

Kelly Cooper
Dept of Health-Env. Health Division
P.O. Box 47820
Olympia, WA 98504-7820
kelly.cooper@doh.wa.gov

Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 42560
Olympia, WA 98504-2560
kaardal@agr.wa.gov

Sno. County Health District
Environmental Health Division
3020 Rucker Avenue #300
Everett, WA 98201
bstraughn@snohd.org

*For Lakewood School District
Capital Projects;*
Superintendent-Mike Mack
mmack@lwsd.wednet.edu

Sno. County Executive Office
3000 Rockefeller Ave
M/S 407
Everett, WA 98201
Lisa.dulude@snoco.org

Getchell Fire District 22
8424 99th Avenue NE
Arlington, WA 98223
rselia@getchellfire.com
chiefhots@getchellfire.com

Regional Transit Authority
Union Station
401 S. Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104

Fire District 21
12131 – 228th St NE
Arlington, WA 98223
thots@firedistrict21.com

Snohomish County Council
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
M/S 609
Everett, WA 98201
Contact.council@snoco.org

Arlington Times
P.O. Box 145
Marysville, WA 98270
pbrown@soundpublishing.com

Stillaguamish Tribe
Attn: Executive Director
P.O. Box 277
Arlington, WA 98223
cstevens@stillaguamish.com

Lakewood School District
17110 16th Drive NE
Lakewood, WA 98259
dkanehen@lwsd.wednet.edu

Marysville Fire District
1094 Cedar Avenue
Marysville, WA 98270
tmaloney@marysvillewa.gov

Snohomish County EDC
728 134th Street SW, Suite 128
Everett, WA 98204
Kendee.yamaguchi@snoco.org

Natural Resources Conservation Svc
Everett Service Center
528 -91st Avenue NE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
paul.gleason@wa.usda.gov

Lake Stevens Sewer District
1106 Vernon Road, Suite A
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
mbowers@lkstevenssewer.org

Snohomish Co. Parks & Rec.
6705 Puget Park Drive
Snohomish, WA 98296
sharon.swan@snoco.org

Seattle Times- North Bureau
1120 John Street
Seattle, WA 98109

SEPA Environmental Review
Department of Ecology
P.O. Box 47703
Olympia, WA 98504-7703
sepaunit@ecy.wa.gov

US Army Corps of Engineers
3015 NW 54th Street
Seattle, WA 98107-4299
Erin.L.Legge@usace.army.mil

National Marine Fisheries Svcs
510 Desmond Drive, Suite 103
Lacey, WA 98503
NOAAStaffDirectory@noaa.gov

WA State Energy Office
Town Square Bldg #4, M/S 43173
925 Plum Street SE
Olympia, WA 98504
tony.usibelli@commerce.wa.gov

City of Everett- Public Works
3200 Cedar Avenue
Everett, WA 98201
everettpw@everettwa.gov

The Everett Herald
1800 41st St., Suite S-300
Everett, WA 98203
joconnor@soundpublishing.com

Department of Transportation
Bill Wiebe
P.O. Box 47300
Olympia, WA 98504-7374
PAZOOKR@wsdot.wa.gov

Dept of Social & Health Services
Land & Building Division
P.O. Box 45848
Olympia, WA 98504-5848

Snohomish Co. PUD- Water
P.O. Box 1107
Everett, WA 98206
eatobin@snopud.com
mewicklund@snopud.com

Tulalip Tribes
6406 Marine Drive
Tulalip, WA 98271
kfinley@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov

Department of Fish & Wildlife
16018 Mill Creek Blvd
Mill Creek, WA 98012
Jamie.bails@dfw.wa.gov

Puget Sound Partnership
326 East D Street 360.464.1232
Tacoma, WA 98421 360.402.5470
marsha.engel@psp.wa.gov

Pilchuck Audubon Society
1429 Avenue D, PMB-198
Snohomish, WA 98290
execdirector@pilchuckaudubon.org

US Environmental Protection Agency
300 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503
Burke.Alison@epamail.epa.gov

Snohomish Co. Public Works
Maria Dobson-Schmidt
3000 Rockefeller Ave, M/S 607,5th floor
Everett, WA 98201
Elbert.esparza@snoco.org

Sno./King County Master Builders
Mike Pattison
335 116th Avenue SE
Bellevue, WA 98004
mpattison@mbaks.com

Office of Archaeology &
Historical Preservation
1063 S. Capital Way #106
Olympia, WA 98501
sepa@dahp.wa.gov

City of Arlington
Planning Director
238 N. Olympic Avenue
Arlington, WA 98223
planning@arlingtonwa.gov

Community Transit
Kate Tourtellot
7100 Hardeson Road
Everett, WA 98203
kate.tourtellot@commtrans.org

City of Everett
Planning Director
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201
planning@ci.everett.wa.us

Community, Trade & Economic Dev.
P.O. Box 48350
Olympia, WA 98504-8350
reviewteam@commerce.wa.gov

Department of Natural Resources
919 N. Township Street
Sedro Wooley, WA 98284
sepacenter@dnr.wa.gov

Snohomish/Camano Island Co.
Board of Realtors
3201 Broadway, Suite E
Everett, WA 98111

Marysville Globe
P.O. Box 145
Marysville, WA 98270
pbrown@soundpublishing.com

US Fish & Wildlife
911 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

~~Futurewise-Removed per Kristin Kelly
814 2nd Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104
Kristin@futurewise.org moved to Audubon~~

Lake Stevens School District
Robb Stanton
2202 123rd NE
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
rstanton@lkstevens.wednet.edu

Snohomish County PDS
3000 Rockefeller Avenue
Everett, WA 98201
Holly.Faller@snoco.org
Owen.carter@snoco.org

City of Lake Stevens
Planning Director
P.O. Box 257
Lake Stevens, WA 98258
rwright@lakestevenswa.gov

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency
Attn: SEPA Review
1904 3rd Ave, Suite 105
Seattle, WA 98101-3317
SEPA@pscleanair.org

Marysville School District
4220 80th Street NE
Marysville, WA 98270
Capital_projects@mssl.k12.wa.us

Snohomish/Camano Island Co.
Board of Realtors
3201 Broadway, Suite E
Everett, WA 98201

Marysville Public Library
6120 Grove Street
Marysville, WA 98270

US Fish & Wildlife
911 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

Regional Transit Authority
Union Station
401 S. Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104

Dept of Social & Health Services
Land & Building Division
P.O. Box 45848
Olympia, WA 98504-7374

Seattle Times- North Bureau
1120 John Street
Seattle, WA 98109

V. FACTORS THE BOARD MUST CONSIDER

1. Overview

A. Population of proposal; what percentage is that to existing entity?

Population is zero as the annexation area is mostly WSDOT ROW.

B. Territory (number of acres)

The annexation area is approximately 70.9-acres.

C. Population Density

Population density is zero as the annexation area is mostly WSDOT ROW

D. Assessed Valuation

The current assessed valuation for the annexation area is \$600.

2. Land Use

A. Existing

WSDOT ROW

B. Proposed: Immediate or long-range

The City of Marysville’s 2015 Comprehensive Plan designation for the annexation area is General Industrial. Immediate and long-range land use includes Interstate 5 and SR 529.

3. Comprehensive Plans

A. Snohomish County Comprehensive Plan

1. What comprehensive plan policies specifically support this proposal?

Policy LU 1.C.1: Unique topographical and physical features such as watershed boundaries, streams, rivers, ridge lines, steep slopes, roads, railroad lines and transmission lines (where they follow property lines) and special purpose district boundaries shall be used, if possible, to delineate and define the boundary.

Policy IC 1.B.1: The county shall work with cities in planning for orderly transfer of service responsibilities in anticipation of potential or planned annexations or incorporations within UGAs.

Policy IC 1.B.2: In newly annexed areas within UGAs, the county shall continue to provide regional services while the cities provide urban services.

Policy IC 1.B.3: The county shall seek interlocal agreements with the cities to establish a process for transferring authority over pending projects, permits, and records and establishes reciprocal impact mitigation for transportation, parks, and schools prior to potential or planned annexations or incorporations.

Policy IC 1.B.4: The county shall not support any proposed annexation of unincorporated lands in Snohomish County by a city or special district situated predominantly outside of Snohomish County unless and until an annexation agreement has been signed by the county and said district or city. Such agreement shall address and substantially resolve issues of

1. Is this proposal in your adopted comprehensive plan, or will a plan amendment be required? If so, when will that amendment be completed?

The City of Marysville's 2015 Comprehensive Plan currently includes the annexation area.

2. When was your Comprehensive Plan approved?

September 15, 2015

3. Has this area been the subject of a Pre-Annexation Zoning Agreement? If so, please enclose a signed copy of the agreement.

The City of Marysville Planning Commission recommended approval of the pre-zone consistent with the adopted City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan establishing the General Industrial zone for the proposed annexation area.

4. What is the proposed land use designation in your adopted Comprehensive Plan? When were your zoning regulations adopted?

The plan designates all of the properties within the annexation area as General Industrial. The City adopted MMC Title 22 *Unified Development Code*, on February 14, 2011.

IV. PLANNING DATA

A. Revenue/Estimates

1. Estimate City expenditures

It is not anticipated that the annexation would create any additional city expenditures. Marysville currently provides maintenance of the SR529 surface ROW, responds to emergency calls in this area and has coordinated enforcement and complaint efforts with WSDOT and Snohomish County.

2. Estimate City revenues to be gained

The City of Marysville includes the General Levy and EMS Levy, amounting to \$2.6813 per \$1000 of assessed valuation.

Total taxes collected for property owners within the city limits (and Marysville School District) are \$11.7745 per \$1000 of assessed valuation.

The City collects a 5% utility tax on natural gas and electric and a 6% utility tax on telephone.

3. Estimate County revenues lost

The taxes which would no longer be collected should the property be annexed to Marysville include the county road tax, which is a very nominal loss in revenue considering the total valuation of the annexation is \$600.

4. Estimate County expenditure reduction:

Expenditure reductions would be based on eliminating services currently provided to the area, such as response from the County Sheriff's office.

5. Estimate fire district revenue lost:

None.

6. Estimate fire district expenditures reduction:

None. The site is presently serviced by the Marysville Fire District and will continue to be served following annexation.

7. Estimate other special district revenue loss:

None.

8. Estimate other special district expenditure reduction:

None.

B. Services

1. Law Enforcement: (if applicable)

- a. Describe current police coverage and services provided:

The City of Marysville has police coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The City employs 88 full time employees, including 65 commissioned police officers which includes Patrol Officer (first responders), Investigations Unit, Multi-Jurisdictional Property Crimes Unit, School Resource Unit, Pro-Act Unit, K-9 Unit, Community Service Officer, Crime prevention Unit (volunteers), SWAT, Collision Investigation Unit. At least 5 officers and one 1 supervisor are on duty at all times. During peak hours an additional 3 officers and 1 supervisor supplements the manpower.

- b. Current emergency and normal response time being experienced:

The average emergency response time is approximately 3-5 minutes and non-emergency response time is 10-20 minutes.

- c. Initial police protection plan contemplated:

The Marysville Police Department is prepared to provide policing services to the newly annexed area, and will make every effort to ensure that adequate response times are maintained.

- d. Back-up plan (mutual aid and/or reserve):

The Marysville Police Department participates in mutual aid with other surrounding law enforcement agencies, including the Snohomish County Sheriff's Department, Washington State Patrol, Lake Stevens Police Department, Arlington Police Department and the Everett Police Department.

- e. Projected police growth plan contemplated:

None contemplated with the proposed annexation.

- f. Source of dispatch:

The City of Marysville operates on a 24-hour enhanced 911-dispatch service.

2. Fire Services

- a. Nearest Station:

The nearest fire station to the annexation area is Marysville Fire District Station #61 located at 1635 Grove Street.

b. Response Time:

The average response time to this area is five minutes.

c. Are they fully manned? How many part-time and full-time personnel?

All Marysville Fire District stations are staffed 24/7. The Marysville Fire District employs 99 full-time personnel, who operate the Fire Districts' five (5) stations (Station 61, 62, 63, 65 & 66). There are 38 Firefighters, 20 Firefighter/Paramedics, and 20 Captains assigned to four Engine Companies, one Ladder Company, four Aid Cars, and two Medic Units. Full-time personnel are supplemented by 27 part-time Firefighters.

d. Major equipment at station location (including type and number of emergency vehicles):

The major firefighting equipment available includes: six (6) engines, one (1) ladder, two (2) advanced life support units (paramedics), four (4) basic life support units, one (1) 4,000 gallon water tender, , one (1) boat, eleven (11) staff vehicles and five (5) various utility vehicles. Each station typically has one engine or *ladder* and one EMS unit on-site at all times.

e. How many fully certified EMT personnel do you have:

74 EMT's and 25 paramedics.

f. What fire rating applies?

A fire rating of 4 applies both within the corporate City limits and outside the City limits within Fire District No. 12.

g. Source of dispatch:

SnoPac Enhanced 911 dispatch service.

3. Water - **There is no water service located with the annexation area. The annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT right-of-way.**

a. Directly or by contract:

N/A

b. Storage location(s), capacity:

N/A

c. Mains to serve the area (diameter, location):

N/A

d. Pressure station location and measured flow:

N/A

e. Current average daily demand (ADD):

N/A

f. Water source: (wells, Everett, etc.)

N/A

- g. Financing of proposed service: (LID, ULID, Developer Extension, etc.)

N/A

4. Sewer - **There is no sewer service located with the annexation area. The annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT right-of-way.**

- a. Directly or by contact:

N/A

- b. Mains to service the area: (diameter, location)

N/A

- c. Gravity or Lift Station required:

N/A

- d. Disposal (City or district treatment plant)

N/A

- e. Capacity Available:

N/A

VI. GENERAL

1. In case of extensions of services, has an annexation agreement been required? If so, please attach a copy of this requirement.

No.

2. Describe the topography and natural boundaries of the proposal:

The topography is generally flat, except the slopes associated with Steamboat and Ebey Slough and the elevation of Interstate 5. The Central Marysville annexation follows an irregular boundary, generally encompassing WSDOT Interstate 5 and SR 529 ROW, north of Steamboat Slough and south of Ebey Slough (see attached annexation boundary map).

3. How much growth has been projected for this area during the next ten (10) year period? What source is the basis for this projection?

Growth potential is very limited as the annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT right-of-way.

4. Describe any other municipal or community services relevant to this proposal:

None known.

5. Describe briefly any delay in implementing service delivery to the area:

None anticipated.

6. Briefly state your evaluation of the present adequacy, cost or rates of service to the area and how you see future needs and costs increasing. Is there any other alternative source available for such service(s)?

Service needs of the proposed annexation area (i.e., streets, emergency services) are currently provided by the City of Marysville, Marysville Fire

District and Snohomish County. There are not anticipated cost increases associated with the annexation.

7. Comparative property and utility tax cost to homeowner before and after annexation:
N/A - the annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT right-of-way.

VII. OBJECTIVES OF THE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD

1. Preservation of natural neighborhoods and communities.

The proposed annexation is contiguous to city limits along the north, east and west boundaries. This area will become a natural extension of the urban level facilities in Marysville. The proposed annexation is located within the UGA boundary and fills in a puzzle piece of Marysville's urban growth area which is currently unincorporated Snohomish County and is surrounded 95% by Marysville corporate limits.

2. Use of physical boundaries, including but not limited to bodies of water, highways, and land contours.

The proposed annexation area is bounded by Steamboat Slough to the south, I-5 and SR 529 ROW to the east and west and Ebey Slough on the north (see attached annexation boundary map).

3. Creation and preservation of local service areas.

The Snohomish County Sheriff's Office currently services the proposed annexation area.

The Marysville Police Department will provide service to the area upon annexation into the City of Marysville.

The Marysville Fire District currently services the proposed annexation area and would continue to do so upon annexation into the City of Marysville.

4. Prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries.

There are no irregular boundaries within the proposed annexation boundary. Upon approval of the annexation irregular boundaries will be eliminated.

5. Discouragement of multiple incorporations of small cities and encouragement of incorporation of cities in excess of ten thousand population in heavily populated urban areas.

N/A - the annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT right-of-way.

6. Dissolution of inactive special purpose districts.

There are no known inactive special purpose districts within the proposed annexation area, nor are there active services which would be rendered inactive by this annexation.

7. Adjustment of impractical boundaries.

There are no adjustments of impractical boundaries within the proposed annexation area. Upon approval of the annexation impractical boundaries will be eliminated.

8. Incorporation as cities or towns or annexation to cities or towns of unincorporated areas which are urban in character.

The annexation area is comprised mainly of WSDOT I-5 and SR 529 right-of-way.

9. Protection of agricultural and rural lands which are designated for long term productive agricultural and resource use by a comprehensive plan adopted by the county legislative authority.

There are no agricultural lands within the proposed annexation area.