

# Downtown Marysville Master Plan

Addendum to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement





# Marysville Downtown Master Plan Addendum to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Text Changes</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Draft SEIS Chapter 1 (Introduction) .....	1
1.2. Draft SEIS Chapter 2 (Description of Alternatives) .....	1
1.3. Draft SEIS Chapter 3 (Earth Analysis) .....	1
1.4. Draft SEIS Chapter 4 (Water Resources Analysis) .....	1
1.5. Draft SEIS Chapter 5 (Streams, Wetlands, Fish, and Wildlife Analysis) .....	1
1.6. Draft SEIS Chapter 6 (Land Use/ Population/ Housing Analysis) .....	1
1.7. Draft SEIS Chapter 7 (Environmental Health Analysis) .....	1
1.8. Draft SEIS Chapter 8 (Transportation Analysis).....	1
1.8.1 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 78 (under 8.1.7): .....	2
1.8.2 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 81:.....	3
1.8.3 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 88:.....	3
1.8.4 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 89:.....	4
1.8.5 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 89:.....	5
1.8.6 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 92:.....	5
1.8.7 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 99:.....	5
1.9. Draft SEIS Chapter 9 (Parks and Open Space Analysis).....	6
1.10. Draft SEIS Chapter 10 (Public Services Analysis) .....	6
1.11. Draft SEIS Chapter 11 (Utilities Analysis) .....	6
1.11.1 Revisions to DEIS page 113: .....	6
1.11.2 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 119:.....	7
1.11.3 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 120:.....	7
<b>Chapter 2: Comments and Responses</b> .....	<b>10</b>
Letter 1 (from Community Transit): .....	10
Letter 2 (from Snohomish County Public Utility District): .....	13
Letter 3 (from Snohomish County Public Works): .....	15

# Fact Sheet

## Project Title

City of Marysville Downtown Master Plan

## Proposed Action

The proposed action is the adoption of a Master Plan and Planned Action for the Downtown Vision area, a portion of Planning Area 1 of the City's neighborhood planning areas. The Downtown Master Plan includes elements addressing development, transportation, utilities, street improvements, parks, trails, and open space, and implementation. A set of design guidelines will also be adopted as a part of the plan.

The Master Plan will be incorporated into the City of Marysville Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan will be an integrated SEPA/GMA process pursuant to WAC 197-11-210. As such, it will combine the processes and supporting analysis required under both GMA and SEPA. Other subsequent actions may include amendments to the City's Transportation Improvement Plan, Land Use Regulations, or Capital Improvement Program.

## Purpose of this Draft SEIS Addendum

This Addendum shows changes that were made to the analysis of the proposed action summarized above. These changes, which were made in response to comments on the Draft SEIS, include minor factual corrections and clarifications to the Draft SEIS, and do not constitute substantial changes to the analysis in the Draft SEIS. Together, the Draft SEIS and this Addendum constitute the Final SEIS.

## No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative assumes that the downtown would develop according to the current Comprehensive Plan land use designations, regulations, and related implementation actions.

## Project Proponent

City of Marysville

## Lead Agency

City of Marysville.

## Contact Person

Gloria Hirashima  
Community Development Director  
80 Columbia Avenue  
Marysville, WA 98270

## **Permits and Approvals Required**

City Council adoption of the Downtown Master Plan by way of ordinance or resolution, as appropriate

Review by the Washington State Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED)

## **SEIS Authors and Principal Contributors**

Primary Author, EIS coordination, Earth, Land Use/Population/Housing, Environmental Health:

MAKERS architecture planning urban design

1904 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

Suite 725

Seattle, WA 98101

Transportation

The Transpo Group

11730 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE

Suite 600

Kirkland, WA 98034

Water Resources and Public Services and Utilities

SvR Design Company

1205 Second Avenue

Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98101

## **Date of Draft SEIS Issuance**

June 18, 2009

## **Date Comments Due**

July 20, 2009

## **Public Hearing Schedule**

September 2009

## **Date of Final Action by Lead Agency (if known)**

Anticipated October 2009

## **Draft SEIS and Addendum Purchase Price**

\$5.00 CD

May be downloaded at no charge from the following web link:

<http://marysvillewa.gov/communitydev/planning/index.html>





## Chapter 1: Text Changes

This chapter includes clarifications and corrections based on the responses to comments presented in Chapter 2 of addendum to the Draft SEIS or based on City review of the Draft SEIS information. The clarifications or corrections are organized in the same order as the Draft SEIS sections and by page numbers. The changes noted below only apply to Draft SEIS Chapters 8 (Transportation Analysis) and Chapter 11 (Utility Analysis). These changes are minor factual corrections and clarifications to the Draft SEIS, and do not constitute substantial changes to the analysis in the Draft SEIS.

### 1.1. Draft SEIS Chapter 1 (Introduction)

There are no changes to the Introduction of the Draft SEIS.

### 1.2. Draft SEIS Chapter 2 (Description of Alternatives)

There are no changes in the descriptions of the alternatives.

### 1.3. Draft SEIS Chapter 3 (Earth Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

### 1.4. Draft SEIS Chapter 4 (Water Resources Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

### 1.5. Draft SEIS Chapter 5 (Streams, Wetlands, Fish, and Wildlife Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

### 1.6. Draft SEIS Chapter 6 (Land Use/ Population/ Housing Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

### 1.7. Draft SEIS Chapter 7 (Environmental Health Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

### 1.8. Draft SEIS Chapter 8 (Transportation Analysis)

Changes or clarifications to the following sections of the Draft SEIS Chapter 8 are shown in ~~strikeout~~ and underline format below:

# Chapter 1

## 1.8.1 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 78 (under 8.1.7):

Table 13. Transit Route Description

Route Number	Route Description	Weekday Service	Weekend Service	Average Weekday Boardings (2007)
<u>200</u>	<u>Fixed local route including the Lynnwood TC, Ash Way P&amp;R, Mariner P&amp;R, Everett Station, Marysville, and Stillaguamish SC.</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>1,824</u>
201	Fixed local route including the Lynnwood TC, Ash Way P&R, Mariner P&R, Everett Station, Marysville, and Stillaguamish SC.	Yes	Saturday & Sunday	1,824
202	Fixed local route including <u>the Lynnwood TC, Mariner P&amp;R</u> , Everett Station, Marysville, Smokey Point Mall, and Stillaguamish SC.	Yes	Saturday & Sunday	727
207	Fixed local route including Smokey Point Mall, Marysville, and Boeing.	Yes	No	51
247	Fixed local route including Stanwood, Marysville, and Boeing.	Yes	No	216
421	Inter-County commuter route including Marysville and the Seattle CBD.	Yes	No	471
422	Inter-County commuter route including Stanwood, Marysville, and the Seattle CBD.	Yes	No	177
821	Commuter route including Marysville and the University District.	Yes	No	116

Route data and descriptions from the Community Transit System Performance Report (August 2007 Executive Summary) and clarifications from Community Transit per a June, 2009 letter to the City.

Two park-and-ride lots are located within the study area, as shown on Figure 27. The Marysville Ash Avenue park-and-ride lot located at 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Ash Avenue has a capacity of about 200 stalls. It serves routes 207 and 421. The Marysville I park-and-ride lot is located at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Ash Avenue and has a capacity of 74 stalls. It serves route 821. Community Transit is currently working on designing a new park-and-ride lot at the corner of Cedar Avenue and Grove Street, just north of the study area. The new facility is expected to open in 2009 and would have a



capacity of ~~over 21300~~ vehicles with additional parking for bicycles and motorcycles.  
The facility will have a large shelter for passengers and room for up to three buses.

### 1.8.2 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 81:

#### 8.1.9 Rail Crossings

There are three at-grade railroad crossings within the study area, along the BNSF mainline at 1<sup>st</sup> Street and 4<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) reports that approximately 19 trains use the BNSF mainline every day with Amtrak offering an average of one passenger train service per day. It has been reported that on occasion queuing of BNSF cars over intersections is problematic.

Table 14 provides additional information on the rail crossings, including safety data. The crossing at 4<sup>th</sup> Street had one property damage only collision in the last 10 years. Crash reports compiled by USDOT show that the collision was a result of motorists ignoring the gates and flashing beacons and attempting to cross the railway in spite of the warning.

### 1.8.3 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 88:

#### 8.2.1.7 Transit Service.

Growth anticipated under both alternatives will increase the demand for transit service within the study area. Community Transit has an adopted six-year Transit Development Plan (TDP) for the period 2008 to 2013. The TDP provides a framework to guide Community Transit's service delivery through the next six years. The City should continue to work with Community Transit to improve transit services and develop a convenient, integrated and efficient transit system that supports future growth.

As part of Community Transit's 6 year TDP, the City of Marysville received analysis for possible service improvements. In the TDP, the Marysville area is slated for increased transit frequency and span of service during 2009 and a possible new route in 2011 to 2013. The new route would be focused on improving service between downtown Marysville and the Mariner park and ride lot in south Everett. The route restructuring planned during the 2011 time period would provide better service connections for riders in south County areas and improve running times by serving areas with high transit ridership and minimizing unproductive service hours.

A new park and ride lot is identified near Cedar Avenue and Grove Street.

The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan recommends that the City work with transit providers to establish a local circulator service to provide intra-community transit service.

To enhance transit access to and from downtown, a number of other treatments were suggested by Community Transit to accommodate projected growth:

- Transit signal priority.
- Transit queue jumps.
- Transit-only slip-ramp to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street from the northbound I-5 off-ramp (project will require its own environmental review).

These types of improvements are often critical in realizing a competitive advantage on important corridors and achieving the mode share required for the success of PSRC's Regional Growth Strategy and Transportation 2040 plan. Consideration of these treatments should be coordinated between the City, WSDOT, and Community Transit.

Affecting fundamental changes in travel behavior that move a much larger share of trips to transit will require long-term coordinated planning of land use, development, roads, and transit. The City should continue to coordinate with Community Transit to support steps in their long-term process of transforming the county into communities that can support the "Think Transit First" approach. Three key steps per Community Transit include identification of a county-wide network of transit emphasis corridors, placing a greater emphasis on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, and developing a Long Range Transit Plan with a horizon year of 2030.

Two additional long-term transit considerations should be further explored: Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along State Avenue (with a station near the mall) and a commuter rail station near the mall or civic center. BRT lines are currently being evaluated by Community Transit throughout the county to complement the new SWIFT line to be initiated later this year between Shoreline and Everett. The concept of a commuter rail station was identified in the Downtown Visioning Plan as an important transit element should commuter rail service be extended north of Everett. Stations for both services would be highly complementary to the envisioned uses and activity in downtown. Both of these actions will require their own environmental review.

#### **1.8.4 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 89:**

Add a new section under 8.2.1 Impacts Common to Both Alternatives/8.2 Impacts:

##### 8.2.1.8 Railroad.

The City should coordinate with BNSF and Amtrak to eliminate railcars queued across intersections as this is detrimental to vehicular circulation and safety. Further concessions to rail service should condition elimination of this issue.

### 1.8.5 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 89:

#### 8.2.2.2 Downtown Bypass.

Although the downtown bypass will be a separate project and will undergo its own environmental review, the Downtown Master Plan recommends consideration of a median boulevard for the corridor. A tree-lined median boulevard would reduce traffic conflicts by directing left-turns on other access to specific intersections. This would improve overall traffic flow and safety. A potential new signalized intersection in the vicinity of 1<sup>st</sup> Street/Alder Avenue would provide primary access/egress location for development along the corridor. The design concept also would likely enhance pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the corridor by separating these modes from automobile traffic. U-turns at specified locations would allow drivers to change direction and access properties on the opposite side of the street. The downtown bypass will also serve as the major truck route, connecting communities east of downtown to the SR529 bridge.

### 1.8.6 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 92:

#### 8.2.2.10 Transit System.

The roadway and non-motorized improvements identified in the Downtown Master Plan would likely enhance use of transit to/from downtown Marysville. City and developer investments in the design themes and street scope improvements would improve access to existing transit service. The Master Plan suggests an in-lane transit stop on 4<sup>th</sup> Street (and 1<sup>st</sup> Street for any future routes) between State and Alder to serve both commuters coming in to the new downtown office space within the study area, but also serve residents in the new downtown housing units who commute into Everett. Additional transit service and stop locations also would be desirable as higher densities are developed.

The development and improvements along 1<sup>st</sup> Street would likely increase potential transit ridership. An in-lane transit stop on 1<sup>st</sup> Street west of Stave Avenue is also recommended by the Master Plan. Transit access to the area also could be enhanced with the bypass east of State Avenue.

### 1.8.7 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 99:

#### 8.2.2.17 Transit and Transportation Demand Management.

The proposed civic campus complex would be relatively well served by transit. Several transit routes would serve the site with stops along State Avenue, Cedar Avenue, Beach Avenue, and 4<sup>th</sup> Street (SR 528). As noted above, pedestrian connections exist or are planned, that provide access to transit along these streets. Improvements to the transit stop(s) along State Avenue serving the civic campus are also proposed.

An existing park-and-ride facility is located at Ash Avenue/6<sup>th</sup> Street west of the proposed City Hall development. Community Transit is planning to construct a new

# Chapter 1

---

transit center park-and-ride at Cedar Avenue/Grove Street. Access to/from the park and ride lots would be via the 4<sup>th</sup> Street (SR 528) or 8<sup>th</sup> Street crossings of the BNSF railroad tracks. These crossings both have controls which should help minimize impacts of increased non-motorized crossings between the park and rides and the civic campus complex.

The City would incorporate a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for the new complex. This would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by the development. The location is well served by transit, bicycle routes, and pedestrian facilities, which would support TDM programs for the complex.

## 1.8.8 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 103:

### 8.3.3 Applicable Regulations and Commitments

Development within the study area shall comply with traffic analysis and proportionate fee requirements as established in the Snohomish County/Marysville Traffic Interlocal Agreement dated June 10, 1999, as amended.

## 1.9. Draft SEIS Chapter 9 (Parks and Open Space Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

## 1.10. Draft SEIS Chapter 10 (Public Services Analysis)

There are no changes to the analysis.

## 1.11. Draft SEIS Chapter 11 (Utilities Analysis)

Changes or clarifications to the following sections of the Draft SEIS Chapter 11 are shown in ~~strikeout~~ and underline format below:

### 1.11.1 Revisions to DEIS page 113:

#### 11.1.5 Power

Power services are provided by Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1 (PUD) primarily by way of overhead distribution with some underground distribution. ~~See Figure 41. The distribution system and associated appurtenances serve the study area as well as locations outside the study area. Additional information can be found in the City of Marysville 2005 Comprehensive Plan.~~ State law authorizes PUDs and their powers are exercised through an elected board of commissioners. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission directs some basic accounting practices and generation guidelines. The PUD obtains approximately 80% of its power from Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). The remaining power is supplied from the PUD Jackson Hydro Project and other long term power contracts with various suppliers. The PUD serves all of Snohomish County and Camano Island.

The PUD uses three major BPA delivery points in Snohomish County as the source for the 115,000-volt transmission system. From these points the power is delivered via the PUD's transmission system to the District's substations. The PUD electrical transmission system within Marysville area consists of above ground power lines.

At the PUD substations, the 115,000 volt transmission system voltage is transformed down to a 12,470-volt (12.47kV) distribution system voltage. PUD residential, commercial, and public customers in the Marysville area are served by the 12.47kV distribution system. The PUD electrical distribution system within Marysville consists of both above-ground and below-ground power lines. These distribution system power lines are typically located within the road right of way (see Figure 41).

### 1.11.2 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 119:

#### 11.2.1.5: Electrical and Franchise Utilities

The PUD has noted that additional electric facilities will be needed within the downtown area to serve the forecasted growth. Consequently, additional new rights of way for transmission and distribution electric facilities, and possibly for new substations may be required as load growth or system reliability standards dictate the need.

~~Additional growth would contribute to increased demand for power, CATV, telephone, and natural gas services.~~

Given most utility distribution, both overhead and underground, is located in the public right-of-way, improvements to existing rights of way may impact existing utility distribution. Construction of new rights of way via dedication would require construction of new utility distribution to support adjacent, private property development.

Clearance from overhead utility distribution in the right-of-way may be impacted by private property redevelopment, particularly multi-story, zero lot line redevelopment.

### 1.11.3 Revisions to Draft SEIS page 120:

#### **11.3.1 Mitigation Measures Incorporated in the Master Plan**

The Master Plan recommended streetscape improvements include use LID stormwater management (See Surface Water section in the Water Resources Chapter for further discussion). If implemented an increase in pervious surface and infiltration would decrease the load on the current storm drainage infrastructure within the down town study area.

The PUD noted that it will continue to provide reliable and safe electric service to the Marysville area, and will continue to analyze the electric system and either upgrade and/or extend the electric system facilities as needed to handle the growth. To accomplish this, the PUD stated that will consult with the City of Marysville and the

## Chapter 1

---

Tulalip Tribes in developing the optimal future electrical system alternatives to serve the projected growth within the study area.





### Chapter 2: Comments and Responses

Chapter 2 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS contains written comments on the Draft SEIS during the comment period. The comment period extended from June 18 to July 20, 2009. Public comments are shown in plain text and responses to those comments are shown as [additions](#).

Public comments received during the comment period include:

Letter Number	Date of Comment	Author
1	June 23, 2009	Community Transit (Brent L. Russell)
2	July 7, 2009	Snohomish County Public Utility District (Tom Cencak)
3	July 20, 2009	Snohomish County Public Works (Candice Soine)

#### Letter 1 (from Community Transit):

Gloria Hirashima  
Community Development Director  
80 Columbia Avenue  
Marysville, WA 98270

June 23, 2009

#### Re: Marysville Downtown Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Ms. Hirashima:

Community Transit appreciates the opportunity to provide comment to proposed development plans throughout Snohomish County. It is our policy to help ensure that future growth is compatible with public transportation and services offered by Community Transit. The document mentioned above has been reviewed by planning staff and comments have been summarized below.

#### Key Downtown Vision Concepts

Community Transit supports promoting mixed use, higher density development in areas of the downtown core served by transit service. At the center, the old mall conversion to a pedestrian oriented space is appropriate when surrounded by riverfront commercial development, mixed use and historic areas. A central destination/ gathering place is essential to elevating the character of downtown Marysville. Transit service will be available to those wishing to visit the pedestrian oriented space. [Comment noted.](#)

### Civic Campus

The envisioned Civic Center site located north of the core on the west side of State Street between 5th and 6th will be well served by transit. Travelling on State Avenue, four Community Transit routes serve an existing bus stop site adjacent to the campus area. They provide a high level of transit service every weekday and weekend, with an extended span of service from 5 a.m. to midnight. Please ensure that every possible effort is made to provide access from the campus interior to the existing bus zones on State Street. Community Transit can assist in design of the bus stop site when the time is appropriate. [Comment noted.](#)

### Transportation Improvements

Grove Street (State Avenue to Ash Avenue) – The new park and ride facility at Grove and Cedar will benefit from a smoother traffic flow resulting from this road improvement project. The city's intention to construct pedestrian and bike facilities along this stretch will provide an opportunity to address any lane marking issues arising from use of the new park and ride. Access to the transit facility will be enhanced by construction of multimodal road features and bike lockers (capacity 8) and bike racks (capacity 6) will be available for use. All Community Transit buses are equipped with bike racks. [Comment noted.](#)

### New Park and Ride

As the City of Marysville grows and the downtown core becomes an important center, transit will play an important role in serving the transportation needs of the City of Marysville. Community Transit has anticipated increased population densities by adopting a specific short-term shared outcome calling for a 50 percent increase in ridership to 13 million boardings by 2012. As stated in the 6 Year Transit Development Plan, one of the initiatives includes “construction of facilities in Marysville and Arlington, providing additional capacity for local and commuter service in north Snohomish County as well as possible opportunities for transit-oriented development.” As a result, the groundbreaking ceremony for the Marysville at Cedar and Grove Park & Ride will be taking place next month. The new park & ride is expected to open in December and will cover about two acres including 213 parking spaces with additional parking for motorcycles and bicycles. The facility will have a large shelter for passengers and room for up to three buses. Ample lighting and security cameras will help keep the site safe with transit service provided by Routes 207, 421 and 821. [Comments detailing the new park & ride above are reflected updated language in Section 1.8.1 of Chapter 1 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.](#)

### Transit Service

Affecting fundamental changes in travel behavior that move a much larger share of trips to transit will require long-term coordinated planning of land use, development, roads and transit. The Community Transit 6 Year TDP presents three important steps in the longer-term process of transforming Snohomish County into a community that can support “Think Transit First”.

1. Identification of a county-wide network of transit emphasis corridors for future market development and transit investment. These corridors connect growth centers, have existing or future potential as significant transit markets and comprise an efficient system of transit connections in the County.

## Chapter 2

---

2. Placing a greater emphasis on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and the role that transit will fulfill in maintaining concurrency on key corridors. This Plan specifically calls for coordinated transit, TDM and land use planning involving Community Transit, Snohomish County and cities.
3. Development of a Long Range Transit Plan with a horizon year of 2030. The LRTP will further develop the principles of transit emphasis corridors, coordinated planning, future BRT expansion and other initiatives to guide Community Transit's journey toward "Think Transit First."

[Comments above are summarized in Section 1.8.3 of Chapter 1 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.](#)

Transit service routes, bus stops locations and park and ride facilities depicted in the draft plan as Figure 27 are essentially correct. Table 13, Transit Route Description should be updated to reflect that Route 202 now serves the same destinations south of Everett as the 201. Also, Route 200 should be included on the chart with parameters showing: Weekday Service – Yes; Weekend Service – No; Route Description – Use current Route 201 description. [See updated Table 13 in Section 1.8.1 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.](#)

Illustration of the high level of transit service in the downtown core can be observed as the existing route system is overlaid on Figure 2: Key land use and design concepts. All future streetscape and road improvement projects envisioned for 4<sup>th</sup> Street and State Avenue should have input from Community Transit. It is very encouraging to see the pedestrian facilities planned as non-motorized paths to connect the proposed Civic Center, Mall area and waterfront amenities – a sense of "place" would be accomplished. [Comment noted.](#)

### Transit Priority Infrastructure

The "Downtown Street Improvement Plan" talks about the City working with WSDOT to improve access to and from downtown Marysville. It would be beneficial if the City (and WSDOT) would be willing to go a step further and call out the particular access needs of transit and identify the benefits of specific treatments such as TSP, transit queue jumps and/or the more problematic concept of a transit only slip-ramp to 3rd Street from the northbound I-5 off-ramp. There could be fairly significant improvements to transit (commuter and local) speed and reliability and potential improvements to bus stop placement with investments in these areas of infrastructure. The City may wish to meet with WSDOT and Community Transit to explore some concepts, their practicality and the cost / benefit of certain improvements. Only with these types of investments will transit realize a competitive advantage on important corridors and achieve the mode share required for the success of the Regional Growth Strategy and the Transportation 2040 plan. [Comments above are summarized in Section 1.8.3 of Chapter 1 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.](#)

### Future Service and Bus Rapid Transit

The highest future transit service levels will be provided in communities that provide the greatest potential market. "Think transit first" will truly be possible in those areas that combine compact, transit-oriented development with high-intensity, corridor-based transit service. For Marysville,

developing and implementing a downtown plan which includes high-density, mixed-use development, an emphasis on pedestrian connections and pedestrian-friendly design, limited automobile parking and transit-priority infrastructure allowing buses to bypass traffic congestion, ensures that residents will continue to be well served by transit. As part of Community Transit's planning efforts, additional Bus Rapid Transit lines are being evaluated to compliment the new *SWIFT* line initiating this November. Generally following an east-west configuration in South County and north-south in areas north of Everett, the City of Marysville is well positioned for consideration of a new BRT corridor. Planning for this type of transit service along State Avenue would include a possible station near the mall and enhanced bus stop zones appropriately spaced.

Community Transit would also like to participate in the discussions for developing a commuter rail station in the core area as depicted in figure 2 as those activities progress.

[Comments above are summarized in Section 1.8.3 of Chapter 1 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.](#)

Again, the key downtown concepts proposed in the draft plan: mixed use areas, waterfront recreational development, pedestrian oriented mall and streetscape improvements on major arterials should serve the City well in providing a vibrant center for residents and visitors. Thank you for including Community Transit in your review process.

Sincerely,

Brent L. Russell  
Transportation System Planner  
Community Transit

### **Letter 2 (from Snohomish County Public Utility District):**

From: Cencak, Tom [mailto:TJCencak@SNOPUD.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 6:51 AM  
To: Gloria Hirashima; Steve Burke (steveb@svrdesign.com)  
Cc: (droanhorse@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov); Backholm, Derek; Castro, Iggy;  
Fletcher, Bob  
Subject: Marysville Downtown Master Plan Review

Hi All,

On June 26, 2009, the Snohomish County PUD received copies of the City of Marysville Downtown Master Plan, the Draft Supplemental Impact Statement and the Downtown Appendices documents. The PUD has completed an initial review of the documents and started an area-wide electric system study using the new data.

## Chapter 2

---

The PUD electric system planning department staff will consult with City of Marysville, the City of Marysville design consultants and the Tulalip Tribes in developing the optimal future electric system alternatives to serve southern downtown Marysville and the surrounding area. Coordination of efforts between the PUD, the City of Marysville and the Tulalip Tribes will be needed to coincide with the electric system study recommendations for any extensions of electrical facilities to accommodate new zoning or development proposals and acquisition of new rights of way.

Gloria and Steve,

Please insert the following data into the City of Marysville Downtown Master Plan document under the "Power and Franchise Utilities" section.

### Power and Franchise Utilities

#### Electricity

The City of Marysville is served by the Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1 (PUD). State law authorizes PUDs and their powers are exercised through an elected board of commissioners. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission directs some basic accounting practices and generation guidelines. The PUD obtains approximately 80% of its power from Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). The remaining power is supplied from the PUD Jackson Hydro Project and other long term power contracts with various suppliers. The PUD serves all of Snohomish County and Camano Island.

The PUD uses three major BPA delivery points in Snohomish County as the source for the 115,000-volt transmission system. From these points the power is delivered via the PUD's transmission system to the District's substations. The PUD electrical transmission system within Marysville area consists of above ground power lines.

At the PUD substations, the 115,000 volt transmission system voltage is transformed down to a 12,470-volt (12.47kV) distribution system voltage. PUD residential, commercial, and public customers in the Marysville area are served by the 12.47kV distribution system. The PUD electrical distribution system within Marysville consists of both above-ground and below-ground power lines. These distribution system power lines are typically located within the road right of way.

Additional electric facilities will be needed within the downtown area to serve the forecasted Marysville area growth. Consequently, additional new rights of way for transmission and distribution electric facilities, and possibly for new substations may be required as load growth or system reliability standards dictate the need. The PUD will continue to analyze the



electric system and either upgrade and/or extend the electric system facilities as needed to handle the growth. The PUD will continue to provide reliable and safe electric service to the Marysville area.

The comments above are integrated into Section 1.11 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS.

If you have any questions or if I may be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to call.

Thanks,  
Tom Cencak  
Snohomish County PUD  
System Planning & Protection Dept  
(425) 783-4341

### **Letter 3 (from Snohomish County Public Works):**

**From:** Soine, Candice [mailto:spwccs@co.snohomish.wa.us]

**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2009 2:57 PM

**To:** Gloria Hirashima

**Cc:** Werdal, Debra; Lee, Aaron; McCormick, Douglas; Stenstrom, Clarissa; Winter, Manuela; Carter, Owen; Burgin, Suzy; Strong, Leah; Soine, Candice

**Subject:** Comments from Snohomish County Public Works Regarding the Marysville Downtown Master Plan

Gloria Hirashima, Director  
City of Marysville  
Department of Community Development

Snohomish County Public Works has reviewed your submittal of the Marysville downtown master plan. Following are comments from the Program Planning Section:

#### **County Concerns**

- Potential renegotiation with the Tulalip Tribe of the maintenance agreement for Marine Drive if traffic increases / causes additional problems for the county due to additional congestion from eastward expansion (population/traffic boom) caused by a 1<sup>st</sup> Street bypass. The 1<sup>st</sup> Street bypass was included in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Tribe and County participated in the review of the element. This is not a new proposal for the Downtown Plan.
- Additional long term development pressures on 84<sup>th</sup> Street NE, 60<sup>th</sup> Street NE, and other county roads east and south of Marysville city limits caused from easier access (less congestion on SR 528 and Sunnyside Boulevard.) See note above.

#### **General Plan Comment**

- The riverfront/marina is stigmatized and surrounded by industrial lands, composting center, freeway noise and structure, state route to the east (SR 528), train noise and within view, and near the aromatic city sewage plant/mudflats. Comment noted.

## Chapter 2

---

- *(Would the following project still be implemented?)*

Current Supportive City Street Improvement Projects

Sunnyside Boulevard ~ 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to Marysville C/L (Urban 3-lane standards)

-2.03 miles and city staging 2012. [The Downtown Plan does not propose any changes to other Street Improvement Projects outside the study area.](#)

### **Marysville Downtown Master Plan**

#### **Pg 9**

The residential zoned parcels that border the future bypass and have stigmatized issues mentioned above may not attract people to live in the downtown area. [Comment noted.](#)

#### **Pg 26**

- Suggest the city builds bike lanes or paths on SR 529 north and south of 1<sup>st</sup> Street or at least from 1<sup>st</sup> northward since the new Ebey Slough bridge will have them connecting Everett with Marysville. [The bicycle plan in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in November of 2008 responds to modifications to the Ebey Slough bridge.](#)
- Consider connecting bike lanes on SR 529 eastward to reach the Centennial Trail and also continuing eastward after the 1<sup>st</sup> street bypass along Sunnyside Boulevard after 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. [The 1<sup>st</sup> Street Bypass is included in the adopted Transportation Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The inclusion of a bike lane on the bypass will be an element of the design.](#)
- Consider building bike routes westward on 1<sup>st</sup> / 60<sup>th</sup> Place NE or 4<sup>th</sup> Street to connect with the Tulalip Tribal Lands. [Comment noted.](#)

#### **Pg 27**

Potentially change angled parking to parallel parking to allow width for bike lanes where applicable. [Back in angle parking is recommended in most areas that angle parking is provided where bike routes are identified. Back in angle parking provides better interaction with bicycle lanes.](#)

#### **Pg 28**

- Build a train overpass on 4<sup>th</sup> Street to reduce congestion. [Congestion on 4<sup>th</sup> Street is analyzed in detail with the City Center Access Study.](#)
- Keep open the option to have 2<sup>nd</sup> Street continue through the Towne Center Mall. [The design standards won't prohibit this connection. It's worth noting that accommodating a grocery store in any major mall redevelopment will require a larger footprint and thus a larger block size.](#)

#### **Pg 29**

- Unfortunately no modeled counts were measured for SR 528 east of State Avenue and right turns at the intersection of SR 529 and SR 528 heading east. Also counts for Second Avenue east of State Avenue would be helpful. [The volumes were collected and are provided in the City Center Access Study and the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.](#)

Pg 32

- Allowing U-Turns at intersections of the bypass could help drivers change directions. [The comments above are integrated into Chapter 3 of the Master Plan and Section 1.85 of this Addendum to the Draft SEIS. U-turns be reviewed as part of the bypass design.](#)
- Will the city's plan framework be timed and built simultaneously? (see below) [Concurrency requirements will assure that infrastructure keeps pace with development.](#)
- Widen Sunnyside Boulevard to 4 to 5 lanes between 47th Avenue NE to south of 52nd Street NE; the Sunnyside Boulevard/Soper Hill Road corridor would be three lanes between south of 52nd Street NE and SR 9. [See notes above.](#)
- How would traffic volumes deal with the bottleneck location where the lanes return from 4 lanes to 2 east of 52<sup>nd</sup>? If the 61<sup>st</sup> Street NE / Sunnyside Boulevard expansion is not in sync with the 1<sup>st</sup> Street bypass. [See notes above.](#)
- Could become an alternative truck route or to I-5 from SR 9 and SR 92 during congestion with the bypass allowing easier access and capacity. [Comment noted.](#)
- Additional access should be considered to SR 528 from 61<sup>st</sup> Street NE/Sunnyside Boulevard east of Liberty Street to provide capacity relief to 4<sup>th</sup> Street and State Street for those coming from Everett on SR 529 or I-5. [Issue for City Center Access Study.](#)
- Why would people not continue to use the new bypass to reach 4<sup>th</sup> Street / I-5 from the east via State Avenue or Cedar Street? (The plan states 1<sup>st</sup> Street will become less traveled after the bypass is built) [The statement was in reference to the section of 1<sup>st</sup> Street west of SR 529. The Bypass is an alternative to provide access and provides relief for people wanting to go to I-5 via 4<sup>th</sup> Street.](#)
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Street could become a heavily traveled shortcut taken from the bypass to reach 4<sup>th</sup> Street-I-5 or SR 529. [Design elements of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street will discourage use as a bypass. The bypass will actually provide relief to 3<sup>rd</sup> Street by relieving volumes on 4<sup>th</sup> Street.](#)
- Depending on which alternative route is selected there could be: additional traffic at the intersections of Liberty St and SR 528, 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE and SR 528, and Alder Avenue and SR 528. [The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan identifies intersections that require mitigation based on the bypass.](#)
- Possible unforeseen environmental issues with Allen Creek and any surrounding wetlands could cause problems. (Fish Habitat and pollution mitigation from roadway expansion) [Comment noted.](#)
- City housing forecasts of 171% and 93% growth to the east and northeast of downtown Marysville Study area indicated huge growth in traffic volumes in the future that may overwhelm current and even the bypass roads. [Future population forecasts were assumed in the Transportation Plan element and indicate that the bypass road, coupled with improvements identified in the City Center Access study will accommodate the forecasted population growth.](#)
- Will the city be able to meet Level Of Service (LOS) standards with or without a bypass? [The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in November 2008 concluded that a bypass was needed to accommodate future growth.](#)
- Future laws governing eminent domain could make the bypass project difficult and inflationary future land acquisition costs must be considered. [Comment noted.](#)

## Chapter 2

---

### Pg 33

- Are there any successful woonerfs in Puget Sound/Washington to compare the downtown proposal to? [Pike Place Market is one \(it is mentioned in the updated Master Plan\)](#)
- Would having a woonerf north of 4<sup>th</sup> Street on Delta Avenue be a good idea with such a busy state route bisecting it? [The plan notes the need for a pedestrian signal across 4<sup>th</sup> Street at Delta which would facilitate the continuation of the Woonerf on both sides of 4<sup>th</sup> Street.](#)
- Is a woonerf successful if parking ratios are 3 spaces per 1,000 sqft of commercial space? Will the typical parking lot suburban shopper be willing to accept potentially difficult to find street parking to shop downtown with large parking lot retail north on State Avenue and on the nearby Tulalip Tribal commercial center? [A Woonerf would not eliminate the need for parking to serve commercial space. There are many examples of thriving commercial space in non suburban settings.](#)

### Pg 53

- Parcels along 1<sup>st</sup> Street and most of riverfront are in the 100 yr floodplain which can bring up permitting issues and concerns for developers. [Comment noted.](#)

### Pg 90

- Residents north of 1<sup>st</sup> Street may lose southern views and fight the development. [Comment noted.](#)

### Marysville Downtown Master Plan SEIS comments

#### Pg 71

- What would the equivalent LOS be if the queues along the closely spaced intersections on 4<sup>th</sup> street were taken into consideration? [The City adopted LOS as the criteria for operational standards. However, the City Center Access Study does review queuing of adjacent intersections on 4<sup>th</sup> Street in the analysis.](#)

#### Pg 75

- What is the current parking utility percentages especially with the surge in transit ridership recently? [The analysis included the most recently available parking utilization.](#)

#### Pg 77

- What are the physical constraints of State Avenue between Grove and 2<sup>nd</sup> Street that do not allow it to be a truck route? [Available turning radii that is constrained by building and utility placement do not accommodate large trucks.](#)

#### Pg 80

- Will the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Columbia Avenue be upgraded for pedestrians as traffic and pedestrians movement increases and shortcuts are taken on the 1<sup>st</sup> street bypass/4<sup>th</sup> Street in the future? [Because of the proposed Woonerf at Delta an upgrade for pedestrian crossing of 4<sup>th</sup> is recommended at that location, not at Columbia Avenue.](#)

#### Pg 81

- How will pedestrians be protected from train movements (example of Safeco Field accidents in Seattle) in the future as pedestrian movements increase and the woonerf is built? [Pedestrians crossing at signalized crossings are protected.](#)

- What speeds do the trains currently travel at and what speeds will they travel at in the future in the downtown area? Up to 30 mph.

### Pg 84

- Both 88<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> streets will only increase by 0.9% and 1.8% even with the growth potential on the eastern and northeastern side of Marysville? The increase is related to the increased density in the downtown study area and is in addition to the background traffic levels that do include regional population growth.
- Without easy access to SR 529 from I-5 for commuters, 4<sup>th</sup> Street will be the main thoroughfare. Access to SR 529 is supplemented, not eliminated, by providing the bypass. 4<sup>th</sup> Street is provided relief to help accommodate future traffic increases.
- Do the future peak hour growths include additional growth on the Tulalip tribal land? As projected in the regional model.

### Pg 85

- If 4<sup>th</sup> Street and beach avenue reaches LOS level F, shouldn't there interconnected other intersections between state avenue and I-5 also have LOS level F? Or is it the issue of closely spaced intersections not being taken into consideration? Beach Avenue is an unsignalized intersection which is analyzed differently than the signalized intersections.

### Pg 86

- Update the new Cedar and Grove Marysville P&R parking space number to 213. Comment noted (both the Master Plan and Addendum to the Draft SEIS have been updated to reflect change).

### Pg 88

- Why isn't 1<sup>st</sup> Street (East of State Avenue) listed as a bicycle facility addition? 1<sup>st</sup> Street would be if it is part of the Downtown Bypass (see 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point in the Draft SEIS). The 1<sup>st</sup> Street Bypass is included in the adopted Transportation Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The inclusion of a bike lane on the bypass will be an element of the design.

### Pg 94

- Loss of parking can be harmful to businesses and residents of the downtown area as density increases. Comment noted. Also note that revitalized, mixed use development can reduce parking demand while increasing commercial activity as residents and businesses are located within walking distance to commercial elements.

The Traffic Group requests the opportunity to review development proposals as they are submitted under this plan amendment for traffic mitigation under the county/city reciprocal agreement.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposed plan.

*Candice Soine, Environmental Review Coordinator*

Snohomish County Public Works

TES - Environmental Services