

# **Madrona School Replacement**

## **SEPA Checklist**

June 2016

PREPARED FOR:

EDMONDS SCHOOL DISTRICT  
20420 68TH AVENUE WEST  
LYNNWOOD, WA 98036

PREPARED BY:

ESA  
5309 SHILSHOLE AVENUE  
NW, STE. 200  
SEATTLE, WA 98107



## INTRODUCTION

Edmonds School District 15 (the District) proposes to construct a new elementary school to replace the existing approximately 86,500 square foot Madrona School. The existing school was built in 1963 and is past its useful life, with outmoded civil, architectural, structural, mechanical, and electrical systems. In addition, the existing facility was designed as a Junior High School for grades 7, 8 and 9 and does not fit the non-graded K-8 style of education used at Madrona School. The non-graded program is comprised of multiage centers (classrooms) that span three grade levels, and each center houses two teachers and 54 students rather than the traditional classroom setup with one teacher and 20 to 30 students. The non-graded program houses approximately 650 students with 80 total teachers and staff. The new school would reflect Madrona K-8's programmatic differences, meet new District-Wide Educational Specifications, and replace outdated infrastructure while working within the parameters of the existing site conditions. The project is funded by a Capital Construction Bond, approved by the voters in February 2014, and construction is slated for the spring of 2017. Construction of the new school facility would take approximately a year. An additional 4 months would be necessary to complete demolition of the existing school and complete sitework.

The proposed new school facility would be constructed on the existing baseball field south of the existing school, approximately 80,000 square feet in size, include six new single-story buildings. Future student enrollment and staffing levels are expected to remain the same as existing levels. The new school would include five new buildings for classrooms and one for the entry, administration, the gym, cafeteria, kitchen, library, and the school's music and science programs. The new school would also have a 3,000 square foot covered play area and new play field where the existing school is located. As part of the project, there would also be improved parking and bus and automobile circulation and significant new stormwater management facilities.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	i
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....	1
<b>A. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. Earth.....	4
2. Air .....	6
3. Water.....	8
4. Plants.....	11
5. Animals .....	12
6. Energy and Natural Resources.....	14
7. Environmental Health .....	15
8. Land and Shoreline Use .....	18
9. Housing.....	20
10. Aesthetics.....	21
11. Light and Glare .....	21
12. Recreation .....	22
13. Historic and Cultural Preservation.....	23
14. Transportation.....	26
15. Public Services.....	29
16. Utilities.....	29
<b>C. SIGNATURE.....</b>	<b>30</b>
REFERENCES.....	31
FIGURES.....	35

**Figure 1: Project Vicinity**

**Figure 2: Project Area and Existing Facilities**

**Figure 3: Topographic Map**

**Figure 4: Site Plan Concept**



## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### A. BACKGROUND

**1. Name of the proposed project, if applicable:**

Madrona School Replacement

**2. Name of Applicant:**

Edmonds School District 15

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

Taine Wilton  
Capital Projects Office  
20420 68th Avenue West  
Lynnwood, WA 98036  
425-431-7172

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

May 2016

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

Edmonds School District 15

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

Construction of the new Madrona School is expected to begin in the spring of 2017. It is anticipated that construction of the new school would be completed by the fall of 2018.

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

No additions, expansion, or further activity is anticipated in the foreseeable future. The District may add relocatable classrooms (portables) to the site in the future.

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

Madrona K-8 School Project Tree Survey. American Forest Management. January 20, 2016.

Madrona K-8 Topographic Survey. July 2015.

Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, New Madrona K-8 Project, Shannon and Wilson, Inc. August 6, 2016.

Preliminary Traffic and Access Review for Replacement. Edmonds School District – Madrona School. Heffron Transportation, Inc. March 9, 2016.

Regulated Building Materials Assessment Report Madrona K-8 School, Edmonds School District, Edmonds, Washington. Terracon/Argus Pacific, Inc. September 30, 2015.

Wetland and Stream Delineation Report New Madrona K-8 Project City of Edmonds, Washington. Shannon and Wilson, Inc. September 15, 2015.

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

There are no applications for other proposals that are pending for governmental approvals that directly affect the property.

**10. List any governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known:**

State and regional agency approvals and permits that would be needed include:

- Asbestos/Demolition Notification (Department of Labor and Industries and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency)
- NPDES Permit (Department of Ecology)

Local approvals and permits that would be needed include:

- Building Permit
- Conditional Use Permit
- Critical Areas Checklist
- Demolition Permit
- Land Use Permit
- Park Impact Fee
- Plumbing and Mechanical Permit
- Project Design Review
- Right-of-Way Construction Permit

- Street Use Permit
- Side Sewer Permit
- Landscape Sprinkler Permit

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

The District proposes to construct a new elementary school to replace the existing approximately 86,500 square foot Madrona School. The new school would be located in the area of the site currently occupied by a baseball field, in the southeastern portion of the 40.78-acre site. The new school would be approximately 80,000 square feet and designed for 650 students and 80 total teachers and staff, maintaining current enrollment and staffing levels. The existing single-story school, built in 1963, would be demolished after construction of the new school is completed. The existing facility was designed as a Junior High School for grades 7, 8 and 9 and does not fit the non-graded K-8 style of education used at Madrona School (multiage centers that span three grade levels, with each center housing two teaches and 54 students). The new school would reflect the Madrona K-8 program, meet new District-Wide Educational Specifications, and replace outdated infrastructure, with improvements providing efficiency that allows enrollment and staffing to be maintained within a smaller school footprint.

The new Madrona School would be a collection of single-story buildings connected by covered walkways (Figure 4). The southern portion of the new school would be comprised of five classroom buildings. The northern building would be comprised of administration; cafeteria; gymnasium; and music, library and science rooms. During construction, the two play areas would be removed. A new kindergarten play area would be located on the western side of the site, near the administrative building, including 3,000 square feet of covered play area. The open space left by removal of the existing school would be redeveloped into a new soccer field. The existing track and field located in the southwestern portion of the site would be elongated to meet current International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) track and field design standards with the play area and covered play located in the center.

Staff and visitor parking would remain in the same location, as would the parent drop-off queue. However, the location of the bus drop-off queue would be redesigned so that it is parallel to the parent drop-off queue and has its own access to 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW. A new service/loading area would be constructed as part of the proposed improvements. It would share access to the site with the bus drop-off queue and would provide a sidewalk for pedestrians accessing the site. A new sidewalk would also be constructed between the two driveways on the school

property as part of the proposed upgrades to improve pedestrian connectivity to the school. New signage for the school would also be provided in the form of a digital sign near the street. In addition, new stormwater management facilities would be implemented as part of the proposed improvements.

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

Madrona School is located at 9300 236th Street SW in Edmonds, Washington (Figure 1). The property is shared with the former Woodway Elementary School to the west, and is adjacent to 236th Street SW to the north and residential properties to the east and south (Figure 2). The site is located in the SE quarter of Section 36, Township 27 North, Range 3 East, Willamette Meridian. The site is located on Tax Assessor Parcel 27033600404600. The legal description is: “SEC 36 TWP 27 RGE 03RT-49) NE 1/4 OF SE1/4.”

Figure 3 shows a topographic map of the Madrona School site.

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

### **1. Earth**

#### **a. General description of the site (underline):**

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other \_\_\_\_\_

The site topography is characterized by flat areas surrounded by steep slopes. The school is bordered by vegetated hills with a 30 percent slope descending to the west, a 40 percent decline to the east, and a 13 percent decline to the south. The northern section of the site, occupied by the existing school and parking lot, is relatively flat. The parking lot is at-grade with the track and field area, while the school site gradually increases in elevation to the south to meet the play area and baseball field. A steep slope (over 40 percent) between the two open spaces separates the difference in grade between the baseball field on the upper plateau and the track and field area on the lower plateau.

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

The steepest slope on the site is located between the two sports fields on the southern end of the property (which can be up to 60 percent), followed

by the ravines bordering the eastern and western sides of the property (which are between 30 and 40 percent depending on the location).

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

The project site is situated on a ridge underlain by Quaternary Vashon till consisting of silty sand with variable gravel and cobble content (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015a). The glacial till is underlain by advanced outwash material at about 80 feet below the surface.

The majority of the property is comprised of Alderwood-Urban land complex (2 to 8 percent slopes). However, the ravine between Madrona School and the former Woodway Elementary is comprised of Alderwood gravelly sandy loam (15 to 30 percent slopes), and there is a 5.6-acre portion of the southeastern corner of the school property that is comprised of Alderwood-Urban land complex (8 to 15 percent slopes) (USDA, 2016). No agricultural land of long-term commercial significance is located within the project area.

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

Steep slopes surround the project area. There is some evidence of erosion on the western side of the site where stormwater runoff has flowed down the western ravine.

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

Excavation and grading would be required for utility extension, construction of stormwater improvements, construction of the new school, and track and field improvements, totaling in 16,800 net cubic yards of export. Excavated material would consist of non-native fill/gravels and native soil. All excavated material would be hauled off site and disposed of at an approved offsite location. Approximately 6,200 cubic yards of imported gravel fill material would be required under proposed pavements and building slabs.

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

The proposed project is surrounded by steep slopes; therefore, the erosion potential is high. In order to meet current Ecology Construction Storm Water General Permit requirements, a properly developed and maintained

erosion control plan with best management practices (BMPs) would be required to control erosion during construction of the proposed project.

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

Under the proposed project, approximately 3 acres of new impervious surfaces would be introduced. However, after the existing school is demolished, up to 2 acres of land could be returned to pervious surface. Currently, 19.5 percent of the site is covered with impervious surface. After construction, 26 percent of the site would be covered with impervious surface.

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

Temporary erosion and sedimentation control BMPs would be installed to minimize erosion during construction. BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by the District in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement. BMPs would include but not be limited to:

- Maintaining cover measures atop disturbed ground, including erosion control matting, plastic sheeting, straw mulch, crushed rock or recycled concrete, or mature hydroseed;
- Providing storm drain inlet protection;
- Routing surface water away from work areas and steep slopes;
- Keeping staging areas and travel areas clean and free of track-out (materials adhering to motor vehicles and inadvertently carried out of the project site to a staging area or paved road);
- Covering work areas and stockpiled soils when not in use; and
- Completing earthwork during dry weather and site conditions if possible.

**2. Air**

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

During construction, there would be a small increase in exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment, and a temporary increase in

fugitive dust due to earthwork for the project. The most noticeable increase in emissions and fugitive dust would occur during demolition and earthwork. Exhaust emissions would also be generated from construction employee and equipment traffic to and from the site.

The new school would include a kitchen area, but basic food production would be done at a central kitchen and delivered to the site. Any odors from food warming or other future kitchen uses would be controlled with the use of exhaust hoods.

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

There are no offsite sources of emissions or odors that would affect the proposed project.

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

The contractor chosen for the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations, including:

- Regulation I, Section 9.11 prohibiting the emission of air contaminants that would or could be injurious to human health, plant or animal life, or property; and
- Regulation I, Section 9.15 prohibiting the emission of fugitive dust, unless reasonable precautions are employed to minimize the emissions.

BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by the District in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement. To reduce fugitive dust emissions from trucks leaving the site, the contractor would be required to establish wheel-cleaning stations at the exits from the site and implement dust control watering on onsite construction haul routes. Streets would be regularly swept to remove dust and debris from construction vehicles. The contractor will also be required to maintain construction equipment in good working order to prevent increased exhaust emissions. See also the mitigation listed in section B.1.h, above.

**3. Water**

**a. Surface Water:**

- 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.**

Three wetlands are located on the project site: Wetland A, Wetland B, and Wetland C (Figure 3). Wetland A (0.02 acre) is a Category IV palustrine scrubshrub wetland, Wetland B (0.4 acre) is a Category III palustrine forested wetland, and Wetland C (0.1 acre) is a Category IV palustrine emergent wetland (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015b).

Wetland A is located on the wooded slope between the former Woodway School and Madrona School. Hydrology in Wetland A is likely supported by a combination of storm drain discharges from the upgradient storm drain outfalls and groundwater. Wetland B is located in the wooded ravine on the eastern property boundary. Hydrology in Wetland B is likely supported by surface flow from the surrounding ravine, the storm drain inputs from the school, and a seasonally high groundwater table. Wetland C is located along the wooded slope, south of Wetland A. Hydrology in Wetland C is likely supported by a combination of the upgradient storm drain discharges and groundwater (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015b).

- 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.**

Construction would occur in close proximity to the three wetlands. Construction of the new school and the service/loading area would occur within 100 feet of Wetland B's buffer and upgrades to the track would occur within 200 feet of Wetland A and C's buffers. A portion of the new school structure would be located within the 60-foot standard buffer that was adopted through the City's revised Critical Areas standards (Edmonds Community Development Code [ECDC] Chapter 23.40, as adopted May 3, 2016). This may require a limited area of buffer averaging, which would be completed consistent with ECDC 23.50.040.G.

The District has avoided all direct impacts to wetlands (wetland fill) by locating proposed facilities almost entirely within existing developed areas. However, stormwater is a source of hydrology for

all three of the wetlands. Construction of Underground Injection Control (UIC) wells for stormwater could impact wetland hydrology. Treated runoff would be directed to Wetland B to maintain its base flow and reduce the hydrologic impact of the UIC wells.

- 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.**

No fill or dredge material would be placed in, or removed from, surface waters or wetlands.

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

The project would not require surface water withdrawals or diversions.

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

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

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

The project would not involve discharge of waste materials to any surface waters. All waste materials from the project, including grading spoils and demolition debris, would be transported off site to an appropriate disposal facility. BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by the District in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement.

**b. Groundwater:**

- 1. Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

No groundwater would be withdrawn as part of the project. However, stormwater runoff would be discharged to groundwater

through use of Underground Injection Control (UIC) wells. More detail on discharge of stormwater to groundwater is provided below in Section 3.c.1.

- 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.**

No waste material would be discharged into the ground. The project site would not utilize septic tanks.

**c. Water Runoff (including stormwater)**

- 1. Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) 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.**

Stormwater is currently funneled into a trench on the western side of the property, but due to fast flows, water often pours over the edge and into the western ravine. Stormwater runoff would be collected on roofs and in catch basins and conveyed via gravity flow to stormwater injection (UIC) wells. UIC wells would be installed to discharge stormwater runoff into the ground. The wells would infiltrate stormwater runoff into the underlying Vashon advance outwash soils, which begin approximately 80 feet below ground surface and are approximately 100 feet thick. No onsite detention would be required.

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

Waste materials in the form of sediment generated during construction could enter surface water through stormwater runoff. The BMPs described below would minimize sediment leaving the site during construction.

Stormwater runoff would be treated for basic level contaminants prior to entering the UIC wells to prevent waste materials from entering groundwater. Stormwater treatment would be provided by means of stormwater media filters in manholes or vaults. Stormwater runoff entering Wetland B will also receive basic level treatment prior to discharge.

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

The UIC stormwater system included in the site design would control runoff water impacts. During construction, BMPs would be implemented to ensure that sediment originating from disturbed soils would be retained within the limits of disturbance. BMPs may include installation of a rock construction entrance, catch basin filters, interceptor swales, hay bales, sediment traps, and other appropriate cover measures. BMPs specific to the site and project would be specified by the District in the construction contract documents that the construction contractor would be required to implement.

In order to mitigate for changes to wetland hydrology, the District would stabilize the outfalls to the ravines, remove non-native species within the wetland and buffer, and enhance surface roughness within the wetland.

**4. Plants**

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

deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

shrubs

grass

pasture

crop or grain

orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

other types of vegetation (see below)

In general, the ravines surrounding the school are dominated by evergreen trees (such as western red cedar and Douglas-fir), ferns, nettles, and invasive species such as Himalayan blackberry and English ivy. Near the wetland in the eastern ravine, wet soil plants, such as tall mannagrass, can also be found. The uplands of the school are predominantly vegetated by grass, weeds (such as dandelions), deciduous trees (such as maples and Pacific dogwood), and a few evergreen trees (pacific madrone). Scotch broom, an invasive species, is located on the steep slope between the baseball field and the track and field area. Within the building areas there are also a few nonnative ornamentals. A tree survey was conducted in January 2016, which identified 479 trees onsite within 10' of the clearings,

trees on the steep slopes were not identified (AFM, 2016). Presently, the City of Edmonds does not protect significant trees under its city and community development code. Tree conservation regulations have been proposed (Edmonds City Code and Community Development Code (ECDC) Chapter 23.20); however, they have not been adopted. Under the draft code, any tree with a diameter of 6 inches or more would qualify as a significant tree. This would include 99 percent of the trees onsite (474).

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

Approximately 12,000 square feet of existing native and ornamental shrub area and approximately 3 acres of lawn area would be altered. Fifty trees would be removed, 33 due to health reasons. Invasive vegetation between the two ball fields would also be removed.

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

The project site does not contain any documented threatened or endangered plant species (WNHP, 2013).

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

Existing trees on the site would be protected to the extent possible using tree protection measures including, but not limited to, use of tree protection fences.

The landscaping plan would place an emphasis on native plants and drought-resistant ornamentals. The landscape would be designed to achieve low water use and low maintenance requirements. Landscape areas would be watered with automatic water efficient irrigation system intended to be used temporarily until plants have become established.

**5. Animals**

**a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.**

During the April 2016 site visit, a bald eagle was observed flying overhead. However, there are no eagle nests identified as being within the project vicinity (WDFW, 2016). According to the Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW), no priority habitats or species are located onsite (WDFW, 2016). However, the ravines surrounding the project site are identified as fish and wildlife conservation areas (City of Edmonds, 2016). It is possible that small mammals such as raccoons, Virginia opossums, mountain beavers, and eastern gray squirrels may use the ravine, along with bird species common in forested areas (e.g.,

chestnut-back chickadee, red-breasted nuthatch, Steller’s jay, downy and hairy woodpecker, and bushtit).

Wetlands near the site may provide a seasonal water source for wildlife such as birds (for drinking or bathing). It is possible that amphibians may also use the wetlands as suitable breeding habitat due to the presence of shallow water with thin-stemmed emergent vegetation for egg laying.

The mowed ballfields to the south of the school may provide foraging habitat for species such as American robin and Canada goose, which use open, grassy areas.

While landscaped areas around the school and parking lot are fairly small and fragmented, they can support species tolerant of human disturbance, such as house wren, Bewick’s wren, black-capped chickadee, bushtit, dark-eyed junco, house finch, house sparrow, Steller’s jay, and American crow. Small mammals such as eastern gray squirrel may forage or nest in trees in these areas.

Nocturnal species such as owls and bats may be present, but were not active during the site visit. Other species may only be visible or present in this area during certain seasons.

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

No threatened or endangered species are known to be on or near the site.

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

The Puget Sound area is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway extends south from Alaska to Mexico and South America. No portion of the proposed project would interfere with or alter the Pacific Flyway.

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

As required under ECDC 23.90.030, the District would undertake measures to protect wildlife habitat within the forested ravines. These would be identified in a fish and wildlife habitat conservation area mitigation plan and may include measures identified in ECDC 23.90.030(C)) such as:

- a native vegetation planting plan;
- plans for retention, enhancement or restoration of specific habitat features;

- plans for control of nonnative invasive plant or wildlife species; and
- stipulations for use of innovative, sustainable building practices.

## 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.**

Electricity and natural gas would be used to meet the new school's energy needs.

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

No existing or proposed buildings within the project boundaries would be tall enough to block the use of solar energy by adjacent properties. No other aspect of the project would interfere with solar energy use by others.

- 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:**

Energy conservation features included in the proposed new school would include:

- Skylights or roof monitors to provide daylighting for student occupied spaces.
- North and south oriented classrooms for optimum daylighting and reduction in electric lighting.
- Access from classrooms to outdoor learning gardens
- Continuous air barrier and air leakage testing during construction to reduce infiltration and energy loss.
- Vestibules at all main entries to reduce heating and ventilation loads by creating an air lock.
- High performing windows with low-e coatings that would be optimized based on the window orientation.
- Continuous insulation on exterior of building to prevent energy loss from thermal bridging.
- Solar readiness for future installation of solar panels on 100 percent of the roof area.
- Energy source metering and display kiosk to inform building occupants and owners of both real time and long term energy use.
- Electrical:

- Daylight controls that automatically dim electric lighting in areas adjacent to windows.
- High efficiency LED lighting for all spaces providing lighting power density of less than 0.5 watts per square foot.
- Vacancy sensors in every room that would automatically turn lights off when space is unoccupied.
- Motion sensors on exterior lights that would automatically dim lights to 10 percent when the area is unoccupied.
- Plug load controllers that automatically switch off 50 percent of electrical outlets in classrooms and offices to reduce vampire loads from printers, monitors, and desk lamps during off hours.
- Mechanical:
  - Air to air heat recovery in classrooms.
  - Decoupled heating and ventilation “DOAS” systems in classrooms.
  - Radiant floor heating in classrooms.
  - Low temperature heating water system.
  - High efficiency condensing boilers.
  - Central air to water heat pump to supplement boiler plant.
  - High efficiency condensing water heaters.
  - Low flow plumbing fixtures.

## 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.**

Accidental spills of hazardous materials from equipment and vehicles could occur during construction. However, a spill prevention and control plan would be developed to prevent the accidental release of contaminants into the environment.

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

According to the Department of Ecology Facility/Site(s) database, Madrona School is a hazardous waste generator due to the presence of a Conditionally Exempt Small Generator (Ecology, 2016).

The Regulated Building Materials Assessment Report found that the existing school contains asbestos throughout the buildings

(Terracon/Argus Pacific, 2015). Bulk samples of suspect asbestos-containing materials (145) were collected and analyzed. Of those samples, 19 materials were found to contain greater than 1 percent asbestos, six materials were assumed to contain asbestos, and two materials were found to contain less than 1 percent asbestos.

Of the paint chip samples collected, 17 were found to contain detectable levels of lead (70 percent). In addition, mercury-containing fluorescent light tubes were identified in the buildings, high-intensity discharge (HID) lamps were identified in the gymnasium and on the exterior of the buildings, and light ballasts associated with fluorescent light fixtures were observed to be PCB-containing and electronic (Terracon/Argus Pacific, 2015).

- 2. Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.**

The existing school contains asbestos and lead paint as described above under 7.a.1. There is also a boiler building onsite that would be demolished as part of the project.

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

Chemicals stored and used during construction would be limited to gasoline and other petroleum-based products required for maintenance and operation of construction equipment and vehicles.

During operation of the new school facility, chemicals stored and used on site would be limited to cleaning supplies and mild acids and bases used for middle school science and would be stored in vented flammable resistant cabinets.

- 4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

No special emergency services would be required.

- 5. Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:**

Site-specific pollution prevention plans and spill prevention and control plans would be developed to prevent or minimize impacts from hazardous materials.

All asbestos-containing materials would be removed and properly disposed of by a qualified State of Washington licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Any previously encountered material encountered during construction activities would be sampled for asbestos prior to being impacted by demolition. Disturbance of painted surfaces with detectable concentrations of lead would be performed according to Washington Labor and Industries regulations for Lead in Construction (WAC 296-155-176). Workers disturbing surfaces with lead-containing paint would be provided the proper personal protective equipment and use proper work methods to limit occupational and environmental exposure to lead.

**b. Noise**

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

There are no existing sources of noise in the area that would adversely affect the proposal.

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

Vehicle and equipment operation during construction could cause noise impacts to nearby residents. Construction hours and noise levels would comply with the City of Edmonds noise standards (ECDC 5.30). The standards state that maximum permissible sound levels in residential communities are not to exceed 55 A-weighted decibels (dBAs). However, maximum permissible sound levels may be exceeded by construction activities between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. After construction is complete, noise levels would not increase over current conditions because enrollment would stay the same.

**3. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

Construction activities would be restricted to hours and levels designated by ECDC 5.30. If construction activities exceed permitted noise levels, the District would instruct the contractor to

implement measures to reduce noise impacts, such as additional muffling of equipment.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

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

The project site is currently used for the Madrona School and is shared with the former Woodway Elementary School in the southwest portion of the property. Adjacent properties include residential properties. The former Woodway Elementary School is currently being used by Lynndale Elementary while the new Lynndale Elementary School is being constructed. Construction of the new school will be completed in January 2017, at which time the former Woodway Elementary will be temporarily used by Mountlake Terrace Elementary. When the new Mountlake Terrace Elementary School is completed in the fall of 2018, the former Woodway Elementary will be vacant. The proposal would not change the current land use of the site and would not affect land uses on nearby or adjacent properties.

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

The site is not currently, and has not been previously, used for working farmlands or working forest lands. No agricultural or forest land would be converted to other uses.

- 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:**

No working farm or forest lands are located nearby the proposed project, so the project would not affect or be affected by working land business operations.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.**

The main structure on the site is the single-story Madrona School, which consists of five separate buildings connected by covered pathways and one

boiler building. Other structures on the site include playground equipment and a storage shed.

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

The existing approximately 95,000 square foot Madrona School and related improvements, including a 2,500 square foot covered play area, covered walkways, parking areas, and playground equipment, would be demolished after the new school is constructed and ready to be occupied.

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

The City of Edmonds zoning classification of the site is RS-8 (Single Family, 8,000 square foot lots).

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

The City of Edmonds comprehensive plan designation of the site is Single Family Urban 1 (City of Edmonds, 2015).

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

The project site is not within a shoreline jurisdiction; therefore, there is no applicable shoreline master plan designation.

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

The City of Edmonds critical areas maps show fish and wildlife conservation areas for “other” species encompassing the existing school in an area roughly corresponding to the forested areas surrounding the school and ball fields. In addition, it shows erosion hazard areas and landslide hazard areas as being located onsite. These hazard areas are identified as being located in the eastern and western ravines and in the middle of the existing field area, between the baseball field and the track field area, and along the western edge of the proposed school. A wetland critical area is also shown in the southeastern corner of the site, corresponding to the location of Wetland B.

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

No one would reside in the completed school. The capacity of the completed new school would be the same as the existing school (650 students). Enrollment growth is not anticipated; therefore, future staffing levels are expected to remain the same (approximately 80 teachers and

staff, including itinerant staff that support Madrona School and other District schools).

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

The completed project would not displace any people.

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

No displacement would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

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

The project would not change existing land uses. The project would obtain a project design review permit from the City of Edmonds before construction.

**m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:**

The project is not located near any agricultural or forest lands, so no measures to ensure compatibility are required.

**9. Housing**

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

No housing units would be provided as part of the project.

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

No housing units would be eliminated.

**c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.**

The project would not cause housing impacts; therefore, mitigation measures to control housing impacts would not be required.

**10. Aesthetics**

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

The height of the new school buildings would be a maximum of 30 feet at the gymnasium. The building height of the classrooms would be 20 feet or less (not including any rooftop mechanical equipment). The principal exterior building material would be brick masonry.

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

Views from adjacent residences facing the current school would not likely be changed by the project because dense vegetation is located between the residential neighborhoods and the school. The views most likely to be altered would be from 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW when the existing school is demolished. Although the new school would be slightly upslope, it would be approximately 500 feet farther away from the street, making it less noticeable with a new soccer field located between the roadway and the school.

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

The school has been designed to reduce aesthetic impacts to neighboring residences homes through use of setbacks and landscaping.

**11. Light and Glare**

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

Exterior lighting would be required for personnel and building safety. Outdoor circulation areas and parking lots would be illuminated by LED light sources. Lighting systems would be designed to provide illumination levels in accordance with the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society, consistent with Energy Codes. A typical streetlight is designed to emit 1 footcandle, a measurement of illumination. Exterior lighting at the new school would be designed to 0.5 footcandles and would be turned off at 10:00 p.m.

The addition of a digital, illuminated sign would comply with City of Edmonds code to meet required setbacks and comply with hours of operation.

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

Exterior building and property lighting from the completed project would not be a safety hazard and is not expected to interfere with views.

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

No offsite sources of light or glare would affect this proposal.

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

It is anticipated that both exterior and interior lighting would be on timers so that the site would be mostly dark at night. Exterior lights would be designed to 0.5 footcandles.

**12. Recreation**

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

The closest recreational opportunities are provided onsite. They include orienteering courses, two playgrounds, and two fields (baseball and track with soccer field) that are jointly used by the City of Edmonds and Madrona School. The property is well used by local residents for recreation. Many people use the orienteering trail system to walk their dogs, and many joggers utilize the school's track for running and walking (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015b). In addition, a year to year interlocal agreement exists between the City of Edmonds and Edmonds School District No. 15 for the scheduling of playfields at Madrona School (City of Edmonds and Edmonds School District 15, 2015). Although the baseball field is not typically used by the community, the track and field area is sometimes used by soccer teams.

The closest park to Madrona School is Hickman Park, which is located 0.75 mile away. The 3-acre park includes a picnic area, trails, playground, a baseball diamond, and soccer fields. The Klahaya Swim and Tennis Club is also located nearby (0.65 mile). In addition, the recreational facilities associated with Sherwood Elementary School, Scriber Lake High School, and the former Woodway Elementary School, are also located less than a mile from the school.

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

The proposed project would temporarily remove play areas and the baseball field during construction of the new school. Once the new school

is built, and the existing school has been demolished, a new covered play area, play field, and kindergarten play area would be provided. It is possible that a new baseball field would also be constructed after the existing school is removed. As part of the project, the existing track and field area located in the southwestern portion of the site would be elongated to meet current International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) track and field design standards.

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

During construction of the new school, use of the existing kindergarten play area would be maintained. Construction would be phased so that older students have access to either the existing play area, the track and field area, or the new covered play area during construction. Impacts to recreational users after school hours would be related to closures of the track and field area while it is being upgraded. The construction period for the track and field upgrades is expected to be of short duration.

**13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

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

The existing Madrona School, built as the Madrona Junior High School, was constructed in 1963 and is over 45 years old. The school features six detached buildings and two athletic fields. The single-story buildings were designed in the New Formalism style and embody the style's characteristic emphasis on the structural grid, use of vertical posts, and colonnades. The buildings feature low-pitch side-gabled roofs with skylights. The school was designed by the architectural firm Waldron & Dietz of Seattle (Waldron & Dietz, 1962).

Three other schools in Edmonds were designed by Waldron & Dietz: Woodway Elementary School (1956), Edmonds High School (1959), and Olympic School (1966). The firm also designed the award-winning Edmonds Community College Master Plan in 1965 (Houser, 2016b). While Waldron & Dietz were notable architects and the Madrona Junior High School is over 45 years in age, there is no indication that it was a notable project by the firm, nor does it appear to embody unique construction methods or design elements that would support listing the building on national, state, or local preservation registers.

A review of historic registers indicates that there are no properties listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic

Places or Washington Heritage Register on or adjacent to the school site (DAHP, 2016). Madrona School is not listed on the City of Edmonds Register of Historic Places or the Snohomish County Register of Historic Places.

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

There is one recorded archaeological site within 1 mile of Madrona School. This is located approximately 0.90 mile east and is a segment of the historic Seattle-Everett Interurban Railroad. Two cemeteries are approximately 0.70 mile to the west: the Edmonds Memorial / International Order of Odd Fellows Cemetery (c. 1910) and the Restlawn Memorial Park (c. 1951). The Edmonds Memorial Cemetery is listed on the Washington Heritage Register. Approximately 0.70 mile south is the Firland Sanatorium complex (1914) which is listed on the Washington Heritage Register. No professional cultural resource studies have been conducted on the Madrona School property. Three studies have been conducted within 1 mile; none of these identified any cultural resources (Baker, 2012; Hartmann, 2008; Schultz, 2006).

The Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's (DAHP) Statewide Predictive Model classifies portions of the project area as "Low Risk" and "Moderately Low Risk" for encountering subsurface Precontact cultural resources (DAHP, 2010). The site is underlain by Pleistocene-aged Vashon glacial till (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015a) and has not been subject to substantial natural deposition since the end of the last Ice Age. The lack of any significant natural deposition during the Holocene period substantially diminishes the potential for intact, buried precontact archaeological resources. There is a thin layer of imported topsoil (fill) overlying the till (Shannon & Wilson, Inc., 2015a) and soils are primarily classified as Alderwood-Urban land complex (2 to 8 or 8 to 15 percent slopes (USDA, 2016). Alderwood-Urban land soils consist of soils developed within glacial parent material, but which has been subject to extensive human modification, such as grading and filling. A review of original construction documents reveals that school construction required extensive cutting and filling to overcome the natural slopes and undulations of the original landform. There is no evidence to suggest that archaeological sites would have ever been present within the school property, but if they had been, it is likely that they would have been destroyed or very significantly disturbed during original preparation of the school construction site.

The closest known ethnographic place names are three shoreline locations over 1.5 miles west along the Puget Sound: Edwards Point, Wells Point, and Richmond Beach where kinnickinnik was gathered (Hilbert et al., 2001). Further review of historic maps and published Native American ethnographic studies suggest a low probability for encountering either Precontact-era or historic-era cultural resources on the Madrona School property (Anderson Map Company, 1910; Hilbert et al., 2001; Kroll Map Company, 1934; Kroll Map Company, 1952; Kroll Map Company, 1960; USGS, 1895; USGS, 1953; USGS, 1968; USGS, 1973; USGS, 1981; US Surveyor General, 1860).

During the 20th century, the Madrona School property was under the ownership of H. T. Lewis and later Edward Brady until the State acquired the land by 1952 (Anderson Map Company, 1910; Kroll Map Company, 1934; Kroll Map Company, 1952; Kroll Map Company, 1960). The project area appears to have remained undeveloped until construction of the school began in 1962.

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

As cited in response to questions 13a and 13b above, the following sources were reviewed in order to identify any potential cultural resources in the project vicinity:

- DAHP;
- The City of Edmonds Historic Preservation Commission, and the Snohomish County Historic Preservation Commission for any recorded cultural resources, cemeteries, national, state, or local register-listed historic properties;
- Previous studies on or near the project area;
- DAHP's Statewide Predictive Model;
- Historical maps of the project area dated 1860, 1895, 1910, 1934, 1952, 1953, 1960, 1968, 1973, 1981; and
- Ethnographic studies.

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

No cultural resources have been identified on the property. The area is considered by DAHP to be "Low Risk" to "Moderately Low Risk" for buried cultural resources (DAHP, 2010).

Under any circumstances, if cultural resources are inadvertently identified during the project, the developer will comply with state laws requiring the protection of cultural resources and human remains (RCW 27.53, RCW 27.44, RCW 68.50, and RCW 68.60). The developer will temporarily halt work in the immediate vicinity of the identified resources and notify the District. The District will notify DAHP and Affected Tribes to negotiate mitigation and/or avoidance measures.

**14. Transportation**

**a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

The site is bounded on the north by, and accessed from, 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW, which is designated as a Local Access roadway by the City of Edmonds. Edmonds Way (also designated as State Route [SR] 104) is a Principal Arterial located about 600 feet east of the site. Other Local Access roadways that serve the vicinity include 93<sup>rd</sup> Avenue W and 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue W, which both extend north from 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW. The school replacement project would retain the two existing driveways in their current locations; however, changes to internal site circulation would modify how those driveways are used. The existing western access driveway would be used for automobile (parent, staff, and visitor vehicles) access and egress. Access and egress for school buses and a portion of staff parking would be consolidated at the existing eastern access driveway (Figure 2).

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

The site is not directly served by public transit. However, Community Transit provides bus service to the City of Edmonds. The closest bus stops are located about 950 feet away from the site (walking distance) on Edmonds Way (SR 104) just south of 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW. These stops are served by Community Transit Route 416 (both directions), which operates seven days per week between the Lynnwood Transit Center and Edmonds Station with headways (time between consecutive buses) of 30 minutes from about 5:20 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. on weekdays. Farther from the site (just over a mile), there are stops located along 244<sup>th</sup> Street SW which are served by Community Transit Route 130. Route 130 provides seven-day service between Edmonds Station, Aurora Village Transit Center, and Lynnwood Transit Center. It also operates with 30 minute headways from about 5:30 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. on weekdays. The Edmonds School District would also continue to provide school-bus transportation for students that qualify.

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

The replacement school project proposes to provide a total of 119 parking spaces (including five ADA spaces); this is the same number of parking spaces that exist currently at the site and none would be eliminated. However, improvements to on-site circulation with increased capacity for parent-vehicle and school-bus load/unload would provide additional space for evening and/or weekend event parking. The parent-vehicle load/unload and queue area encircling the proposed main parking lot would provide capacity for an additional 40 vehicles to park during evening or weekend events. The school-bus load/unload area has room for up to 40 additional vehicles to park during event conditions. In total, the site would have capacity to accommodate 199 vehicles for evening and/or weekend event conditions.

City of Edmonds parking requirements for elementary schools are outlined in ECDC 17.100.050.M.1. The ECDC requires 11 spaces per 100 students, as well as nondedicated parking areas onsite to accommodate special event parking.

Based on the future school capacity of 650 students, 72 parking spaces would be required by ECDC. The proposed project would provide 119 angled parking spaces, which would meet the minimum requirement and provide an additional 45 spaces for school-day event parking. As described, the site would also have capacity to accommodate an additional 80 vehicles in the queue/load/unload areas for evening and weekend events, bringing the site total to 199 spaces. The proposed parking supply would meet the City's code requirements.

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

A sidewalk would be added on the south side of 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW between the school's two existing driveways. This sidewalk would connect to a new on-site walkway adjacent to the easternmost driveway and provide improved pedestrian connectivity to the school. No other improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle, or state transportation facilities would be required to accommodate the proposal.

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

The project would not occur in the vicinity of or use water, rail, or air transportation.

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

Based on traffic counts performed at the site driveways in October 2015, the existing school is currently estimated to generate about 1,350 trips per day (675 in, 675 out). The peak volumes occur during the morning arrival period from 8:30 to 9:30 a.m. when the school generates about 400 trips (225 in, 175 out). Volumes are also high during the afternoon dismissal period with the school generates about 310 trips (145 in, 165 out) between 3:15 and 4:15 p.m. The school was observed to generate about 115 trips (50 in, 65 out) during the commuter PM peak hour of the adjacent roadway network (from 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.).

The proposed replacement school would have the same enrollment capacity and a smaller building (in terms of overall floor area) compared to the existing school. Therefore, the project would not result in any new trips generated on the local roadway network.

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

The proposal would not interfere with the movement of agricultural or forest products on streets in the area because no agricultural or working forest lands are located within the vicinity of the project site.

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

The project includes several components that would improve traffic circulation and pedestrian safety compared to current conditions, including the addition of a new sidewalk connection along the south side of 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW and improved internal site circulation, passenger-vehicle queuing capacity, and separated school-bus/parent-vehicle access and egress patterns.

The District would require the selected contractor to develop a construction management plan (CMP) to address traffic and pedestrian

control during construction of the school. The CMP would define truck routes, lane closures, walkway closures, and parking disruptions, as necessary. To the extent possible, the CMP would direct trucks along the shortest route to arterials and away from residential streets to avoid unnecessary conflicts with resident and pedestrian activity. The CMP may also include measures to keep adjacent streets clean on a daily basis at the truck exit points (such as street sweeping or onsite truck wheel cleaning) to reduce tracking dirt offsite. The CMP would identify parking locations for construction staff. To the extent possible, construction employee parking would be contained onsite.

**15. Public Services**

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

The project would not result in an increased need for public services.

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

Because an increased need for public services is not required; mitigation to reduce impacts to public services is not proposed. However, two service areas would be provided onsite for fire protection: one along the eastern boundary of the site and the other on the track field.

**16. Utilities**

- a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:**

Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic systems, other

- 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.**

All of the utilities noted above currently serve the school site. Utilities would be extended from 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW to serve the new school, and would potentially be extended all the way through the property to connect with the utility system located in the residential neighborhood to the south.

**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:  \_\_\_\_\_

Name of signee: AARON BOY \_\_\_\_\_

Position and Agency/Organization: Senior Associate, ESA \_\_\_\_\_

Date Submitted: June 17, 2016 \_\_\_\_\_

## REFERENCES

- American Forest Management (AFM). 2016. Madrona K-8 School Project Tree Survey. January 20, 2016.
- Anderson Map Company  
1910 Anderson's Atlas of Snohomish County. Electronic document, <http://www.historicmapworks.com/Map/US/699402/Township+27+North++Range+3+East++W+M+++Puget+View++Bayview++Richmond+Fruit+Garden/Snohomish+County+1910/Washington/>, accessed April 27, 2016.
- Terracon/Argus Pacific. 2015. Regulated Building Materials Assessment: Madrona K-8 School. September 30, 2015
- Baker, R. Todd  
2012 *Cultural Resource Survey for the Proposed Edmonds Community Health Center Project, Edmonds, Snohomish County, Washington*. Prepared for Community Health Center of Snohomish County by Terracon Consultants, Inc., Mountlake Terrace, WA. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia, WA.
- City of Edmonds. 2016. City of Edmonds GIS. Available at: <http://maps.edmondswa.gov/Html5Viewer/?viewer=html>
- City of Edmonds. 2015. City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan. Adopted July 28, 2015.
- City of Edmonds and Edmonds School District No. 15. 2015. Interlocal Agreement Between City of Edmonds and Edmonds School District No. 15 for Repairs, Maintenance, and Scheduling of Playfields at Madrona Nongraded K-8 School. August 11, 2015
- Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)  
2010 Statewide Predictive Model. Last updated 2010. Electronic document, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/>, accessed April 26, 2016.  
2016 Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Database (WISAARD). Electronic document, <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/>, accessed April 26, 2016.
- Ecology (Washington State Department of Ecology). 2016. Facility Site Report: Edmonds School District Madrona School (Facility/Site: 34486491). Accessed 4/7/2016.
- Hartmann, Glenn D.  
2008 *Cultural Resources Assessment for the Swift Bus Rapid Transit Project, Technical Memo 0711A-3, Snohomish County, Washington*. Prepared for OTAK by Cultural Resource Consultants, Inc., Bainbridge Island, WA. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia, WA.

Heffron Transportation, Inc. 2016. Preliminary Traffic and Access Review for Replacement. Edmonds School District – Madrona School. March 9, 2016.

Hilbert, Vi, Jay Miller, and Zalmai Zahir

2001 *Puget Sound Geography: Original Manuscript from T. T. Waterman*. Lushootseed Press, Seattle. Available from Zahir Consulting Services, Federal Way, WA.

Houser, Michael C.

2016a Dietz, Robert H. Electronic document, [http://www.docomomo-wewa.org/architects\\_detail.php?id=26](http://www.docomomo-wewa.org/architects_detail.php?id=26), accessed April 27, 2016.

2016b Waldron, Lawrence G. Electronic document, [http://www.docomomo-wewa.org/architects\\_detail.php?id=110](http://www.docomomo-wewa.org/architects_detail.php?id=110), accessed April 27, 2016.

Kroll Map Company

1934 Kroll's Atlas of Snohomish County. Electronic document, <http://www.historicmapworks.com/Map/US/31587/Page+01++Edmonds/Snohomish+County+1934/Washington/>, accessed April 27, 2016.

1952 Kroll's Atlas of Snohomish County 1943 revised 1952. Electronic document, <http://www.historicmapworks.com/Map/US/488893/Page+1+Township+27+N+R+3+E++Edmonds++Edwards+Point++Wells+Point/Snohomish+County+1943+Revised+1952/Washington/>, accessed April 27, 2016.

1960 Kroll's Atlas of Snohomish County. Electronic document, <http://www.historicmapworks.com/Map/US/56147/Township+27+North++Range+3+East++Edmonds++Woodway+++Page+001/Snohomish+County+1960+Published+by+Kroll/Washington/>, accessed April 27, 2016.

Schultz, Erica

2006 *New Tower ("NT") Submission Packet – FCC Form 620*. Prepared for Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation by EBI Consulting, Burlington, MA. On file, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Olympia, WA.

Shannon & Wilson, Inc. 2015a. Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report: New Madrona K-8 Project. 9300 236<sup>th</sup> Street SW City of Edmonds, Washington. August 6, 2015. Submitted to Edmonds School District #15.

Shannon & Wilson, Inc. 2015b. Wetland and Stream Delineation Report: New Madrona K-8 Project. City of Edmonds, Washington. September 15, 2015. Submitted to Edmonds School District #15.

US Geological Survey (USGS)

1895 *Snohomish, WA, 30' Series Quadrangle*. US Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

1953 *Edmonds East, WA, 7.5' Series Quadrangle*. US Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

1968 *Edmonds East, WA, 7.5' Series Quadrangle*. US Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

1973 *Edmonds East, WA, 7.5' Series Quadrangle*. US Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

1981 *Edmonds East, WA, 7.5' Series Quadrangle*. US Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

US Surveyor General

1860 Township 27 North, Range 3 East Survey Map. Electronic document, [http://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1\\_2.php?path=PWA&name=t270n030e\\_001.jpg](http://www.blm.gov/or/landrecords/survey/yPlatView1_2.php?path=PWA&name=t270n030e_001.jpg), accessed April 27, 2016.

Waldron & Dietz

1962 Madrona Junior High School Construction Plan Set, Sheets 1-E9. On file, ESA, Seattle.

WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). 2016. Priority habitats and species online mapping. Available: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/phs/>.

WNHP (Washington Natural Heritage Program). 2013. Rare plant species and vegetation communities GIS mapping.



## **FIGURES**