

## St. Edward State Park Ballfield Improvements (VAR17-0120)

### Notice of Application Public Comments and City of Kenmore Response

Notice of Application August 18, 2017 to September 9, 2017. Comments consolidated by topic and are responded to below.

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
<b>General</b>				
G-1	General: Completed notice to receive copy of decision.	Van Fossen 8/21/17 Evans 8/21/17 Arkley 8/30/17	The Development Services Department creates a Party of Record list of individuals who will receive a copy of the Notice of Decision	
G-2	General: Clarify if a chain link fence or split rail fence will surround the ballfield.	Finley 8/29/17	The Development Services Department response 8/30/17: The final location, height and materials for fencing will be determined during the review process. Around the backstop/bleacher area it will likely be chain link fencing. Fencing other areas such as adjacent to wetlands is under review.	
G-3	General: Clarification on the Notice of Application Process, SEPA Notice Process, length of comment period, Notice Board requirements.	Hirt 8/22/17 Hirt 8/28/17 Finley 9/8/17	The Development Services Department response 8/23/17 to Hirt: The NOA comment period will be followed by a 14-day SEPA public comment period. The NOA comment period is your opportunity to comment on the project. The separate SEPA public comment period is your opportunity to comment on SEPA related environmental aspects (i.e. SEPA checklist). Please feel free to comment during both comment periods.  Comments on the Notice Board are procedural and are responded to by Development Services.	

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
G-4	General: What are the field measurements and acreage?	Hirt 8/31/17	<p>The Community Development Department response 9/7/17: Measurements are available on Sheet C1.1 of the plan set. Soccer 315' x 210'. The two modified fields shown are 240' x 120'. Baseball 200' outfield (a portable fence needed if an actual outfield is desired). Bases are at 60' with a 15' setback from the backstop.</p> <p>The legal description shows a proposed lease area of 4.16 acres and within this leased area the improved turf field area is 2.25 acres (size added to SEPA checklist A.11).</p>	Legal Description and Sheet C1.1 of the plan set.
G-5	Provide complete written comments by DAHP regarding the ballfields and proposed screening from the entry road (referenced in SEPA checklist)	Aagaard 9/8/17	<p>City to provide DAHP written comments.</p> <p>The City received a letter dated 9/30/16 from DAHP. The City then met with DAHP staff and State Parks staff on-site in October 2016 to discuss recommendations. The SEPA checklist Section B.13.d reflects what was discussed during the on-site meeting including screening.</p>	9/30/16 DAHP letter to City
G-6	Provide the complete comments by Casey Costello regarding the stream review	Aagard 9/8/17	Comments made verbally in the field and summarized in the Revised Draft Critical Areas Report.	
G-7	General: Opposition to the ballfield proposal and granting the variance	Aagaard 9/8/17 Carlson 9/7/17 Carlson S 9/8/17 Eastside Audubon 9/7/17 Engbarth 9/7/17 Finley 9/8/17 Finn 9/8/17 Fukuda 9/2/17 Griffith 9/7/17	37 individual commenters are in opposition to the ballfield proposal and granting the variance. Comments were consolidated by general topic areas and responses are provided in the Opposition Section O-1 through O-19.	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Garneski 9/4/17 Gins Su 9/7/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hayden 9/7/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hill 9/2/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Hill J 9/4/17 Hirt 9/8/17 Knight 9/8/17 Mailheau 9/5/17 Mailheau 9/8/17 Mitten 9/7/17 Moon 9/4/17 Moon 9/8/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Jade 9/2/17 Olavarria 9/5/17 Prince 9/8/17 Robinson 9/7/17 Schuler 9/6/17 Scully 9/7/17 Singh 9/7/17 Slayden 9/7/17 Thormodson 9/5/17 Unruh 9/8/17		

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Warren 9/5/17 Younghans 8/18/17		
G-8	General: Support the ballfield proposal and granting the variance	Ahten 9/8/17 Alcorta 9/8/17 Anderson 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Aragon 9/8/17 BaderEddin 9/8/17 Bennett 9/8/17 Burrell 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Carlson K 9/8/17 Chae 9/8/17 Clements 9/8/17 Connor 9/7/17 Cooley 9/8/17 Dailey 9/8/17 Dailey T 9/8/17 Dawson 9/8/17 DeKay 9/8/17 Devasahayam 9/8/17 DiGioia 9/8/17 Dillman 9/8/17	100 individual commenters are in support of the ballfield project and granting the variance. Comments were consolidated by general topic area and responses are provided in the Support Section S-1 through S-6.	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Dowell 9/8/17 Economou 9/8/17 Elmy 9/8/17 Engel 9/8/17 Erickson 9/8/17 Fink 9/8/17 Fournier 9/8/17 Freeburg 9/8/17 Fried 9/8/17 Gehlsen 9/8/17 Geremia 9/8/17 Guest 9/8/17 Gustafson 9/8/17 Hagen 9/8/17 Hayes 9/8/17 Haver 9/8/17 Headlee 9/8/17 Hedman 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hiller 9/8/17 Hogge 9/7/17 Holes 9/7/17 Holt 9/8/17 Hutchinson 9/7/17 Johnson 9/8/17		

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Jones 9/7/17 Jones D 9/7/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Kelle 9/6/17 Koppelman 9/8/17 Lane 9/6/17 Large 9/8/17 Lawlor 9/8/17 Ledger 9/8/17 Litzinger 9/8/17 Looney 9/6/17 Looney R 9/6/17 Lord 9/8/17 Madigan 9/8/17 Marin 9/8/17 Maurer 9/7/17 Miller 9/8/17 Minahan 9/8/17 Mulcare 9/6/17 Mullins 9/6/17 Mullins S 9/6/17 Nordyke 9/8/17 Orrico 9/8/17 Painter 9/6/17 Patton 9/8/17 Reid 9/8/17 Reid V 9/8/17 Richter 9/8/17 Rigor 9/8/17		

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Schauman 9/8/17 Schwietzer 9/8/17 Shatsman 9/8/17 Schmidt 9/8/17 Skoor 9/11/17 Smith 9/8/17 Smith L 9/8/17 Snider 9/7/17 Snider J 9/8/17 Suarez 9/8/17 Suarez M 9/7/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 9/8/17 Tomesh 9/4/17 Travis 9/8/17 Ulm 9/8/17 Van Meurs 9/7/17 Volland 9/7/17 Washington 9/7/17 Whiteley 9/8/17 Wilson 9/8/17 Yang 9/8/17		

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
<b>Opposition</b>				
O-1	Opposition: Does not meet all six variance criteria, comments provided to all or some criteria.	Aagard 9/8/17 (attached Burnell letter addressed under Comment O-13) Finley 9/8/17 Finn 9/8/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Prince 9/8/17	<p><b>1. There are special circumstances applicable to the subject property or to the intended use such as shape, topography, location or surroundings that do not apply generally to other properties and which support the granting of a variance from the buffer width requirements; and</b></p> <p>Aagaard: We agree with Ms. Aagaard that there are other parks with structures or features on the National Register. However, this particular special circumstance is that the existing active recreation ballfield is a contributing factor to the St. Edward Seminary Historic District and is also currently located in a wetland and its buffer. The existing ballfield location reflects the District’s original site plan as described in the Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI). The Inventory describes the “full development of the east side of the seminary building for recreational uses” (CLI, p. 43), including the field, ball courts and the gym. Recreational spaces were, in fact, emphasized in the St. Edward Seminary Historic District landscape (CLI, p. 11). The Inventory states that Washington State Parks should “continue use of historic sports field for active recreation” (CLI, p. 163). For these reasons, the active sports field must remain in its current location on the “football field terrace” of the Historic District (CLI, p. 37). Relocating the existing ballfield out of this area is not possible without adversely impacting the District’s historic designation.</p> <p>Given that the existing wetland and its buffer extend across nearly half of the existing mown grass sports field and that fields for active sports have certain dimensional requirements, keeping active fields on the terrace is not possible without</p>	<p>Variance Justification Memo</p> <p>Revised SEPA checklist</p> <p>2006 Cultural Landscape Inventory</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding Contract 16-C1507</p> <p>January 2018 Revised Critical Area Report and Draft Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR)</p>



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>some impact to the wetland buffer. The proposal has shifted the renovated field west out of the wetland, while avoiding impacts to the existing large trees on the west side of the field along the entry drive (another contributing factor to the District, CLI, p. 76 and p. 120). This still results in some continuing impact to the wetland buffer. The desire to retain the historic integrity of the sports field terrace and the resulting inability to relocate the sports field from its present location to a location entirely outside of the critical area buffer is the “special circumstance” that must be balanced with the need to conform to present day critical area regulations as much as possible.</p> <p>Finley, Hendrickson and Hill: Ms. Finley, Mr. Hendrickson and Ms. Hill acknowledge that the integrity of the historic landscape is important and are concerned that the integrity is not retained by the project design. This “special circumstance” means that an active sports field must be located where the current field is located. To achieve an active recreational use on this field (one of the characteristics described as being historically significant), improvements are needed.</p> <p>Prince: Ms. Prince comments that the proposed ballfield is in a completely “different league” than normal ballfields in our state parks and that the existing ballfield currently provides active recreation, open space and wildlife habitat while on the National Register. Because of this uniqueness, she believes that a location outside the park should have been chosen for improved fields. Although the field now is used for open space and provides limited wildlife habitat, these functions are primarily the result of the lack of field maintenance and poor</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>field drainage that presently restricts use by most active recreation users. Historically the field was used exclusively for active recreation by the seminarians, including football, soccer and baseball activities. At one point the field included a striped football field. The Cultural Landscape Inventory anticipates that this active recreation use will be restored by the field improvements. The Cultural Landscape Inventory does not mention open space or wildlife habitat as being important on the field.</p> <p><b>2. Such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right or use possessed by other similarly situated property but which because of special circumstances is denied to the property in question; and</b></p> <p>Aagaard: As the ballfields’ general location cannot be changed and their use for active recreation is limited by their current deteriorated conditions, improvements are needed and must conform as much as possible to existing critical area rules. Both the City and State Parks agree (refer to the recitals in the 1/22/16 Memorandum of Understanding, Contract 16-C1507), that there are mutual benefits in improving the ballfields. Ms. Aagaard suggests that the existing use of the unimproved ballfields in the wetland and buffer could continue, or improvements could be made to develop one natural turf field outside of the wetland buffer. The City has chosen to improve the fields as synthetic turf rather than natural turf fields for several reasons. In general, synthetic turf fields require less maintenance, less use of water, and no use of fertilizers compared to natural turf. Additionally, the poor drainage of natural turf fields during the long rainy season of the region</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>prohibits use of the field during winter months. The design of the synthetic turf fields and drainage system will allow for year-round use of the fields by the community.</p> <p>Finley: Although Ms. Finley states that “field use is not being denied,” many types of active recreational use of the fields is in fact being prohibited by the existing condition of the field</p> <p>Finn: Ms. Finn states that the ballfields have not “fallen into disrepair” and could continue to be used for active use. Analysis shows that, in fact, the existing field has not been maintained for safe game play, that its location partially in a wetland and poor drainage prohibits use for organized sports throughout much of the year, and that, historically, more robust recreational facilities, including a striped football field, have been located on the site.</p> <p>Hill: Ms. Hill comments that current use of the field is precisely as intended. However, historically, the field has been actively used for football, baseball and soccer. These uses required extensive modification to the natural environment and the field has now fallen into disrepair. Improvements are needed to meet the field’s intended use for active recreation. The “contributing factor” to the Historic District is not open space or wildlife habitat, but is an active recreation field.</p> <p>Prince: Ms. Prince contends that strict adherence to the buffer requirements would diminish the preservation and enjoyment of recreational use only for the group of people who desire a new ballfield in this location. However, as stated above, the existing field has not been maintained for safe game play. Many</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>types of active recreational use of the fields are being prohibited by the existing condition of the field and improvements are necessary to meet the field’s intended use for active recreation.</p> <p>Two fields are proposed rather than one because one field is not adequate to meet the community need for game-quality sports fields.</p> <p><b>3. The granting of such buffer width variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvement; and</b></p> <p>Aagaard: The buffer width variance would in fact move activity to the west, out of Wetland A, which is currently degraded and mowed within the existing ballfield (see Revised St. Edward State Park Field Improvements Critical Areas Report and DraftWetland Mitigation Plan, ESA, 2018). The proposal includes restoration of the wetland to improve wetland functions. Currently, there is little buffer function provided to the wetland by the ballfield. With the proposal, the enhanced area of the buffer would be planted with native shrubs and emergent plants that will provide water quality benefits to the wetland and more diverse wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Finley and Hill: The proposal seeks to minimize impacts to the historic character of the St. Edward Seminary District. The ballfields—that have been used for active recreation for 80 years, including a striped football field--will be retained in that use. Other contributing factors to the Historic District also will be restored (see SEPA Checklist B.13.d). The Washington State Parks historic preservation officer has visited the site with staff</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>(October 2016) and suggested changes to ensure that historic views along the entry drive are maintained. The height of the new backstop has been reduced to protect the view of the seminary from the entry drive. Likewise, the “open and closed” pattern along the entry drive has been maintained by interrupting the proposed screening along the north side of the field (rather than providing continuous screening) (added to SEPA Checklist B.10.c.). Perspective drawings show maintenance of views to the seminary building from the access driveway (available on City’s project website).</p> <p>Hendrickson: The applicant disagrees with Mr. Hendrickson; the public process for the review of the permit application has followed all required procedures and the project has been extensively discussed in the community and on the City’s webpage. As in this case, the application for a variance is contemplated in the Zoning Code when “special circumstances” arise.</p> <p>Prince: The applicant maintains that the proposal would not be injurious to the property. With regards to the historic character of the Park, see above. None of the numerous environmental studies accompanying the proposal suggest that the proposal will have a significant negative impact. The fields have been used for active recreation for many years.</p> <p><b>4. The granting of the buffer width variance will not significantly impact the subject critical area; and</b></p> <p>Aagaard, Finley and Hill: The current ballfield lies partially within the wetland and its buffer. The proposal shifts the ballfield as far west as practicable (given that the general</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>location must be preserved and to avoid tree removal along the west side of the field) and enhances the wetland and the buffer (see Draft Revised St. Edward State Park Field Improvements Critical Areas Report and Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan, ESA, 2018). Ms. Aagaard, Ms. Finley and Ms. Hill provide no evidence that the enhanced wetland buffer provides less buffer function than the existing wetland and buffer area which is mowed grass and herbs. The environmental studies conclude that functioning of the wetland and the reduced buffer would improve with the proposal.</p> <p>Currently, the degraded wetland and buffer are regularly mowed, in recreational use, and sometimes used for overflow parking by Parks for special events. These activities would cease once the area is enhanced and fenced. Commenters also contend but provide no evidence that migrating amphibians in the wetland would be impacted by the proposal. As the SEPA checklist states, "A Herpetological Survey (amphibians) conducted in 2006-2007 indicates that three salamander species are present within the stream/wetlands systems in the park: Pacific Giant Salamander (<i>Dicamptodon</i> spp.), Western Red-backed Salamander (<i>Plethodon vehiculum</i>), and <i>Ensatina</i> (<i>Ensatina eschscholtzii</i>). However, no salamander habitat is present within the project footprint; the nearest suitable salamander habitat is south of the project area, within the interior of Wetland A." (SEPA Checklist B.5.a.)</p> <p>The Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR) discusses the wetland hydrology and includes figures, hydrologic modeling, and calculations showing that no impacts to Wetland A are expected. Per the Washington State</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>Department of Ecology approved King County Surface Water Design Manual, the average daily volume to a wetland may not be increased or decreased by more than 20% and the average monthly volume may not increase or decrease by more than 15%. The modeling and calculations provided in the Draft Stormwater TIR support this condition. See response to comments O-13A through O-13E for more information.</p> <p>Hendrickson: Mr. Hendrickson did not provide evidence to show that the critical areas report is inaccurate and misleading. Wetland and stream delineations and classifications summarized in the report have been verified and approved by state resource agencies. Bird and bat studies have been conducted and other impacts to wildlife have been assessed (see SEPA Checklist, B.5).</p> <p><b>5. The decision to grant the <i>variance</i> includes the <i>best available science</i> and gives special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance <i>anadromous fish habitat</i>; and</b> Aagaard, Finley, Hendrickson and Hill: Numerous scientific studies have been completed for this project, including a wetland report (see St. Edward State Park Field Improvements Critical Areas Report and Draft Wetland Mitigation Pla., ESA, 2018), hydrological analyses (see Draft Stormwater TIR, Perteet, 2018), and discussion of streams and potential fish use (see SEPA Checklist B.3.a and B.5). The proposed ballfield renovation does not affect anadromous fish habitat. The project is located over 4,000 feet upstream from the nearest identified anadromous fish habitat (Lake Washington) (WDFW, 2016).</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>The future shoreline restoration project on Lake Washington is not a mitigation measure required for the ballfield project, as the ballfield project has no impact on anadromous fish habitat. The restoration project will be pursued by the City of Kenmore in partnership with Washington State Parks as a future project subject to available grant funds. This future project would enhance fish habitat and additional SEPA review will be completed at the time of Shoreline Permit review. References to the future shoreline project have been removed from the SEPA checklist.</p> <p><b>6. The granting of the <i>variance</i> is consistent with the general purpose and intent of the <i>City's</i> comprehensive plan and adopted development regulations.</b></p> <p>Aagaard: See applicant's Variance Justification, criterion 6.            Finley: We agree that the improvements will be used by sports teams, but they also will be used by others for organized or informal use, all users are considered the general public. State Parks proposes that the City would not schedule official games, practice games or tournaments on Memorial Day weekend or weekends and holidays July 1 through Labor Day without prior consent of the State. Field use during these times may be available for State Park scheduled play, open play or State Park sponsored events or may be used by the City for organized team practice only. State Parks also proposes a minimum of 24 daylight hours per week for State Park scheduled play/open play hours. Typically, organized team practices (e.g. youth baseball, soccer) start at 4pm and the assumption would be scheduled practice likely Monday through Thursday. The field would be unscheduled until 4pm on four weekdays and open all day on one weekday (likely Friday). Weekend games are</p>	



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			likely to be scheduled Saturday and Sunday, except no games on Memorial Day weekend or weekends and holidays July 1 through Labor Day. There are likely to be no weekend games in January or February. Added to SEPA Checklist B.12.c.	
O-2	Opposition: Locate ballfields elsewhere and/or there are sufficient ballfields including turf fields close in the area including Big Finn Hill and school sites.	Carlson 9/7/17 Engbarth 9/7/17 Finley 9/8/17 Finn 9/8/17 Fukuda 9/2/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Garneski 9/4/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Hirt 9/8/17 Knight 9/8/17 Jade 9/5/17 Prince 9/8/17 Robinson 9/7/17 Schuler 9/6/17 Scully 9/7/17 Tomesh 9/4/17	<p>The grass ballfield is an existing recreation facility within St. Edward State Park. The ballfield has historically been used for a variety of organized team sports and other recreational programs including soccer, baseball, football and cricket as well as other informal recreation uses. However, the ballfield has not been used for several years by youth or adult organized team sports due to the poor condition of the field. Improving the ballfield would not entirely preclude use by existing users and would provide game quality fields for use by the general public. The general public includes members or supporters of organized youth and adult recreation teams.</p> <p>The ballfield is a contributing factor to the St. Edward Seminary Historic District and is also currently located in a degraded wetland and its buffer. The existing ballfield location reflects the District’s original site plan as described in the 2006 Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI).</p> <p>The ballfield proposal is consistent with the St. Edward State Park Management Plan (CAMP) as further described in the SEPA checklist. The CAMP identifies continued use of the field for a variety of organized and unorganized recreational events. The CAMP recommends preparing development, use and maintenance agreements with local organizations such as baseball, softball, soccer and cricket leagues and the City of Kenmore. The CAMP also notes that ballfields as community recreation facilities are primarily a local government responsibility.</p>	Supply & Demand Analysis revised January 2018  Revised SEPA checklist  2006 Cultural Landscape Inventory  2008 St. Edward State Park Management Plan

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>Kenmore residents live in the North Lake Little League (NLLL) and Northshore Youth Soccer Association (NYSA) service areas. These are the largest youth recreational sports leagues serving Kenmore and they have experienced pressure in scheduling sufficient field time to meet the practice and game needs of their participants. The analysis of facility supply and demand focuses on these two leagues as the primary users of Kenmore fields, but it is also recognized that other existing and emerging active recreation activities continue to seek more field space in Kenmore and the region than is currently available.</p> <p>As shown in Figure 2, of the Supply and Demand Memo there are over 60 fields within a five-mile radius, but twelve leagues and five school districts compete for their use and there is a shortage of supply to meet the growing demand. Improving existing school fields which are currently scheduled for practice and games would improve quality of fields but would not necessarily increase the supply.</p> <p>The formula used by the City to assess supply and demand concluded that at full availability, the restoration of the two fields at Saint Edward Park into lighted turf facilities would meet the calculated current need for both game-quality and practice fields for both NYSA and NLLL.</p> <p>See response to comment O-1 for proposed scheduling of field use.</p> <p>. Even with the reduced hours and days proposed in the draft</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>lease agreement between the City of Kenmore and Washington State Parks, two lighted turf fields at Saint Edward Park will add new capacity. They will substantially reduce current shortfalls in field supply for youth soccer and Little League in the City of Kenmore, and supply Kenmore’s proportionate share of top-quality game and tournament facilities.</p> <p>Big Finn Hill Park is the within the youth sports boundaries of Kirkland Lacrosse and Lake Washington Youth Soccer Association. These public sports teams have first priority in scheduling for the synthetic turf field. Additional public youth sports from outside the service boundaries and public adult sports groups or unorganized drop-in play receive lower priority for scheduling remaining fields at the park. Returning leagues like the Kirkland Little League get priority use of the fields. The fields are fully scheduled for games and practice. The North Lake Little League got some limited time last year on the ballfield.</p>	
O-3	Opposition: Concern about loss of tranquility, serenity, sanctuary. Keep the site undeveloped and natural.	Carlson 9/7/17 Eastside Audubon 9/7/17 Engbarth 9/7/17 Finn 9/8/17 Fukuda 9/2/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hayden 9/7/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hill 9/2/17	<p>The proposed ballfield improvements are within the existing footprint of the historic ballfield. This site has been used for active and informal recreation for many years. The existing ballfield lies adjacent to the main park entry road which provides access to the Seminary, pool building and main parking areas. Park characteristics of tranquility, serenity and natural areas are maintained away from these existing buildings and active spaces.</p> <p>The Saint Edward Seminary Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI), 2006, identifies the existing active recreation ballfield as a contributing factor to the St. Edward Seminary Historic District.</p>	2006 Cultural Landscape Inventory  Revised SEPA checklist

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		<p>Hill F 9/8/17                      Hirt 9/8/17                      Jade 9/5/17                      Knight 9/8/17                      Mailheau 9/8/17</p> <p>Moon 9/4/17                      Olavarria 9/5/17                      Prince 9/8/17                      Robinson 9/7/17                      Scully 9/7/17                      Slayden 9/7/17                      Thormodson 9/5/17                      Tomesh 9/4/17                      Unruh 9/8/17                      Younghans 8/18/17                      Warren 9/5/17</p>	<p>The existing ballfield location reflects the District’s original site plan. The Inventory describes the “full development of the east side of the seminary building for recreational uses” (CLI, p. 43), including the field, ball courts and the gym. Recreational spaces were, in fact, emphasized in the St. Edward Seminary Historic District landscape (CLI, p. 11). The Inventory states that Washington State Parks should “continue use of historic sports field for active recreation (CLI, p. 163) on the “football field terrace” (CLI, p. 37) of the Historic District.</p> <p>The active sports field has been used, historically, for football, baseball and soccer. Field striping is shown in an early photograph (CLI, p. 44) and backstops and bleachers have been placed on the site. The sports field, along with the gymnasium and now-demolished tennis and handball courts, provided recreational facilities for the Saint Edward preparatory school—similar to athletic facilities provided by contemporary schools. Maintaining an active sports field is ultimately both consistent and compatible with the historic and cultural integrity and landscape of the historic district.</p> <p>The Washington State Parks historic preservation officer has visited the site with staff (October 2016) and suggested changes to ensure that historic views along the entry drive are maintained. The height of the new backstop has been reduced to protect the view of the seminary from the entry drive. Likewise, the “open and closed” pattern along the entry drive has been maintained by interrupting the proposed screening along the north side of the field (rather than providing continuous screening) (added to SEPA Checklist B.10.c.). Perspective drawings show maintenance of views to the</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>seminary building from the access driveway (available on City's project website).</p> <p>Temporary noise impacts would result from construction of the fields. Construction is anticipated to last four to six months. Following construction, a minimal increase in noise is expected to result from field use and maintenance. The park is currently well used by visitors for a variety of activities and events which generate various levels of human noise and also existing equipment noise from maintenance operations. The majority of the park area is forested which abates noise from surrounding properties and other areas in the park. The ballfields are also surrounded by trees which help abate noise and provide screening.</p> <p>In addition to Kenmore Municipal Code noise regulations, Washington State Parks seeks to minimize increases over existing noise levels at areas with elevated noise sensitivity. While Title 352 WAC (Parks and Recreation Commission) does not establish formal criteria to measure noise increases, 5 dBA is a historically-accepted threshold by which to assess adverse noise impacts. The draft Noise Study modeled predicted noise sources that are associated with ballfield uses, including a referee whistle, a baseball bat hitting a 50 mph pitch, and spectator cheering. The modeling showed that predicted sound levels from ballfield activity would not exceed the 5 dB increase criteria.</p> <p>The City acknowledges that the natural feel of the park in the area of the ballfield may be impacted by the project. However, mitigation measures will be utilized to reduce aesthetic</p>	

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>impacts. These include using a turf color (such as a muted green) that blends into the natural context of the site; painting the light poles, bleachers, and backstops in black or brown; and establishing a mix of native conifers and evergreen shrubs along the north side of the field to partially screen the improved field. Other mitigation measures include reducing the height of the backstops from 28 feet to 24 feet and considering alternative backstop materials, such as netting, that could minimize the appearance of the backstops.</p>	
O-4	<p>Opposition: Concern about loss of wetland, wetland impacts, wetland buffer impacts, insufficient mitigation.</p>	<p>Aagaard 9/8/17            Carlson 9/7/17            Carlson S 9/8/17            Eastside            Audubon 9/7/17            Engbarth 9/7/17            Finley 9/8/17            Fukuda 9/2/17            Garneski 9/4/17            Gin Su 9/7/17            Hayden 9/7/17            Hendershott 9/7/17            Hill F 9/8/17            Hirt 9/8/17            Knight 9/8/17            Moon 9/4/17            Mailheu 9/5/17            Prince 9/8/17            Thormodson 9/5/17</p>	<p>The wetland (Wetland A) on the east side of the ballfield and its associated 100 foot buffer are within the existing grass ballfield. The wetland is impacted as it is being regularly mown. The 100-foot wetland buffer is impacted as it is also being regularly mown and used for recreational activities. This mowed area currently provides limited habitat functions.</p> <p>The proposed ballfield improvements were designed to avoid impacts to Wetland A and forested portions of its buffer (S. Carlson: When we refer to wetland impacts, we are referring to <i>direct</i> wetland impacts, such as fill of the wetland.). The project avoids all direct (i.e., fill) impacts to the wetland and forested buffer, except for the proposed removal of one hazard tree from the wetland, and three trees from the buffer, which will be replaced at a 3 to 1 ratio. See response to Comment O-11 for further discussion of tree impacts and proposed mitigation.</p> <p>The field was shifted to the west but still within the existing ballfield footprint; buffer impacts are limited to a portion of the existing mowed grass ballfield. As mitigation for the loss of approximately 42,700 square feet of mowed wetland buffer,</p>	<p>Revised SEPA checklist</p> <p>January 2018 Revised Critical Area Report and Draft Mitigation Plan</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>the City will enhance approximately 61,600 square feet of existing, disturbed buffer and wetland area. Invasive vegetation will be removed from the enhancement areas and native herbs and shrubs will be installed, and the mitigation area will be protected in perpetuity.</p> <p>City code requires 5 years of monitoring for wetland mitigation projects (KMC 18.55.280), but the City will monitor the enhancement areas for 10 years to ensure the success of the plantings.</p> <p>Overall, the mitigation proposal will provide a greater diversity and density of native plants and increase the habitat value for native wildlife species, as compared to existing conditions.</p>	
O-5	Opposition: Concern about artificial turf, and/or keep grass natural.	Agaard 9/8/17 Eastside Audubon 9/7/17 Finley 9/8/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Gins Su 9/7/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Knight 9/8/17 Mitten 9/7/17 Prince 9/8/17 Robinson	<p>Impacts to soils will be limited to the footprint of the proposed synthetic turf field (approximately 2.25 acres). No chemicals or fertilizers will be used on the synthetic turf; surrounding soils and beneficial insects would not be significantly affected by the project.</p> <p>Removal of the existing sod would result in a minor loss of foraging habitat, although mowed grass is not considered to provide high-quality wildlife habitat. St. Edward Park contains approximately 310 acres of undeveloped habitat, most of which is forest; the project would disturb less than 1% of the total habitat within the park. Additionally, approximately 20 acres of mowed field habitat will remain in the park, adjacent to the seminary building and Bastyr University.</p> <p>To offset the loss of habitat provided by the mown field,</p>	2008 St. Edward State Park Management Plan  Comparison of Synthetic turf vs natural turf (Bruce Dees & Associates 2016)  Revised SEPA checklist

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		9/7/17 Schuler 9/6/17 Singh 9/7/17 Slayden 9/7/17 Thormodson 9/5/17 Tomesh 9/4/17 Unruh 9/8/17 Warren 9/5/17	<p>enhancement plantings and other measures are proposed. The wetland and buffer enhancement, along with the native tree and shrub plantings proposed along the north side of the field, will provide a greater diversity and density of undisturbed native plant species in the vicinity. To further enhance wildlife habitat, the City will install nest and feeder boxes, as well as bat boxes in the project vicinity. The City will also remove invasive plant species such as English ivy and holly in the vicinity of the ballfield to improve habitat conditions in adjacent undisturbed forested areas.</p> <p>The St. Edward State Park Management Plan (i.e. 'CAMP' report) pg. 18 states that the use of natural grass fields should continue, unless subsequent assessment shows that synthetic turf has "comparable to less environmental impact, no adverse health conditions, lower operating expenses, and does not impair park management, among other considerations." Synthetic turf results in less injury to players and requires less maintenance than natural turf. In addition, as opposed to well-maintained natural turf, synthetic turf does not use fertilizers or pesticides. Certified lead-free synthetic turf and inert infill material would be installed; crumb rubber (i.e. ground rubber from truck and automobile tires) will not be used as infill material. Instead, sand is being proposed as the infill material.</p> <p>A comparison of natural versus synthetic turf concluded that a properly maintained grass field would result in more water use, the potential for nutrient runoff from fertilizers and gas/fuel entering the atmosphere from frequent mowing compared to a synthetic turf field.</p> <p>Synthetic turf absorbs solar energy faster than grass which can</p>	



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>cause synthetic turf fields to become hotter than natural grass fields, especially during sunny weather. In general, heat increases form turf are less of a concern in mild climates such as the Puget Sound. Additionally, because the field is surrounded by forest habitat, the hours of the day that the entire field would be exposed to direct sunlight are limited.</p> <p>The synthetic turf product is expected to last at least 10 years. When the turf must be replaced, turf materials are recycled according to the requirements of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of the United States EPA. The recycling system is a heat and pressure extrusion method which processes 100% of the turf in whole, without separation. The residual product is reused in building products. The field infill material would be screened, cleaned and reused.</p>	
O-6	Opposition: Concern about field lighting and light impacts, including impacts on bats, and nocturnal birds	Carlson 9/7/17 Eastside Audubon 9/7/17 Fukuda 9/2/17 Garneski 9/4/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hill 9/2/17 Knight 9/8/17 Schuler 9/6/17 Tomesh 9/4/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Olavarria 9/5/17	<p>Existing large security lights on the seminary building illuminate the adjacent parking lot and most of the existing ballfield. Only the extreme reaches of the eastern and southern edge of the ballfield, along the forest margin, approach darkness. These security lights stay on throughout the night year-round.</p> <p>The St. Edward State Park Management Plan (CAMP report) page 19 states that field lighting is not recommended. However, since 2008 when the CAMP report was authored, lighting technology has significantly evolved.</p> <p>The proposed LED lighting is designed to reduce light pollution and will utilize extensive shielding to reduce the impact of glare and spill light. The shielding proposed meets recommendations by both the International Dark Sky Association and Nature Conservancy report on outdoor LED lighting.</p>	2008 St. Edward State Park Management Plan  Revised SEPA checklist  Lighting plan  Stantec 7/5/17 letter  Updated hours of light/darkness table

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>Since the lighting system dramatically reduces the amount of up-light delivered into the atmosphere, there is a safety issue with tracking fly balls during baseball\softball play. Fly balls disappear when travelling into the zone of darkness that exists above the height of the floodlights. To properly light fly balls there will be one floodlight on four of the poles that will be directed up to provide the minimum amount of light necessary for safe play. All other floodlights are aimed down within the athletic field boundaries.</p> <p>The proposed LED color temperature for the floodlights has been reduced from 5,700K to to 4,000K. The use of 5,000K and 5,700K LED's is typical for outdoor athletic field lighting systems throughout North America. Although there are recent studies regarding use of lower temperature LED's to reduce amounts of blue light, these reports do not analyze impacts of sports lighting systems that do not operate from dusk to dawn. Instead, existing research addresses how indoor lighting systems and outdoor dusk to dawn lighting systems affect human circadian rhythms. Reducing the color temperature to 4,000, while not believed to be necessary given the existing conditions discussed above and other measures designed to limit impacts, is proposed as an additional mitigation measure to further reduce any potential impacts to nocturnal birds, bats, and other animals that are present in the project vicinity.</p> <p>A variety of mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize lighting impacts to light-sensitive species. Proposed lighting mitigation measures include: installing lighting as close to the field as possible; using lighting only during scheduled gameplay; using the latest LED lighting</p>	<p>August 2017 Bat Survey report by Owl Ridge</p> <p>ESA 8/31/17 review of St. Edward State Park Bat Study</p> <p>ESA 9/25/17 nocturnal bird survey and findings</p> <p>8/11/11 Washington State Parks Natural Resource Management Policy</p> <p>Revised Ballfield Supply and Demand Memo January 2018</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>technology to reduce the impact of glare and spill light; and installing native conifer and shrub species to buffer field lighting from the rest of the park. The proposed lighting schedule has been revised to limit the use of lighting to no earlier than 4:45 p.m. and no later than 9 p.m and limit lighting to the months of March, April, October, and November, fully avoiding the summer months when bats are most active. Additional mitigation measures proposed include: retrofitting the forest trail lights running parallel to Seminary Drive with more up-to-date, nocturnal-friendly fixtures; working with State Parks and the seminary tenant to remove the bright, old-style horizontal lights on the Seminary and Gymnasium that partially illuminate the field 24 hours a day, year-round.</p> <p>A bat study was completed on behalf of State Parks. In contrast to the high diversity of bats and high numbers of bat detections near the watered sites (detention pond and lakeshore), 91% of the detections at the ballfield consisted of one common species - the silver-haired bat (<i>Lasionycteris noctivagans</i>), which is known to forage along forest clearings, above ponds, along riparian areas, and above trees. The only other species recorded here were nine detections of the hoary bat (<i>Lasiurus cinereus</i>), two of the Yuma myotis (<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>), and one of the long-legged myotis (<i>M. volans</i>). All of these bats are common species in western Washington. The conclusion of this study is that adding lighting might reduce the habitat value of certain areas to bats. A review of this study concluded that the project impacts to bats have been reduced to a negligible level (Final Bat Study Memo, available on City project website).</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>Bat use of the ballfield appeared limited to the darker recesses adjacent to the forest and above the wetland ditch along the eastern edge. Bat use of this edge of the ballfield was highest from late June to the 2nd of July and then fell precipitously to either no detections or just two detections per evening through early August. Thus, bat use of the area appears to be limited to a small area adjacent to the forest for a short portion of the summer.</p> <p>The conclusion of ESA’s review of the bat study is that because the proposed ballfield lighting plan uses guidelines of the International Dark Sky Association and The Nature Conservancy (in particular, using hardware to reduce light spillage and avoiding light schedules that cause conflicts for foraging bats), there would be negligible effects to bats from the proposed lighting plan.</p> <p>The lighting plan would have only negligible effects on bats because of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed light schedule has been updated. Lighting will now only occur during four months: March, April, October and November. Lights will not be used during the peak bat seasonal use months (June and July), or during May and August when bat use is minimal</li> <li>• Lights will be turned on at 4:45 p.m. at the earliest and turned off by 9:00 p.m., at the latest, year-round.</li> <li>• There are no special-status bats in the area.</li> <li>• There are no roosting or maternal colonies nearby.</li> </ul> <p>Bats use the ballfield for a short duration during the summer that coincides with the time the ballfield lights are generally not needed.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys indicate that more productive foraging areas are present within a short distance from the ballfield.</li> <li>• The proposed lighting technology adheres to conservation recommendations and does not spill out from the field of play; areas outside of the ballfield will not be affected.</li> </ul> <p>The nocturnal bird survey completed by ESA detected owls in the vicinity of the ballfield but concluded that lighting would have only negligible effects because of the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shielding meets the recommendations by the National Dark Sky Association and Nature Conservancy guidelines for LED lighting.</li> <li>• Lights will be turned off by 9:00 p.m. at the latest, year-round.</li> <li>• There are no special status crepuscular or nocturnal bird species in the area.</li> <li>• The ballfield and surrounding forest edge is already partially illuminated by bright floodlights throughout the night hours.</li> <li>• The proposed lighting technology adheres to conservation recommendations and does not spill out from the field of play; areas outside of the ballfield will not be affected.</li> </ul> <p>Eastside Audubon: We agree that the nocturnal bird surveys occurred outside of the preferred window for nocturnal bird use (late winter–early spring). This was due to schedule constraints associated with the timing of the overall project.</p> <p>The State Parks Natural Resource Policy for common native species and habitats states “State Parks will preserve, promote and protect all native species and their respective habitats in</p>	

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>balance with the agency’s cultural resources protection and recreation objectives. Where native species are significantly impacted by regulations or Commission sanctioned actions efforts will be made to minimize and mitigate these impacts”. Significant is further defined as “having or likely to have an important (usually quantifiable) effect”. Under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), a significant effect is defined as “...a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality” (WAC 197-11-794). The project is not expected to have a significant impact on bats or nocturnal birds, as defined by State Parks or SEPA.</p>	
O-7	<p>Opposition: Project changes the space from public to private and/or using public funds to mostly benefit a private enterprise and/or project benefits a small portion of the community when the park should be managed to benefit all State Park visitors.</p>	<p>Finley 9/8/17 Fukuda 9/2/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hill 9/4/17 Hirt 9/8/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Mailheu 9/8/17 Prince 9/8/17</p>	<p>The project enhances recreational opportunities at St. Edward State Park for the general public. The general public includes use by organized and informal recreation users. The area of the ballfield within St. Edward State Park will continue to be owned, operated and maintained by public agencies (State Parks and the City) for use by the general public.</p> <p>The CAMP (pages 18 and 19) identifies continued use of the field for a variety of organized and unorganized recreational events and preparing development, use and maintenance agreements with local organization such as baseball, softball, soccer and cricket leagues and the City of Kenmore. The lease agreement between the City and State Parks would provide the terms and conditions for improving, operation and maintenance of the ballfield. The draft lease terms prescribe times for unscheduled open play.</p>	<p>2008 St. Edward State Park Management Plan (CAMP)</p>
O-8	<p>Opposition: Concern about increased noise.</p>	<p>Fukuda 9/2/17 Hendershott</p>	<p>The noise study concluded that predicted sound levels from field activities do not exceed the 5 dBA increase criteria.</p>	<p>June 2017 Greenbusch Noise</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		9/7/17 Hill 9/2/17	Therefore, no noise impacts are predicted.	Study  Revised SEPA checklist
O-9	Opposition: Concern about lack of parking and/or loss of seasonal overflow parking.	Hill 9/2/17 Olavarria 9/5/17 Warren 9/5/17	<p>There are 220 existing parking stalls at St. Edward State Park to serve park users. Fehr &amp; Peers completed a parking review in May 2016. This study accounted for parking demand resulting from ballfield development and concluded that the City's plan to add 19 parking stalls would provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in parking demand due to two concurrent baseball games. 12 new stalls are proposed at the northern loop lot, while 7 new stalls are proposed adjacent to the ballfield.</p> <p>Later in 2016, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission hired Sound Engineering to complete a review of the Fehr &amp; Peers study, as well as assess existing parking demand and 20-year parking demand for general park users. Sound Engineering recommended adding 38 additional parking stalls to accommodate growth in general park users over the next 20 years, and to monitor the parking occupancy to ensure the stalls meet the demand.</p> <p>Fehr &amp; Peers agrees with Sound Engineering that some growth in general park users is expected over the next 20 years. That growth may result in more days and longer periods of overcapacity parking. Fehr &amp; Peers continues to recommend that the City of Kenmore provide 19 parking stalls as part of the upgrade to the ballfields, to accommodate the expected growth. The City identified possible locations to site a number of additional parking stalls to address general park user growth.</p>	<p>Revised SEPA checklist</p> <p>5/26/16 Fehr &amp; Peers Traffic and Parking Analysis</p> <p>6/23/17 Fehr &amp; Peers St. Edward State Park Parking Study Review</p> <p>April 2017 Sound Engineering St. Edward State Park Parking Study</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>The lease agreement will include a condition that the City construct 19 additional stalls at a future date, to reach the 38 stalls recommended by Sound Engineering over the next 20 years.</p> <p>The Sound Engineering assumption that parking supply at the park is at capacity is a very conservative assumption, since parking demand currently only exceeds capacity on fewer than 4 percent of days per year.</p> <p>The new ballfields would remove the existing overflow parking which are used infrequently for large special events. The City will provide alternative parking for City events needing overflow parking, and will work with State Parks to develop a plan for any other event needing overflow parking, as proposed in the lease language. There are currently limited special events that use the grass field for overflow parking. These events are the City sponsored six summer evening concerts, and also the one day historic British-car meet.</p> <p>The language of the draft lease agreement would not allow for scheduled games on Memorial Day or on weekends and holidays from July 1 through Labor Day which are typically very popular times for park use (added to SEPA checklist B.12.c). The TRAFx data shows some of the busiest days have been holidays and weekends from July 1 through Labor Day. The Fehr &amp; Peers parking occupancy studies show that weekday games can be accommodated with the existing parking supply. If this scheduling is strictly adhered to, the City’s addition of 19 parking spaces would be an amenity for park users, but not technically required to accommodate the ballfield project.</p>	



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
O-10	Opposition: Concern about increased traffic.	Hill 9/2/17 Knight 9/8/17 Robinson 9/7/17 Warren 9/5/17	<p>The proposal will generate additional traffic; however, the existing roadways and signals are adequate to handle the expected increase. The trip generation analysis was based on a worst-case scenario of two games ending and two games beginning within the same hour. To be conservative, it was assumed that there is no carpooling among coaches, players, or referees. It was also assumed that some parents do not stay to watch the game, which creates more vehicle trips into and out of the park, due to drop-off. This conservative analysis results in 192 peak hour vehicle trips into and out of the park (96 in and 96 out). This is the maximum one-hour trip generation for weekday and weekend.</p> <p>The traffic analysis showed the added trips to the park entrance intersection will increase delay at the intersection of NE 145<sup>th</sup> Street and Juanita Drive NE by about 11 seconds per vehicle, but the delay can be mitigated by updating the signal timing. The expected Level of Service (LOS) of the intersection with the added trips meets the City's standard. Furthermore, the City of Kenmore has planned for this level of development. The recently added traffic signal provides the highest level of safe site access.</p> <p>In general, an increase in traffic increases the likelihood of a collision. However, the roads in St. Edward State Park are low speed with no history of collisions. We would not expect the increase in traffic to increase collisions with the added traffic from the ballfields.</p>	Revised SEPA checklist  5/26/16 Fehr & Peers Traffic and Parking Analysis
O-11	Opposition: Concern about tree protection.	Prince 9/8/17	The project has been designed to avoid removal of trees to the greatest extent possible. However, the latest tree retention and protection plan (Tree Solutions, 2018), recommends the	Tree Protection Plan, Tree Solutions Inc

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>removal of eleven trees on the south side of the ballfield, and pruning of four. This latest arborist report incorporates State Park standards in determining tree impacts and protection. Recommendations from the report were incorporated into the SEPA checklist (See Section B.4.b). Construction activities are anticipated to have minimal impact on the trees recommended for treatment, however due to existing conditions and the location of these trees, they may pose a safety hazard to future ballfield users.</p> <p>City Tree Protection standards (KMC Chapter 18.57) require a minimum number of tree units per acre of net buildable area. No trees within the net buildable area are proposed for removal and so no replacement is required for trees outside of critical areas. The City’s Critical Areas standards (KMC Chapter 18.55) require that mitigation for hazard tree removals in critical areas be in-kind and onsite, and sufficient to maintain the functions and values of the critical area. The City proposes to replace the four trees removed from the wetland and wetland buffer, onsite, at a 3 to 1 ratio, exceeding code requirements. In addition, it is recommended that some hazardous trees are cut and left as snags to provide wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The State Parks arborist determined that four trees have hazardous conditions and will require emergency treatment (i.e., pruning or removal) in the near future, regardless of the proposed project. Several other trees in the vicinity are described as at risk of falling or sudden branch drop that may require removal or pruning before the ballfield project is constructed. An additional two trees pose no imminent risk, but should be monitored over time. Most of these trees identified</p>	<p>2018. Revised SEPA checklist</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>by State Parks are also recommended for pruning, removal, or monitoring by the latest arborist report, and are not in addition to those recommended for treatment by Tree Solutions.</p> <p>All of the applicable tree impact mitigation measures recommended by Tree Solutions, Inc., as documented in the project’s tree protection plan, will be implemented by the City. A summary of these mitigation measures (such as installation of tree protection fencing and the use of pneumatic excavators within critical root zones), along with an acknowledgement that some project activities will occur within tree root zones, was added to the checklist (Refer to SEPA Checklist B.4.d.).</p> <p>The pervious pathway that was planned to connect the disabled parking stalls to the west side of the ballfield has been relocated in order to reduce potential impacts to the critical root zones of the trees within the grove west of the field. In addition, the proposal has been revised to remove the pervious pathway between the parking area and the grove of trees, and to instead use gravel, to minimize impacts to roots.</p>	
O-12	Opposition: Concern about contaminants in stormwater water runoff from artificial turf including microparticles of plastic and impact to people, water sources and aquatic organisms, and the environment.	Singh 9/7/17 Thormodson 9/5/17	<p>The project will be required to comply with Kenmore Municipal Code (KMC) 13.35 stormwater requirements including water quality, consistent with City adopted codes and State law. Compliance with these regulations is generally adequate to address water quality impacts related to stormwater.</p> <p>The project will not result in a significant impact on water quality. It has been designed to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the surrounding wetland and nearby stream and is in full compliance with Washington State Department of Ecology standards.</p>	<p>“Draft” June 2017 Technical Information Report (TIR)</p> <p>Revised SEPA checklist</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>The revised proposal now also includes a water quality treatment component (added to SEPA Checklist 3.c.2). The Drainage Plans have been revised to show a StormFilter Manhole downstream of the ballfield, but upstream of the project discharge location. As discussed in the Draft Stormwater TIR, a StormFilter Manhole is a concrete manhole that uses filter cartridges to treat stormwater and remove contaminants. This product and the cartridge filters have been approved for use by the Washington State Department of Ecology. The Draft Stormwater TIR contains a discussion and calculations which document that this proposed treatment method will ensure that the St. Edward Park Ballfield is in compliance with local and state laws for stormwater discharges.</p> <p>No chemicals will be used in cleaning or removing items from the field. The field will be swept with a mechanical sweeper dragged behind a small “gator” utility vehicle and debris will be removed from the site. Water will be used to wash off anything not caught in the sweeper. This water will enter the stormwater system where water quality treatment is proposed before runoff is discharged (added to SEPA checklist B.3.c.2). Water will not be used to clean the field during hot sunny days.</p> <p>The entire field will be surrounded by a pervious concrete walk which will restrict any particles used as infill to the field area. Concrete generally does not leach once cured. All portions of the concrete which will contact surface water will be fully cured and will therefore not increase PH in the surrounding environment, provided that the contractor covers the concrete for a short period after the initial pour.</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>The synthetic turf infill will be an inert, certified lead-free material. A permeable backing pad, located just under the turf, will block the turf infill from coming into contact with soil and groundwater while allowing stormwater to drain into the underground stormwater collection system. Crumb rubber infill (i.e. ground rubber from truck and automobile tires, commonly used as infill material in synthetic turf fields) will not be used. Instead, the infill material will be inert sand/silica.</p> <p>The link to a report about micro plastics in the water supply does not attribute this to a particular cause and does not mention artificial turf.</p> <p>The link to a report about stormwater runoff from artificial turf fields only studied fields that included a crumb rubber infill layer, which the project will not use. The study found elevated levels of zinc in stormwater runoff from these fields, but the report did not discuss if this was likely due to leaching from the crumb rubber, the artificial turf grass blades, or another material in the fields. Several other research studies have been done that show elevated levels of zinc in stormwater leaching from artificial turf fields with crumb rubber infill. However, no research could be found that indicates downstream water quality problems related to leachate from lead-free artificial turf with silica sand infill.</p>	
O-13A	Opposition: General concern about disruption to existing drainage patterns, impact to wetland hydrology and	Aagaard 9/8/17 Burnell 9/8/17 Gins St 9/7/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Hirt 9/8/17	The stormwater system for the proposed field is designed according to current Washington Department of Ecology stormwater standards. Overall, the system is designed to mimic pre-development conditions, in order to maintain surface and groundwater flows to the surrounding wetland and stream.	Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR)

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
	lack of hydrologic analysis.	Prince 9/8/17	<p>The elevation difference between the field underdrain system and the wetland limits the ability to provide treatment to runoff entering the wetland. To keep contaminants out of the wetland, only non-pollution generating surfaces will discharge to the wetland. A continuous model (Western Washington Hydrology Model) was used to determine the average daily volume and average monthly volume of stormwater runoff to the wetland in the existing condition. The model was then run for the proposed condition and compared to the existing condition to determine the amount of grass and non-pollution generating permeable concrete walkway that should discharge to the wetland in order to keep the average daily and monthly rainfall volumes within the allowable ranges of 20% maximum change to daily volume and 15% maximum change to monthly volume.</p> <p>The proposed synthetic turf field will be permeable to water. Directly below the turf and backing pad will be a plastic collection grid system that has 95% void space for stormwater runoff; stormwater will accumulate and flow to a detention system constructed underneath the field. Water will be discharged from the detention system to the proposed water quality treatment facility, and then after being treated discharges to the existing ditch which leaves the project site at the southwest corner of the site. The detention facility is designed to release stormwater at a rate similar to existing conditions and the Draft Stormwater TIR documents and demonstrates that this facility is in compliance with the Ecology Stormwater Code and Washington State law.</p>	Revised SEPA checklist

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			See response to Comments O-13B through O-13E below for more detailed information.	
O-13B	Opposition: Lack of technical and hydrologic substantiation for the City of Kenmore's stormwater drainage statements which compare pre-and post-field development. There are no hydrologic analysis to support "No Impact" statements made regarding Wetland A hydrology.	Burnell 9/8/17	<p>The Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR) discusses the Department of Ecology (DOE) requirements for altering flows to wetlands and how this project is addressing/meeting those requirements. Documentation demonstrating how it can be stated that little to no impacts will be made to Wetland A is included within the appendices of the TIR, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figures showing areas and types of land cover within the project site contributing to the wetland in both existing and proposed conditions.</li> <li>• Western Washington Hydrology Model (WWHM) report output for both the existing and proposed conditions (model inputs and output).</li> <li>• Excel spreadsheets which compile and sort the modeling output. The spread sheet arranges existing and proposed flow volumes by date to calculate the average daily volume for each day of the year over the 50 years that we have rainfall data for within the model, then it compares existing and proposed volumes showing that changes exceeding 20% are not occurring (DOE requirement).</li> <li>• The spreadsheet then combines the data into months and calculates the average volume per month and compares the existing and proposed monthly volumes to ensure that changes exceeding 15% are not occurring (DOE requirement).</li> </ul>	Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR)

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			This information satisfies DOE regulations and state laws, and supports the statement that this project has little to no impact on Wetland A.	
O-13C	Opposition: Proposed athletic field stormwater drainage plans have the potential to cause a decrease in surface water/stormwater flow to Wetland A	Burnell 9/8/17	<p>The current version of the plans routes some of the trench drains to the wetland as well as some of the underdrains from the permeable concrete walkways. These areas are shown in a figure included within the appendices of the TIR. The areas match the areas input into the WWHM model. The calculations mentioned in the above response demonstrate that the proposed areas flowing to Wetland A will not increase or decrease average daily flow volumes by more than 20% and average monthly flow volumes by more than 15%.</p> <p>This is consistent with DOE requirements.</p>	Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR)
O-13D	Opposition: No technical evaluation of substantiation of existing wetland hydrology and maintaining hydrology post-project	Burnell 9/8/17	<p>Calculations are included within the appendices of the Draft Stormwater Technical Report and included with the project plans.</p> <p>The Existing hydrologic conditions were determined using topographic survey to find the area contributing runoff to Wetland A in the existing condition. These areas were entered into hydrologic modeling software (WWHM) to find flow rates and volumes. The same was done for the proposed condition.</p> <p>Although less area is contributing to Wetland A in the post-developed condition than in the existing condition, because permeable concrete walkways create more runoff than grass, the model deems the two conditions hydrologically equivalent.</p>	
O-13E	Opposition: Concern about the potential for decrease in stormwater drainage to Wetland A	Burnell 9/8/17	The trench drain at the eastern edge of the ballfield that Suzanne Burnell refers to is actually part of the permeable concrete walkway underdrain system. The soil below the permeable walkways has no potential for infiltration, and	Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report (TIR)



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
	<p>and potential hydrologic impairment. The stormwater system may divert water away and cause a decrease in surface water discharge to wetlands.</p>		<p>therefore as stormwater flows through the permeable concrete, it will migrate through the free-draining rock beneath to the slotted underdrain between the walkway and the wetland. The pipe inverts of each of these slotted underdrains are equal (meant to equalize the amount of flow to each wetland outfall). The three outfalls from the slotted underdrains to the wetland are actually at or above the top of the wetland, so no water within the wetland will be taken away from the wetland by these underdrains.</p> <p>A very specific amount of surface runoff from very specific surface cover types has been designed to discharge to the wetland. No turf surface will discharge to the wetland. There is an impermeable concrete curb which extends below the field and walkway underdrain systems. This acts as a barrier between the field underdrain system and the walkway underdrain system. Also, an impermeable plastic liner will be placed below and on the sides of the field underdrain system to ensure that all runoff from the field remains within that system which flows into the underground detention vault, away from the wetland.</p> <p>More details have been added to the drainage detail plan sheets showing how runoff will flow within the ballfield underdrain system to the detention vault. There is a detailed discussion of this in the Draft Stormwater Technical Information Report.</p>	
O-14	<p>Opposition: Concern about the Council spending taxpayer dollars on the project and cost of</p>	<p>Finley 9/8/17 Gin St 9/7/17 Hendershott 9/7/17</p>	<p>Concerns about project costs are noted. Capital, operation and maintenance costs associated with the project are not factors considered in the land use permit and SEPA process. The allocation of funds for park capital projects, operations and</p>	

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
	operations and maintenance.	Hill 9/2/17 Hill 9/4/17 Hirt 9/8/17 Knight 9/8/17 Robinson 9/7/17 Thormodson 9/5/17 Unruh 9/8/17 Warren 9/5/17	maintenance are decisions made by Council during the budget review and adoption process.	
O-15	Opposition: Proposed improvements are inconsistent/incompatible with the park's historic and cultural integrity and landscape including maintaining views.	Aagaard 9/8/17 Carlson 9/7/17 Finley 9/8/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Hirt 9/8/17 Prince 9/8/17	See response to Comment O-3.	2006 St. Edward Cultural Landscape Inventory  Revised SEPA checklist  Perspective drawings
O-16	Opposition: Proposed improvements are not in compliance with National Park Service Standards for preservation and rehabilitation standards for cultural and historic landscapes.	Aagaard 9/8/17 Finley 9/8/17 Hill F 9/8/17	The Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) for Saint Edwards Park was "prepared by the National Park Service for Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission" (CLI, p. 3). "The purpose of the project was to provide Washington State Parks with baseline information...and general treatment guidelines" (CLI, p. 3). "These treatment guidelines follow the standards and guidelines established by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, National Park Service" (CLI, p. 157). According to the CLI, "a preservation philosophy will ensure that the Saint Edward Seminary Cultural Landscape retains integrity over time and	2006 St. Edward Cultural Landscape Inventory  "Revised draft" SEPA checklist

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>continues to reflect and embody the <u>values and intents of the landscape’s originators</u>” (p. 158).</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation of landscape characteristics in the CLI documents the features that define historic character (CLI, p. 63). “Landscape characteristics are both tangible and intangible aspects of a cultural landscape that date from the period of significance” (CLI, p. 63). According to the CLI, the “landscape characteristics of Saint Edward Seminary Cultural Landscape that retain integrity” related to the sports field include “spatial organization,” “land use” and “topography.” The CLI states that “the seminary institution facilitated multiple opportunities for passive and active recreation” (p. 158). The general treatment guideline in the CLI related to the ballfields, states, “Preserve and enhance historic active and passive recreational opportunities (CLI, p. 160). Considering the intent of the landscape’s originators, it is easy to conclude that active sports fields are an appropriate treatment in the location of the existing sports fields. A natural grassy field for casual passive use was never the vision for this area.</p> <p>Specific feature treatment recommendations in the CLI are addressed in the SEPA checklist. These recommendations include spectator seating, improved drainage, and prevention of encroachment of native forest—all in support of continued use of the fields for active recreation (CLI, p. 163).</p> <p>The proposal is compatible with both the general treatment guidelines and the specific feature treatment guidelines prepared by the National Park Service, within the context of current critical area regulations that impact the area.</p>	

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
O-17	Opposition: Project noise will disturb guests at the new seminary restoration project.	Carlson 9/7/17 Engbarth 9/7/17 Hill 9/2/17	While the WAC does not establish formal criteria to measure noise increases, the noise study concluded that predicted sound levels from field activities do not exceed 5 dBA increase over existing conditions, the historically accepted threshold by which to assess adverse noise impacts. Therefore, no adverse noise impacts are predicted.	Draft Noise Study
O-18	Opposition: Concern about wildlife impacts, impact on ecosystem/ biodiversity corridor and loss of/impact to natural habitat including for bats, owls, frogs, and anadromous fish	Aagaard 9/8/17 Carlson 9/7/17 Carlson 9/8/17 Carlson S 9/8/17 Eastside Audubon 9/7/17 Engbarth 9/7/17 Finley 9/8/17 Garneski 9/4/17 Hendershott 9/7/17 Hendrickson 9/8/17 Hill 9/2/17 Hill F 9/8/17 Mailheau 9/8/17 Mitten 9/7/17 Tomesh 9/4/17 Gandolfo 9/5/17 Mailheau 9/5/17 Olavarria 9/5/17 Prince 9/8/17 Schuler 9/6/17	<p>The existing ballfield is routinely mowed and experiences frequent recreational use. This area generally has low habitat value, but it is likely used as a foraging area by birds such as American robins, ravens, American crows, and swallows. Mammals may also use the field as part of a larger foraging area or as part of a movement corridor between forested portions of the park. The ditched portion of Wetland A along the east side of the ballfield may provide a seasonal water source for some species.</p> <p>Removal of the existing sod would result in a minor loss of foraging habitat, although mowed grass is not considered to provide high-quality wildlife habitat. St. Edward Park contains approximately 310 acres of undeveloped habitat, most of which is forest; the project would disturb less than 1% of the total habitat within the park. Additionally, approximately 20 acres of mowed field habitat will remain in the park, adjacent to the seminary building and Bastyr University.</p> <p>The degraded emergent wetland adjacent to and within the ballfield likely does not provide suitable habitat for salamander species or other wetland-dependent species because it is frequently mowed and functions as a recreational area. Red legged frog has not been observed in the project vicinity. In 2006 and 2007, Washington Department of Natural Resources conducted an amphibian and reptile survey in St.</p>	<p>January 2018 Revised Critical Area Report and Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Revised SEPA checklist</p> <p>August 2017 Bat Survey report by Owl Ridge</p> <p>ESA 8/31/17 review of St. Edward State Park Bat Study</p> <p>ESA 9/25/17 nocturnal bird survey and findings</p>

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		<p>Singh 9/7/17                      Unruh 9/8/17                      Warren 9/5/17                      Younghans 8/18/17</p>	<p>Edward State Park; red legged frog were not observed anywhere in the park. Additionally, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitat and Species (PHS) does not include any listings for red legged frog in the park. However, Pacific chorus frog have been seen in the emergent wetland in the spring of 2017. The Critical Areas Report has been updated to include this information.</p> <p>The proposed ballfield improvements were designed to avoid all direct impacts to Wetland A and forested portions of its buffer, except for the removal of three hazardous trees from the buffer and one from the wetland. These trees will be replaced on site at a 3 to 1 ratio. The field was shifted to the west but still within the existing ballfield footprint; apart from tree removal, buffer impacts are limited to a portion of the existing mowed grass ballfield.</p> <p>As mitigation for the loss of approximately 42,700 square feet of mowed wetland buffer, the City will enhance approximately 61,600 square feet of existing, disturbed buffer and wetland area. Invasive vegetation will be removed from the enhancement areas and native herbs and shrubs will be installed, and the mitigation area will be protected in perpetuity.</p> <p>City code requires 5 years of monitoring for wetland mitigation projects (KMC 18.55.280), but the City will monitor the enhancement areas for 10 years to ensure the success of the plantings.</p> <p>Overall, the mitigation proposal will provide a greater diversity</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>and density of native plants and increase the habitat value of the wetland and wetland buffer for native wildlife species, as compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>WDFW confirmed during a May 2016 site visit that the stream (Stream #0226) that flows south from Wetland A, originating approximately 400 feet south of the existing ballfield, is a regulated water of the state that potentially provides resident salmonid (e.g. trout) habitat. SalmonScape maps show several anadromous species in Lake Washington (including documented fall Chinook, coho, sockeye, and winter steelhead, and presumed bull trout/Dolly Varden). However, none of these fish species are shown using Stream #0226 (The Washington Department of Natural Resources maps the stream as Type N (non-fish-bearing)). The project has minor impacts if any to the stream. Water quality and stormwater runoff are addressed in Section O-13 above.</p> <p>As described in detail Section O-6 above, the bat study completed for State Parks concludes that adding lighting “might” reduce the value of certain areas to bats. The ESA review of the bat study and the ESA nocturnal bird survey conclude that the effects of the proposed project have been reduced to a negligible level in accordance with State Park’s guidelines.</p> <p>There are no threatened or endangered species known to be present in the project area. Bald eagle (recently federally delisted) and pileated woodpecker (state candidate species) are documented in the greater St. Edward State Park by the WDFW Priority Habitats and Species</p>	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
			<p>program. Several other state or federally listed sensitive species could be present in forest or wetland habitats in the project vicinity, including western toad, Vaux’s swift, olive-sided flycatcher, several species of bats, and mink (City of Kenmore, 2004).</p>	
O-19	<p>Opposition: Project components including artificial turf and impact to buffer are not compatible with the focus of the proposed Environmental Education and Research Center (EERC), Wilderness Awareness School, and other environmental educational camps or events.</p>	<p>Carlson S 9/8/17 Engbarth 9/7/17</p>	<p>The existing grass field is mown, which includes the wetland on the eastern edge of the field and all the associated wetland buffer.</p> <p>The proposed restoration and enhancement of both the wetland and buffer could provide educational opportunities for both the future EERC and the Wilderness Awareness School.</p> <p>The field development will not necessarily displace existing users, including the Wilderness Awareness School who use the field as a staging area and may continue to do so. As described in the response to Comment O-1, scheduling of the field will allow for regular open play hours and State Parks activities.</p>	<p>“Revised draft” SEPA checklist</p> <p>January 2018 Draft Revised Critical Area Report and Conceptual Mitigation Plan</p>
<b>Support</b>				
S-1	<p>Support: Wetland restoration and enhancement and buffer enhancement as mitigation for buffer impacts.</p>	<p>Ahten 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Aragon 9/8/17 Bennett 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Chae 9/8/17 Connor 9/7/17 Dailey 9/8/17</p>	<p>One wetland (Wetland A) and its associated 100-foot buffer is located along the east and south sides of the existing ballfield. Under current conditions, the wetland and buffer are impacted by recreational field use, and maintenance activities such as mowing. This mowed area provides limited habitat and water quality improvement functions. See response to Comment O-18 for a discussion of proposed wetland and buffer impacts and mitigation.</p>	<p>“Revised draft” SEPA checklist</p> <p>January 2018 Draft Revised Critical Area Report and Conceptual Mitigation Plan</p>

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Dailey T 9/8/17 Devasahayam 9/8/17 DiGioia 9/8/17 Dillman 9/8/17 Economou 9/8/17 Fink 9/8/17 Fournier 9/8/17 Freeburg 9/8/17 Geremia 9/8/17 Guest 9/8/17 Gutafson 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Holt 9/8/17 Hopkins 9/8/17 Jay 9/8/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Kelle 9/6/17 Koppelman 9/8/17 Lane 9/6/17 Lawlor 9/8/17 Litzinger 9/8/17 Looney 9/6/17 Looney R 9/6/17 Madigan 9/8/17		



Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Marin 9/8/17 Minahan 9/8/17 Mulcare 9/6/17 Mullins 9/6/17 Mullins M 9/6/17 Nordyke 9/8/17 Orrico 9/8/17 Painter 9/6/17 Patton 9/8/17 Rigor 9/8/17 Skoor 9/11/17 Shatsman 9/8/17 Snider J 9/8/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 9/8/17 Ulm 9/8/17 Yang 9/8/17		
S-2	Support: Support investment in ballfields/multipurpose fields for youth and local sports programs. Shortage of useable fields in Kenmore.	Anderson 9/8/17 Burrell 9/8/17 Carlson K 9/8/17 Clements 9/8/17 Erickson 9/8/17 Elmy 9/8/17 Engel 9/8/17 Fink 9/8/17	The ballfield improvement project enhances recreational opportunities at St. Edward State Park for the general public which includes public use by organized and informal recreation users.  Even with the reduced hours and days proposed in the draft lease agreement between the City of Kenmore and Washington State Parks, two lighted turf fields at Saint Edward Park will add new capacity. They will substantially reduce current shortfalls in field supply for youth soccer and Little League in the City of Kenmore, and supply Kenmore’s proportionate share of top-	Revised Supply & Demand Analysis (January 2018)

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Fried 9/8/17 Haver 9/8/17 Hayes 9/8/17 Headlee 9/8/17 Hiller 9/8/17 Holes 9/7/17 Hutchison 9/7/17 Jay 9/8/17 Jones B 9/7/17 Jones D 9/7/17 Kelle 9/6/17 Large 9/8/17 Ledger 9/8/17 Looney 9/6/17 Looney R 9/6/17 Maurer 9/7/17 McFarren 9/7/17 Miller 9/8/17 Minahan 9/8/17 Schwietzer 9/8/17 Shatsman 9/8/17 Smith 9/8/17 Snider J 9/8/17 Suarez 9/8/17 Travis 9/8/17 Whiteley 9/8/17	quality game and tournament facilities.	
S-3	Support: Moving ballfield	Ahten 9/8/17	The project proposes to retain the field in the existing footprint	Revised

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
	out of the wetland.	Alcorta 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Aragon 9/8/17 Bennett 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Chae 9/8/17 Dailey 9/8/17 Devasahayam 9/8/17 DiGioia 9/8/17 Dillman 9/8/17 Dowell 9/8/17 Fournier 9/8/17 Freeburg 9/8/17 Fried 9/8/17 Geremia 9/8/17 Gustafson 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Holt /8/17 Hopkins 9/8/17 Jay 9/8/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Koppelman 9/8/17	but shift it west out of the wetland, which is located in the existing mown grass field.	SEPA checklist.  January 2018 Revised Critical Area Report and Draft Mitigation Plan

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Lane 9/6/17 Litzinger 9/8/17 Looney 9/6/17 Looney R 9/6/17 Madigan 9/8/17 Marin 9/8/17 Mullins 9/6/17 Mullins s 9/6/17 Orrico 9/8/17 Painter 9/6/17 Patton 9/8/17 Rigor 9/8/17 Skoor 9/11/17 Snider 9/7/17 Suarez 9/8/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 9/8/17 Uln 9/8/17 Yang 9/8/17		
S-4	Support: Reduction of potential contaminants for field turf maintenance, fertilization, irrigation	Ahten 9/8/17 Alcorta 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Chae 9/8/17 Dailey 9/8/17 Dailey T 9/8/17 Devasahayam 9/8/17	In general synthetic turf fields require less maintenance, less use of water and no use of fertilizers compared to natural turf.	Synthetic turf vs natural turf analysis  Revised SEPA checklist

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Dillman 9/8/17 Dowell 9/8/17 Economou 9/8/17 Fournier 9/8/17 Freeburg 9/8/17 Geremia 9/8/17 Gustafson 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Holt 9/8/17 Jay 9/8/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Koppelman 9/8/17 Lane 9/6/17 Lawlor 9/8/17 Litzinger Marin 9/8/17 McFerran 9/7/17 Madigan 9/8/17 Mulcare 9/6/17 Orrico 9/8/17 Painter 9/6/17 Patton 9/8/17 Rigor 9/8/17		

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Skoor 9/11/17 Snider 9/7/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 98/17 Ulm 9/8/17 Yang 9/8/17		
S-5	Support: Habitat enhancement and improvements to ecosystem.	Ahten 9/8/17 Alcorta 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Dailey 9/8/17 Dailey T 9/8/17 DiGioia 9/8/17 Dowell 9/8/17 Economou 9/8/17 Germia 9/8/17 Gustafson 9/8/17 Jay 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Holt 9/8/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Koppelman	See response to S-1 above. Overall, the mitigation proposal will provide a greater diversity and density of native plants and increase the habitat value for native wildlife species, as compared to existing conditions.	

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		9/8/17 Lane 9/6/17 Lawlor 9/8/17 Litzinger 9/8/17 Looney R 9/6/17 Marin 9/8/17 McFerran 9/7/17 Mulcare 9/6/17 Mullins 9/6/17 Patton 9/8/17 Skoor 9/11/17 Snider 9/7/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 9/8/17 Yang 9/8/17		
S-6	Support: Support making recreational space a priority	Ahten 9/8/17 Alcorta 9/8/17 Antoine 9/8/17 Apel 9/8/17 Caley 9/8/17 Capusan 9/8/17 Chae 9/8/17 Dailey 9/8/17 Devasahayam 9/8/17 DiGioia 9/8/17 Dillman 9/8/17 Economou 9/8/17	The ballfield improvement project enhances recreational opportunities at St. Edward State Park for the general public which includes public use by organized and informal recreation users.	Revised SEPA checklist.

Response to Notice of Application Public Comments

Comment Number	Comment	Commenter Last Name(s)	Response	Reference Document
		Fournier 9/8/17 Geremia 9/8/17 Guest 9/8/17 Gustafson 9/8/17 Hermanides 9/8/17 Hillenbrand 9/8/17 Holt 9/8/17 Jay 9/8/17 Kauffman 9/8/17 Lane 9/6/17 Large 9/8/17 Lawlor 9/8/17 Ledger 9/8/17 Litzinger 9/8/17 Marin 9/8/17 Mulcare 9/6/17 Orrico 9/8/17 Rigor 9/8/17 Skoor 9/11/17 Snider 9/7/17 Swearingen 9/8/17 Taves 9/8/17 Ulm 9/8/17 Volland 9/7/17 Yang 9/8/17		