EXHIBITS 2-4 SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS

				L	0-20-000	130	
OF LAKEN	2005				RECEIVED 02/25/2020 CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	EXI	HIBIT
È	N, N	ENVIR	ONMEN	TAL CHE	ECKLIST APP	LICATIO	ON FORM
0	3)		Please fill in	every field. I	f a field is not appl	icable mark N	N/A
•1996	~		2	220321022 220283027	215.71 29.75		
PIERCE COUNTY	PARCEL N	UMBER (S):	2	220321007 220283026 A	36.73 CRES: <u>6.15</u>		-
ADDRESS/LOCAT	TION:	9601 Steilacoom I	Blvd SW, Lake	wood, WA	Total: 288.34		
PROJECT DESCRI	PTION: <u>r</u>	Master Plan for the eplacement foren	e existing Wes sic hospital, a ial cottage for	tern State Ho potential resi the existing (ospital site, providir dential treatment fa Child Study & Treat	ng for a acility, and ar ment Center	1
APPLICANT: (man	datory)						
Name: Robert I	lubenthal	1		Daytim	ne Phone: (360) 90	2-8168	
Mailing Address:	P.O. 100	:45848 0	ympin,	WA JEE	104.5048		_
Email Address; Signature:	Robert.Hub	enthal@dshs.wa.go	ov Pr Co	ofessional Lio	cense No: <u>n/a</u> 1: Bab Hubert	V	
AGENT/ CONSUL	TANT/ AT	TORNEY: (mandat	ory if primary	contact is di	fferent from applic	ant)	
Name: Eric R	idenour, SR	G Partnership	1	Daytim	e Phone: 503-222-	1917	
Mailing Address:	621 SW	Columbia St. Portla	nd, OR 97201				_
Email Address:	EricRide	nour@srgpartnershi	p Lic	cense No: n	/a		
PROPERTY OWN	ER 1: (man	datory if different	from applica	nt)			
Name:	n/a		12/22/2	Daytim	e Phone: <u>n/a</u>		
Mailing Address:	n/a						_
Email Address:	n/a		Signature:				
PROPERTY OWN	ER 2: (if m	ore than two prop	erty owners a	attach additio	onal info/signature	sheets)	
Name:	n/a			Daytim	e Phone: n/a		
Mailing Address:	n/a					*	_
Email Address:	n/a		Signature:	n/a			
The above our knowle property de application	signed pro dge and u escribed a :	perty owners, ce nder penalty of p bove and designa	rtify that the s erjury, each s te the above	above inform tate that we parties to act	nation is true and o constitute all of th t as our agent with	correct to the ne legal own respect to t	e best of ers of the his
UFFICE USE ONLY:	<u></u>				Z	ONE:	
APPLICATION #:	And a second sec		RECEIVED BY				
APPLICATION #: DATE APPLICATION R DATE APPLICATION C	ECEIVED: OMPLETE:		COMPLETEN	ESS REVIEW BY:			
APPLICATION #: DATE APPLICATION R DATE APPLICATION C	ECEIVED: OMPLETE:			ESS REVIEW BY:			_



Appendix 8: SEPA Checklist

This appendix includes a checklist addressing the State Environmental Protection Act (*SEPA") criteria. The text includes instructions and questions, preserving the format of the list, as well as the project team's responses. Note that figures referenced follow the narrative of the checklist.

PURPOSE OF CHECKLIST:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICANTS:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR LEAD AGENCIES:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

USE OF CHECKLIST FOR NON-PROJECT PROPOSALS:

For non-project proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS (part D). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements -that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Western State Hospital Master Plan

2. Name of applicant:

Department of Social and Health Services

Facilities, Financial, & Analytics Administration - Office of Capital Programs

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

Bob Hubenthal, Assistant Director, Capital Facilities Management Department of Social and Health Services Facilities, Finance and Analytics Administration PO Box 45848 Olympia, WA 98504 360.902.8168 robert.hubenthal@dshs.wa.gov

Aarón Martínez, Capital Projects Manager Office of Capital Programs Department of Social and Health Services Facilities, Finance and Analytics Administration PO Box45848 Olympia, WA 98504 360.902.8325 Aaron.Martinez@dshs.wa.gov

- 4. Date checklist prepared: 20-January-2020 revised 17-November -2020
- 5. Agency requesting checklist: City of Lakewood
- 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

The major development under this master plan - a new forensic hospital - is projected to begin in approximately 6 years. A residential treatment facility is a potential secondary use and would also be expected in the second half of the ten-year planning horizon of this master plan.

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

No. The Master Plan incorporates the currently proposed additions and expansion to the existing facilities anticipated for the 10-year planning period.

- 8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
 - Natural Resources Evaluation: Western State Hospital Master Plan (PBS 2019');
 - Subsurface Exploration, Geologic Hazard, Infiltration Study, and Geotechnical Engineering Report, Western State Hospital New Patient Support Center (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. 2017);
 - Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2008)
 - Western State Hospital Cultural Resource Management Plan (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2011)
 - Traffic Study: Western State Hospital Master Plan (TSI 2020);
 - o Utility Review: Western State Hospital Master Plan (AEI 2020)
- 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.

No applications are pending for governmental approval of other proposals affecting the WSH Campus.

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

The Master Plan is not anticipated to require additional permits or approvals. Individual projects to be constructed as part of the implementation of the Master Plan will require site specific permits. The individual permits may include the following City of Lakewood permits and approvals:

- Boundary Line Adjustment
- o Building, Electrical, Mechanical and Plumbing permits
- $_{\rm o}\,$ Clearing and Grading
- Construction Stormwater General Permit
- Critical Areas Review
- Demolition

* PBS Environmental, Natural Resource Evaluation for WSH Master Plan, October, 2019

- Drainage Review
- Land Use Modification
- Master Facilities Plan Modification
- Right-of-way
- SEPA
- Site Development Permit

The Master Plan does not anticipate impacts to wetlands, waters, habitats, or species that would require additional state or federal permits.

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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

Western State Hospital (WSH) provides evaluation and inpatient treatment for individuals with serious or long-term mental illness, including patients referred through their Behavioral Health Organization, the civil court system (when individuals meet the criteria for involuntary treatment under RCW 71.05), or through the criminal justice system (RCW 10.77).

Patient Population, Capacity and Staff Levels

WSH currently provides more than beds 900 for these patients, and the master plan projects that actual beds in use would drop to no more than 865 beds. However, as demolition and conversion plans may not occur immediately after existing beds are vacated, actual bed capacity could at times be higher than projected demand for services.

As detailed in the master plan document, the peak capacity for beds on the campus at any point in the ten-year planning cycle is 963 beds without the Residential Treatment Facility (RTF), or 1,011 if the RTF were to be built. Population-related impacts in this report consider up to this 1,000-bed capacity as the basis of impact analysis.

WSH also employs approximately 2,200 staff members, making it the fourth largest employer in the City of Lakewood.

Planned Development

DSHS is engaged in an ongoing master planning effort for the WSH Campus to: incorporate changing facility needs; address the growth management issues of stakeholders (including Pierce County and the City of Lakewood); and streamline the permitting process for future projects.

The initial master plan for the campus was approved by the City in 1998 and is based on a 10-year planning period. An update to the Master Plan was prepared in 2008, and the latest planning efforts were initiated in 2018.

As part of the current master planning update, DSHS has evaluated several alternatives for layout of the campus, including rehabilitating existing buildings and constructing new facilities. Siting Alternatives for the proposed new forensic hospital were documented in a predesign study.

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.

Western State Hospital is located in the City of Lakewood, Washington, see Figure 1. The site abuts the north side of Steilacoom Boulevard SW, extending from 87th Avenue SW on the east to Sentinel Drive on the west. The Campus extends northward from Steilacoom Boulevard SW to Golf course Road SW on the east side to approximately 79th Street SW on the west. The Public Land Survey System location is Sections 33, 43, and 48, Township 20 North, Range 2 East. The campus totals approximately 288 acres, and is composed for four separate tax parcels, described below.

• The largest parcel (0220321022) is 215.71 acres is size, and includes the frontage of Steilacoom Boulevard SW from 87th Avenue SW westward to Sentinel Drive. This parcel contains most of the developed portions of the campus, as well as Garrison Springs and the associated forested valley slopes.







- The second parcel (0220321007) is 36.73 acres in size, and extends northward from Garrison Springs. This parcel includes the majority of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course, now closed.
- The third parcel (0220283027) is 29.75 acres in size, and is located to the north of Parcel 0220321007. This parcel includes the northern ¹/₄ of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course, the forested valley slope to the north, and the forested disc golf course area to the east.
- The last parcel (0220283026) is located at the northeastern-most corner of the site and is 6.15 acres in size. The parcel is also part of the former golf course.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1 EARTH

General description of the site:

The Campus is primarily upland terraces with slopes less than 15 percent; with the overall topography sloping gently from the southeast corner to the northwest corner.

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

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

The forested valley slopes to the north and south of the golf course contain slopes of up to 70 percent inclination, with localized sections as steep as 100 percent inclinations (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. 2017).

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 longterm commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Three soil mapping units were identified in the study area: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam; Everett very gravelly sandy loam; and Xerochrepts (PBS 2019). A summary of the characteristics is provided in Table 1.

Spanaway soils occur at elevations from 200 to 590 feet and are typically used for woodland, pasture, cropland, homesites, and

*:	
1	*:

Symbol	Map Unit Name	Slope	Landform	Parent Material	Drainage Class	Soils hydric?
						Hydric inclusions?
41A	Spanaway gravally appdy	0 to 15%	Terraces and plains	Glacial outwash	Somewhat	No
	loam				drained	(15% Spana, Yes)
13D	Everett very gravelly sandy loam	15 to 30%	Outwash terraces and escarpments, kames, moraines, eskers	Glacial outwash	Somewhat excessively drained	No (10% Alderwood, No but may support wetlands in some situations) (10% Indianola, No)
47F	Xerochrepts	45 to 70%	Valley sides	Sandy and gravelly outwash and/or glacial till	Well drained	No

* 1 NRCS, 2019b.

wildlife habitat (NRCS, 2019b). Spanaway gravelly sandy loam is not considered a hydric (wetland) soil by the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils (NTCHS).

Everett soils occur at elevations from 30 to 900 feet and are typically used for livestock grazing, timber production, and urban development (PBS 2019). Everett very gravelly sandy loam is not considered a hydric soil by the NTCHS, however this soil unit does include slopes of 15 to 30 percent.

Xerochrept soils occur at elevations from 0 to 980 feet on steep valley sides; these soils are not considered hydric soils by NTCHS, however this soil unit does include slopes of 45 to 70 percent.

The Geotechnical Report prepared for a portion of the Campus indicated the area includes fill soils from 2 to 15 feet in depth, likely underlain by recessional outwash, with advance outwash at lower elevation (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. 2017). This is consistent with the soil mapping described above. d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Portions of the Garrison Creek valley slope are composed of gravelly soils subject to seepage and meet the City of Lakewood definition for Landslide Hazard Areas (Associated Earth Sciences, Inc. 2017). The valley slope on the north side of the Campus is similarly steep, and is expected to have similar characteristics to the valley slope along Garrison Creek. The Individual projects included in the Master Plan will provide site specific geotechnical studies (if appropriate) and will be designed to avoid steep areas that may contain unstable soils or landslide hazards.

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

The proposed Master Plan is a planning level document, and as a result does not include the level of detail necessary to calculate filling,

LU-20-00027

RECEIVED

03/11/2022 City of Lakewor

excavation, or grading quantities. The individual projects will calculate grading quantities and disturbance areas on a site by site basis. Any fill used on the Campus will be consist of clean fill material obtained for approved sources.

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

No erosion would occur from ongoing use of the campus or as a result of the approval of the Master Plan. Individual projects in the Master Plan are expected to result in clearing, excavating, and grading that will expose soils and have the potential to result in erosion.

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

The Master Plan will not result in change in impervious surfaces at the WSH Campus. Full implementation of the individual projects in the Master Plan will result in a change of impervious surface from 18.9% percent to 19.6 percent with the new hospital and western parking; this would increase to 20.6 percent if the potential Residential Treatment Facility (RTF) and adjacent parking were built.

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

The individual projects within the Master Plan will include sitespecific Construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention (CSWPP) and Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control (TESC) Plans. These plans will incorporate Best Management Practices such as the establishment of stable construction entrances, placement of sediment fences, installation of control measures to cover exposed earth, use of wattles and checkdams, ongoing monitoring of stormwater runoff, etc. The project Contractor will adopt those plans and will to execute and amend the plan as necessary. The implementation of robust CSWPPP and TESC plans is anticipated to successfully control the potential for erosion and ensure compliance with Department of Ecology Construction Stormwater regulations. 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.

Implementation of the individual projects in the Master Plan would result in construction related emissions. Anticipated emission sources would include use of construction equipment, dust from excavation and grading, and chemical odors from asphalt paving operations. These construction-related emissions are expected to be temporary in nature, and of short-term in duration. We anticipate that any operational increase in emission from vehicles using the Campus after project completion will be negligible.

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

None.

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

Mitigation would include reasonable precautions to avoid fugitive dust emissions, including application of water or dust-binding chemicals to bare soils during dry weather, street and vehicle cleaning to prevent mud, dirt and other debris on paved roadways and planting of paving areas that would be exposed for prolonged periods of time. Construction equipment would be maintained in good repair. After project completion, vehicular traffic is not expected to significantly increase.

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.

Yes – two wetlands and two streams were identified on or in close proximity to the campus. Details of these surface waters are provided below.

Wetlands

Two wetlands (GS South and GS North) were identified within or in the immediate vicinity of the project area. Table 2 describes these wetlands, and summarizes the Cowardin classification, hydrogeomorphic class, and preliminary rating and buffer width per LMC 14.162.080.

Wetlands GS North and GS South are slope wetlands associated with the Garrison Springs riparian corridor. Numerous areas of seepage were observed on the valley walls upslope of the stream during the site visit, and these areas were dominated by wetland plant species. Preliminary wetland ratings were completed with the 2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, consistent with LMC 14.162.030. Both wetlands fall on the margin of the Category II/III. Buffers for wetland with these ratings range from 60-225 feet, depending on the habitat score.

Table 3: Potential Streams present at the Site and Preliminary Ratings

Stream	Flows to	Preliminary Stream Rating [*]	Preliminary Buffer Width [†]
Garrison Springs	Chambers Creek	Perennial, Fish- bearing (Type F)	65-150
Unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek	Chambers Creek	Perennial, Fish- bearing (Type F)	65-150

* Water typing based on definition per 14.165.010

 Local stream ratings and buffer widths are based on Lakewood's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Chapter 4 Section C.

Table 2: Potential Wetlands Present at the Site with Preliminary Ratings and Buffers

Wetland	Wetland HGM Class [*]	Cowardin Classification [†]	Dominant Species Observed	Wetland Hydrology Indicators Observed	Preliminary Wetland Rating ^{‡§}	Preliminary Buffer Width
GS South	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225
GS North	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, small-fruited bulrush, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225

* Hydrogeomorphic classification after Hruby (2014).

† Cowardian classification after Cowardin et al. (1979).

+ Preliminary rating based on Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Hruby, 2014).

§ Local wetland ratings and buffer widths are based on City of Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) Title 14 - Environmental Protection (LMC 14.162).

Streams

Two streams were identified within the Study Area: Garrison Springs and an Unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek. A summary of the characteristics of these streams and preliminary stream rating and buffer widths are provided in Table 3.

Garrison Springs/Garrison Creek is located in the central west portion of the WSH Campus. Garrison Springs, is a perennial stream, originating from seeps on the steep slopes on the western portion of the Campus and flowing northwest to the Garrison Springs Hatchery and the Chambers Creek Estuary on Puget Sound. Garrison Springs is approximately 5-15 feet wide at the ordinary high water mark and appeared to be channelized adjacent to the access road which provides access to the hatchery.

Current habitat in the stream is predominantly riffle and run type. Pools are largely limited to the areas above man-made structures on the stream. The stream substrate is primarily gravels with some fines, and the banks are somewhat incised. Mixed forest canopy and forested slope wetlands provided 100 percent canopy coverage, except where interrupted by the hatchery access road. The stream flows beneath Chambers Creek Road, entering Chambers Creek through a concrete box outfall with a steel rack that limits access.

The unnamed stream is a tributary to Chambers Creek and is located beyond the Campus northern property line. As a result, most of the stream could not be evaluated during the site assessment. However, water could be heard flowing the deep, steep sided valley located to the north of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course.

The lower reach of this stream appears to be piped beneath the abandoned industrial facility at Chambers Creek Road. Several seeps areas were also identified in this area, and a concrete pipe outfall was located on the estuary of Chambers Creek, which likely represents the terminus of this stream. Flows were present at the outfall in July 2019, indicating that flows in this stream are likely perennial. Aerial imagery shows a densely vegetated, mixed forest riparian canopy in the riparian area, extending from the disc golf area northwest to Chambers Creek Road.

Individual Master Plan projects that require State or federal funding or permits will be required to assess the presence of wetlands and streams prior to funding or permit approval. More detailed field studies would be conducted at this time.

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.

No work is proposed in or over waters. Some individual projects on the Campus may be constructed within 200 feet of Garrison Creek or associated wetlands.

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.

None.

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

No.

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

No work is proposed within a 100-year floodplains.

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.

No waste material would be discharged to surface waters.

b. Ground Water:

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.

The WSH Campus currently uses water from wells located in Garrison Springs. The Master Plan anticipates that in future, the WSH Campus



will transfer control of these wells to the Lakewood Water District, and future water needs at the Campus will be supplied by the District.

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 will be discharged into the ground water. Waste from the WSH Campus includes domestic sewage and hospital waste, and the currently served population includes approximately 900 patients and 2,800 employees. The WSH Campus waste needs are currently provided by the Town of Steilacoom Sewer Utility.

Under the proposed Master Plan, the type of waste would not change. The served population would include approximately 865 patients with a maximum capacity of approximately 1,000 beds[†] - and 2,700 employees. The WSH Campus waste needs would continue to be provided by the Town of Steilacoom Sewer Utility, which has sufficient capacity for the proposed increases.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Anticipated sources of stormwater runoff on the Campus include building roofs, surface parking lots, and internal roadways. Runoff will be collected and disposed of on-site using a combination of pervious pavements, porous concrete, bioretention cells, and roof drain infiltration galleries. All stormwater runoff will be managed and infiltrated on-site.

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

It is unlikely that waste material would enter ground or surface waters. Waste material from project construction would be removed from the site and treated appropriately. Any toxic substances such as fuel, lubricants, hydraulic fluids, paint, solvents, and cleaning materials will be isolated from water on the site and disposed of at an appropriate off-site facility. Operation sewage waste be will be collected and piped off-site for treatment at Town of Steilacoom Sewer Utility facilities, and hospital waste will be removed from the site and properly disposed of at an approved facility. Construction related and operational stormwater will be conveyed to treatment facilities on-site.

3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Site drainage proposed in the Master Plan designed to follow the existing site drainage basins and is not expected to alter on-site drainage patterns.

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

The Master Plan anticipates that stormwater from the Campus will be infiltrated on site to minimize the impact on drainage patterns.

See "Patient Population, Capacity and Staff Levels" on page A8-3

4. PLANTS

- a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:
 - X deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other
 - <u>X</u> evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other
 - \underline{X} shrubs
 - _<u>X</u>_grass
 - ____pasture
 - ____crop or grain
 - _____ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
 - X wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
 - ____water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
 - ____other types of vegetation

The majority of the campus is developed, and vegetation in these areas consists of maintained lawn area with landscape trees. Species present in this area include:

- common domestic grasses (bent grasses [*Agrostis sp.*], bluegrasses [Poa sp.], fescues [*Festuca sp.*], and rye grasses [Lolium sp.])
- disturbance tolerant forbs (e.g. common dandelion [*Taraxicum* officinale], hairy cat's ear [*Hypocharis radicata*], sheep sorrel [*Rumex* acetosella], etc.),
- landscape trees (domestic cherry and flowering plums [*Prunus sp.*], European horse-chestnut [*Aesculus hippocastanum*], Norway maple [*Acer platanoides*], and Tree-of-Heaven [*Alianthus altissima*]),
- scattered native trees (Douglas fir [*Pseudotsuga menziesii*], Sitka spruce [*Picea sitchensis*], and copses of Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*).

The Fort Steilacoom Golf Course is located the northwest corner of the property, and is also maintained as grass, with scattered native coniferous trees and Oregon White Oak.

The disc golf area (NW) has a similar canopy to the golf course. In the open areas, the shrub community is dominated by Scot's broom (*Cytissus scoparius*).

Table 4: Native Plants on the WSH Campus

Stratum	Common Name (Scientific Name)
Tree	Bigleaf maple (Acer macrophyllum) Oregon white oak (Quercus garryana) Red alder (Alnus rubra)
Shrub	California dewberry (Rubus ursinus) Dull Oregon grape (Berberis nervosa) Oceanspray (Holodiscus discolor) Salmonberry (Rubus spectabilis) Snowberry (Symphicarpos albus) Vine maple (Acer circinatum)
Herbaceous	Giant horsetail (Equisetum telmateia) Orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata) Sword fern, or Pineland sword fern (Polystichum munitum) Western lady fern (Athyrium cyclosorum)

In areas where the canopy is denser, the dominant shrub species include California dewberry (*Rubus ursinus*), dull Oregon grape (*Berberis nervosa*), evergreen blackberry (*Rubus laciniatus*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and snowberry (*Symphicarpos albus*).

In the two ravine areas, the vegetation consists of a mixture of native and non-native species. The dominant species present include:

• red alder (*Alnus rubra*) and bigleaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*) in the canopy, and

Table 5: Native Plants on the WSH Campus

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal ESA Listing Status	Critical Habitat Designated?
Golden Paintbrush	Castilleja levisecta	Threatened	No
Marsh Sandwort	Arenaria paludicola	Endangered	No
Water Howellia	Howellia aquatilis	Threatened	No

• California dewberry (*Rubus ursinus*), dull Oregon grape, evergreen blackberry, Himalayan blackberry, oceanspray (*Holodiscus discolor*), salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), snowberry, and vine maple (*Acer circinatum*).

Dominant herbaceous species present include giant horsetail (*Equisetum telmateia*), orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata), reed cararygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), Pineland sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), and western lady fern (*Athyrium cyclosorum*).

Mapping from the WDNR Natural Resources Heritage Program identifies a single native plant community as present on or near the WSH Campus. This plant community is Oregon white oak dominated or co-dominated canopies. This community occurs in four locations on the Western State Hospital Campus: two on the eastern end of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course near Garrison Springs, and two to the east one either side of Kids First Lane.

Table 4 presents a list of the native trees, shrubs, and herbaceous species identified on the WSH Campus during the field evaluation.

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

Projects considered in the Master Plan are concentrated in the developed portions of the Campus. Specific areas of vegetation removal would be determined for each of the individual projects, but the total affected areas are:

 approximately 3 acres of miscellaneous lawns and landscaping in the area of the new forensic hospital

Common Name	Scientific Name	Historic or Current presence?	Washington State Status	Potential habitat present?
White-top aster	Seriocarpus rigidus	Current	Sensitive	Yes
Common bluecup	Githopsis specularioides	Historic	Sensitive	Possible
Giant chain fern	Woodwardia fimbriata	Historic	Sensitive	Yes

Table 6: Rare and Sensitive Plant Species

- approximately 4 acres for the potential Residential Treatment Facility, which is mostly vegetated, but also include 2 cottages to be removed
- o approximately 2/3 acre for the cottage at the CSTC complex
- approximately 1/3 acre for the Treatment and Recreational Facility at CSTC

The affected vegetation will include grasses and forbs in the landscaped lawn areas (bent grass, bluegrass, fescue, rye grass, common dandelion, hairy cat's ear, sheep sorrel, etc.), and landscape trees (domestic cherry and flowering plums, European horsechestnut, Norway maple, and Tree-of-Heaven). Native tree than may be affected include Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, and Oregon white oak.

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

Endangered Species Act Listed Plants

A review of information from the USFWS IPaC database (Appendix A) identified three federally threatened or endangered plant species as potentially present in the vicinity of the project. These species are listed in Table 5.

Golden paintbrush is listed as Threatened under the ESA and is found in native northwest grasslands. There are no current or historic populations in Pierce County. Marsh sandwort is listed as Endangered under the ESA. This species is found in swamps, wetlands, and freshwater marshes along the coast. In western Washington, water howellia occurs in low-elevation wetlands and small vernal pools (PBS, 2019).

The field reconnaissance did not identify any individuals of golden paintbrush, marsh sandwort or water howellia on the WSH campus. However, the protocols for identification of ESA plants require multiple field visits conducted over several years and timed to match the emergence/flowering of the target species.

Individual projects in the Master Plan will conduct more comprehensive field studies to determine the presence or absence of ESA listed plants as appropriate.

Rare and Sensitive Plant Species

The WDNR Natural Resources Heritage Program website identifies three rare or sensitive species as potentially present on or near the

RECEIVED

03/11/2022

LU-20-00027

WSH Campus. Characteristics of these species are described listed in Table 6.

White-top aster is found in relatively flat, open grasslands of lowlands in gravelly, glacial outwash soils (WDNR, 2019c). White-top aster is mapped as occurring in the northeast corner of the WSH Campus and has been identified by WDNR as present on the WSH Campus as recently as August 13, 2010 (PBS 2019).

Common bluecup is historically found in the vicinity of the WSH Campus. This species is found in dry, open places in lowlands, such as grassy balds, talus slopes, and gravelly prairies. There are no recent observations of common bluecup in Pierce County, and none of the habitats that support this species are present on the Campus.

Giant chain fern is historically found in the vicinity of the WSH Campus. This species is found in stream banks, shaded wet road banks, the edges of bogs, and wet bluffs amongst coniferous trees and adjacent to saltwater. Similar habitats are present on the Western State Hospital Campus and nearby.

The field reconnaissance did not identify any individuals of White-top aster, common bluecup, or giant chain fern. However, the protocols for identification of rare and sensitive species may require multiple field visits timed to match the emergence/flowering of the target species. Considering the relatively recent identification of white-top aster (August 2010), this species should be presumed to be present.

Individual projects in the Master Plan will conduct more comprehensive field studies for the presence of rare and sensitive plant species.

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

The master plan includes recommendations to reduce impacts on protecting species such as the White Oak. Areas of cultivated landscape will generally be near building entries and within courtyards used for recreation. Open areas of the site will be maintained as open space, with minimal disturbance. *e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site*.

No Class A noxious weeds were identified on the WSH Campus during the field investigation. Scattered knapweed specimens were present on the site, but were not positively identified as C. biebersteinii, and a number of Class B and C noxious weeds were identified on the Campus. A summary of the noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site is presented in Table 7.

Individual projects in the Master Plan will meet Pierce County and City of Lakewood regulations for control of noxious and invasive weeds.

 Table 7: Noxious, Invasive, and Non-Native Plants

Common Name	Scientific Name
Class A Noxious Weed	Scattered knapweed specimens were present on the site, but were not positively identified as C. biebersteinii.
Class B Noxious Weed	Scot's broom (Cytissus scoparius)*
Class C Noxious Weed	English ivy (Hedera helix) Evergreen blackberry (Rubus laciniatus) [*] Hairy cat's ear (Hypochaeris radicata) Himalayan blackberry (Rubus armeniacus) [*] Reed canarygrass (Phalaris arundinacea) [*] Tree of Heaven (Alianthus altissima)
Non-regulated, non- native species	Bentgrasses (Agrostis sp.) Bluegrass (Poa sp.) Cherry (likely cultivar varieties of the genus Prunus) Common sheep sorrel (Rumex acetosella) Eastern redcedar (Juniperus virginiana) European horse-chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum) Fescue grasses (Festuca sp.) Flowering plum (varieties of the genus Prunus) Lanceleaf plantain (Plantago lanceolata) Norway Maple (Acer platanoides)

^{*} Non-regulated noxious weed per Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board.

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

15 DEC 2021

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.

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other

The only positive wildlife identifications during the field evaluation were woodpeckers (identified by their sound), squirrels (likely eastern gray squirrel [*Sciurus carolinensis*] or eastern fox squirrel [*Sciurus niger*]), and American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*).

However, considering the large size of the site and the presence of relatively undisturbed riparian areas in close proximity to Puget Sound, we would anticipate a variety of wildlife species that are adapted to proximity with suburban human populations, such as rats, mice, voles and similar rodents; North American raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), Virginia opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), and passerine bird species.

Deer (*Odocoileus sp.*) and coyote (*Canis latrans*) and were not observed on the Campus, but are likely present due the proximity of the riparian habitats on and near the Campus to Chambers Creek estuary, which supports a variety of fish and wildlife species. A brief reconnaissance of the estuary area positively identified deer, great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), and bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*).

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

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Critical Habitat Designated?
Puget Sound Chinook Salmon	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha	Federally Threatened	Yes
Puget Sound Steelhead	O. mykiss	Federally Threatened	Yes
Puget Sound-Coastal Bull Trout	Salvelinus confluentus	Federally Threatened	Yes
Gray wolf	Canus lupus	Federally Endangered (Proposed)	No
Marbled murrelet	Brachyramphus marmoratus	Federally Threatened	Yes
Streaked horned lark	Eremophila alpestris strigata	Federally Threatened	Yes
Yellow-billed cuckoo	Coccyzus americanus	Federally Threatened	Proposed
Oregon spotted frog	Rana pretiosa	Federally Threatened	Yes
Biodiversity area	N/A	State Priority Habitat	N/A
Little brown bat	Myotis lucifugus	State Priority Species	N/A
Slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch	Sitta carolinensis aculeata	State Candidate Species	N/A
Western Pond Turtle	Actinemys marmorata	State Endangered	N/A

Table 8: Federal and State-Listed Habitats and Species

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

Federal and State-Listed Habitats and Species

The USFWS IPaC website (Appendix A), NOAA Fisheries ESA listings, and WDFW PHS data identify several federally and state threatened or endangered species, as well as priority habitats and species in the vicinity of the project. The results are presented in Table 8.

Salmonscape and StreamNet were also reviewed for presence of anadromous fish, but no habitat was identified in either database.

Suburban developed areas in the Puget Sound do not provide suitable, usable habitat for large terrestrial predators such as Gray wolf or North American Wolverine. Oregon spotted frog requires relatively large areas of emergent wetland that are not present on the Campus.

 Table 9: Migratory Bird Species

Common Name	Scientific Name	Breeding Season [*]
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	January 1 - September 30
Black Turnstone	Arenaria melanocephala	Breeds elsewhere [†]
Great Blue Heron	Ardea herodias fannini	March – August 15
Lesser Yellowlegs	Tringa flavipes	Breeds elsewhere [‡]
Marbled Godwit	Limosa fedoa	Breeds elsewhere§
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Contopus cooperi	May 20 - August 31
Red-throated Loon	Gavia stellate	Breeds elsewhere [¶]
Rufous Hummingbird	Selasphorous rufus	April 15 - July 15
Western Screech-owl	Megascops kennicottii kennicottii	March 1 - June 30

* Noted by USFWS to be a liberal estimate of breeding season

Exposed gravel areas to the site could provide potential habitat for streaked horned lark, but the frequency of disturbance on the Campus makes nesting by this species unlikely. Nearby marine areas could potentially provide foraging habitat for marbled murrelet. Habitat suitable for use by yellow-billed cuckoo includes large tracts of riparian habitat with small trees and shrubs suitable for nesting. Some areas of similar riparian habitat are present on the Campus and nearby. Future projects should assume that streaked horned lark, marbled murrelet, yellow-billed cuckoo or suitable habitats may be present and should conduct more detailed studies.

Streams on the Campus and nearby have long culverted sections or other man-made barriers that preclude use by listed anadromous ESA listed fish species (Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout). However, these species are present in Puget Sound and likely use the nearby areas of Chambers Creek. As a result, future projects should assume the potential for impact to these species.

The riparian areas along Garrison Springs and the unnamed tributary to Chambers Creek meet the definition of biodiversity areas and would be protected as critical areas. Similarly, habitats for little brown bat, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch (mapped on the site) western pond turtle (mapped in the vicinity) would also need to be considered by future projects.

Migratory Bird Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The USFWS IPaC website (See PBS 2019) identified several species protected under the Migratory Bird Ac as potentially present in the vicinity of the Campus. These species area are listed in Table 9.

Potential impacts to these migratory birds during their breeding season would need to be considered by future projects.

Individual Master Plan projects at the Campus should conduct site specific field studies to identify ESA listed, priority, and critical species and habitats in the immediate project vicinity.

Critical Fish and Wildlife Species and Habitats

LMC 14.154.020 identifies a list of 11 critical fish and wildlife species and habitats, five of which are occur on or near the Campus. Table 10 provides details on these critical fish and wildlife species and habitats present at the WSH Campus.

[†] Indicates the species does not likely breed within project area

[‡] ibid

[§] ibid

[¶] ibid



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

Yes. The site is part of the Pacific Flyway for migratory birds. Fish species may also use the downstream portions of the streams may provide habitat for migratory fish species.

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

The proposed WSH Master Plan retains approximately 48 acres of wildlife habitat in its current condition. The preserved habitat includes Oregon White Oak habitat (much of which is currently used for active and passive recreation), wetlands, streams, and riparian areas on or abutting the campus.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

No invasive animals are known to be present on the WSH Campus.

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, natural gas, gasoline and diesel fuel will be used to power construction equipment.

Individual projects are expected to use electricity (provided by Tacoma Power) to provide power to the building's electrical components and natural gas (provided by Puget Sound Energy) for heating buildings or water on the campus.

Currently many campus facilities are heated by steam from a central boiler room, with boilers fueled by natural gas. The plan recommends further study to develop strategies to reduce reliance on natural gas, in response to the State's Net Zero policy.

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

No. There is significant open space around the site that no built features will shade neighboring properties. Within the site, development density will allow future facilities to have buildingintegrated or ground-mounted photovoltaic facilities and effective solar orientation. 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:

Individual projects implemented as part of the Master Plan will include energy modeling and mechanical LEED services.

Table 10: Critical Fish and Wildlife Species and Habitats

Habitats and Species of Local Importance	Description
Priority Oregon white oak woodlands	WDNR identifies four patches of either oak-dominant forest or woodland canopy, or urban oak canopy (Figure 5). The four patches (32.61 ac. total) were identified in the northern half of the property.
Snag-rich areas	Snag-rich areas are likely to occur in the stream riparian areas.
Rivers and streams with critical fisheries	Rivers and streams with critical fisheries on or near the Campus.
Waters of the state, including all water bodies classified by the Washington Department of Natural Resources	WDNR Forest Practices Application Mapping Tool identifies Garrison Springs and the unnamed tributary to Chambers Creek within the Study Area (
(DNR) water typing classification system as detailed in WAC 222-16-030, together with associated riparian areas	
Lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental entity or tribal entity.	Garrison Springs Hatchery may meet the requirements of this habitat of local importance, the hatchery is run by WDFW (WDFW, 2019b).

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.

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

A campus-wide study for environmental health hazards has not yet been completed, however the site is known to be within the boundaries of the Tacoma Smelter Plume.

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.

None were identified.

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.

Transportation fuel for construction equipment will be used and may be stored on site during construction in compliance with State regulations for proper equipment storage. Other toxic chemicals that may be required for construction (such as pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) will be stored and used in accordance with all federal, state and local regulations.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services are anticipated to be required for the Master Plan or the individual projects implemented under the Master Plan. A safety plan which will include emergency spill responses in compliance with State regulations will be provided. The completed project will be served by typical public emergency services.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Master Plan projects will conduct soil sampling for arsenic and lead following the 2012 Tacoma Smelter Plume Guidance. Subsequent actions in response to testing results will comply with the Model

Toxics Control Act (MTCA) cleanup requirements in (Chapter 173-340 WAC).

Site designs for the individual projects will include protective measures to isolate or remove contaminated soils from public spaces, yards, and children's play areas, and any contaminated soils will be managed and disposed of in accordance with state and local regulations, including the Solid Waste Handling Standards regulation (Chapter 173-350 WAC).

Site specific studies will also be completed to determine the presence of any other contaminants at Master Plan project sites.

b. Noise

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

Land uses surrounding the WSH Campus are primarily residential and park/public open space. As a result, existing noise in the vicinity is largely the result of traffic on the roads in the immediate vicinity.

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

Short-term noise would result from the use of construction equipment such as trucks, machinery and excavation activities during daylight hours. Long-term operational noise is limited to vehicular traffic using the parking lot and access roads. Use of the parking lots and access roads would occur primarily during daylight hours and at shift changes.

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

Construction will only occur during daylight hours to minimize the impact of short term noise disturbances. Long-term noise disturbances will be minimized in compliance with local noise ordinances.

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 WSH Campus is currently used as a hospital facility and provides mental healthcare services for patients in western Washington State. The campus includes the Hospital facilities, support facilities for the heathcare facilities, and open space.

The proposed Master Plan will not change the use of the facility, and the proposed Master Plan incorporates a more compact facility footprint to allow for greater security. As a result, the proposed Master Plan and the subsequent project are not expected to alter the land uses on nearby properties.

The hospital is an Essential Public Facility as defined by the State, and is being developed on land zoned for this type of use.

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 non-farm or non-forest use?

While there was some production gardening by patients of the hospital in its early history, the WSH Campus has not been used as working farmland or working forest land for over 40 years.

1) 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, the project will not affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest lands.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

There are approximately 60 buildings on the site, built up over more than a century, and totaling approximately 1,435,000 SF. These are detailed in Table 3 and Figures 11 and 12 (pp. 1-17) of the Master Plan document.

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

Yes, several outmoded structures are proposed for demolition, totaling up to 150,000 SF. These are described in the report and summarized in Figure 17 of the Master Plan document.

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

The WSH Campus is currently zoned Public Institutional and Open Space/Recreation (1) by the City of Lakewood.

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

The current comprehensive plan designation of the Campus includes Public Institutional and Open Space designations.

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

Not applicable; project site is not located within 200 feet of a shoreline.

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

Yes, portions of the WSH Campus and the abutting lands includes areas designated as geologically hazardous areas (erosion hazard and/ or landslide hazard areas), critical aquifer recharge area, wetlands, and streams (Garrison Creek and a second unnamed stream located immediately to the north of the Campus). The Campus also includes several habitats and species of local importance (Priority Oregon white oak woodlands, Snag-rich areas, rivers and streams with critical fisheries, waters of the state together with associated riparian areas, and Lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental entity or tribal entity).

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

The health-care facilities are projected to serve 865 patientsand a maximum capacity of up 1,000 beds⁴ - as well as a staff of approximately 2,700.

See "Patient Population, Capacity and Staff Levels" on page A8-3 for explanation of population and capacity.

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

Approval of the Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in displacement.

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

None proposed. The Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in displacement.

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

The Master Plan helps establish a more compact layout for the major facility on the WSH campus. In combination with the other revisions to the Master Plan, the facility siting will support:

- Improved security for patients and neighbors, with fewer patients circulating between buildings;
- Preservation of open space on the Campus;
- Improved traffic flow;
- More efficient utility supply, and;
- Improved accessibility.
- *m.* Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

None proposed. The Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in impacts to agricultural and forest lands.

9. HOUSING

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

While residential accommodations are provided for patients in treatment these accommodations are not considered general housing.

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

None.

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

None proposed. The Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in housing impacts.

10. AESTHETICS

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

The new hospital in expected to be three stories in height, with a maximum of five stories. It would be of comparable height to existing buildings on the site.

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

The primary buildings will be on a site area that is previously developed. Existing views are not expected to be altered significantly.

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

The design intent will include massing the building to create courtyards and other features that will benefit patients and reduce the apparent scale of the facility.

11. LIGHT AND GLARE

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

The proposed Master Plan improvements will include interior and exterior lighting fixtures attached to the building and in parking areas. Interior lighting would be on during all hours of the day, and exterior building lights, roadway and parking lot lighting would be on during evening, night and early morning hours for safety.

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

Light from the proposed Master Plan improvements is not expected to be a safety hazard or interfere with views.

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

Off-site sources of light or glare may result from adjacent street and traffic lighting; these sources are not expected may affect the WSH Campus or facilities.

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

Light from the proposed Master Plan improvements will be directed at pedestrian walkways, parking lots, and access roads to minimize the effects of light and glare on nearby uses and wildlife.

12. RECREATION

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

The Campus and publicly accessible properties on the vicinity provide a variety of active and passive recreational opportunities including baseball, bicycling, bird watching, disc golf, running, and walking.

These recreation opportunities are available on Campus at the former ballfields and Fort Steilacoom Golf Course (accessible during daylight hours from 87th Avenue SW), and off-site at Fort Steilacoom Park (south of Steilacoom Boulevard SW) and the Chambers Creek Canyon Park (north of the Campus).

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

The proposed Master Plan improvements are not expected to have permanent impacts to off-campus recreational uses would preserve the existing open space at the former Fort Steilacoom Golf Course and nearby areas currently used for disc golf. Construction of the individual projects in the Master Plan may result in temporary and short-term changes to site access to preserve the safety of recreational users and construction crews.

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

Access changes resulting from the proposed Master Plan improvements will be minimized to the maximum extend possible while maintaining the safety of recreational users and workers at the Campus.

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 ? If so, specifically describe.

The WSH site presents a complex layering of historic functions with an extensive set of prehistoric, historic, and non-historic features (including archaeological sites, buildings, structures, objects, landscape elements, etc.) spread across the vast expanse of an 882-acre site. These activities encompass a broad time period from aboriginal use, Hudson Bay and early exploration by the 1830s, settlement by the 1840s, Fort Steilacoom by 1849, and hospital and institutional farm uses by 1871 (*Artifacts Architectural Consulting*, 2008).

Portions of the Campus area listed to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Washington Heritage Register (WHR) as the Fort Steilacoom Historic District on November 25, 1977. The NRHP listing was amended on December 16, 1991.

Culturally significant feature identified at the site include two prehistoric sites, Fort Steilacoom, associated cemeteries, 36 extant buildings dating from the period from the 1850's to the 1960's, and 17 additional structures including monuments and accessory buildings.

These buildings and structures are described in detail in the Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2008).

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.

Yes. Two prehistoric sites and three historic cemeteries (military, settler, and hospital) are present in the area. Additional detail is provided in the Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2008).

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.

WSH has retained archaeological and cultural resource specialist to prepare documents to document the archaeological and cultural history of the WSH Campus and vicinity. Documents prepared include:

- Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2008)
- Western State Hospital Cultural Resource Management Plan (Artifacts Architectural Consulting 2011)
- 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.

The master plan calls for protection of the historical resources associated with the 19th Century history of the site, including the Fort Steilacoom era and the early hospital era. These include the Settlers' Cemetery, and potentially the early morgue and bakery buildings.

DSHS will work with the Fort Steilacoom Historical Association to support protection and interpretation of the extant Fort-era facilities.

For facilities from the hospital's expansion phases, DSHS will document facilities prior to any demolition or major alteration.

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.

Steilacoom Boulevard is the primary street serving the site. To the east, 87th Avenue SW is the campus boundary and to the west, Sentinel Drive is the boundary.

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?

Pierce Transit provides bus transit to the primary site entry. A bus route connects WSH to both central Steilacoom to the west and the Lakewood Transit Center to the east. From the transit center, transfers can be made to other destinations in Pierce Transit's service area. c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

The project will provide an additional 334 parking spaces, for a total of 1,993. This will allow WSH to reduce the incidence of informal parking in non-designated areas, and will better accommodate shift overlap periods.

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).

The WSH master plan recommends changes to the internal circulation system that would lead to relocation of the primary vehicular access points. These changes are proposed to increase separation of access drives, while improving campus wayfinding. The changes are not required, but projected to be beneficial to the near-campus flow of traffic.

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

These will not be a significant mode of travel for staff, visitors or deliveries to the site.

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 non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Based on the targeted populations on the WSH campus, 5,709 trips on average would be generated to and from the site on weekdays. This represents a 6% reduction from current measured traffic. Peaks are projected as follows:

- o 677 trips from 7:00-8:00 a.m., 5% down from existing
- o 366 trips, from 4:00-5:00 p.m., 6% down from existing

Additional detail on the study methodology and projected travel patterns is provided in the Transportation Impact Analysis, see Appendices. The TIA also includes interim scenarios that address the

impacts of potentially higher populations in interim periods over the planning timeframe.

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.

No.

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

WSH will continue to participate in the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program. Primary programs include transit passes, carpool and vanpool support, employer-provided transit passes and supporting programs such as a guaranteed ride home.

As documented in the 2019 CRT report, initiatives for near term expansion include expanding the vanpool program and further coordination with Pierce Transit.

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 proposed Master Plan improvements will not result in an increased need for public services, including fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, or schools.

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

None proposed. The proposed Master Plan improvements will not result in an increased need for public services.

16. UTILITIES

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: (underlined)

electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other: steam heat

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.

Current services include: Tacoma Power (electricity) and Puget Sound Energy (natural gas); current facilities are provided water from an onsite well system; future facilities will be connected to the Lakewood Water District's system.

These systems and their capacities are further described in the master plan report; see "Utilities & Infrastructure" on page 43.

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 _____ Robert J. Hubenthal

Position and Agency/Organization Capital Programs Director, WA DSHS

Date Submitted: Dec. 15, 2021

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

D. Supplemental sheet for non-project actions

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

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

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

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Operation of the WSH Campus is not expected to result in increases in discharges to ground or surface waters. Operational emissions to air result from the use of motor vehicles on the WSH Campus and operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment, which produce minimal emissions. Similarly, the Campus operations do not produce any of toxic or hazardous substances. The WSH Campus does not use industrial machinery, so the operational noise generated on the Campus is largely the result of vehicular traffic and the operation of HVAC equipment. The associated noise levels of these machines are typically low, and are consistent with the Public Institutional land use.

The project incorporates a variety of approaches to reduce the impact of the WSH Campus to the environment, including: on-site infiltration of stormwater; implementation of Best Management Practices to control construction-related erosion and sedimentation, and to contain toxic or hazardous materials used during construction; and application of appropriate site clean-up measures for any identified -toxic or hazardous materials.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Operational measure to avoid or decrease discharges include:

- On-site stormwater treatment and infiltration;
- Application of green building technology to reduce energy needs and potential emissions;
- Implementation of operational safety standards for the storage of toxic or hazardous substances to prevent accidental release; and

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

Removal of vegetation would be necessary in order to construct the new buildings proposed in the Master Plan. Vegetation to be removed is dominated by maintained lawns and horticultural tree species, although some Oregon white oak are present. The loss of this vegetation has the potential to affect some species of animals.

Since the project will not require work in wetland or streams, impacts to buffers will be avoided or minimized, and best management practices will be used to address stormwater issues on the site, fish and marine life would not be affected by the Master Plan improvements.

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

Development of the Campus and removal of vegetation is concentrated in the previously developed portions of the Campus, which will minimize the loss of vegetation. Replacement of notable trees (particularly Oregon white oak) would be developed in consultation with the City and other stakeholders.

In addition to efforts to minimize the footprint of the new development, existing open space on the Campus would be retained. The former Fort Steilacoom Golf Course (72.6 acres) and an area use d by the community as a current disc golf course (approximately 15 acres, SE loop) would be preserved. These two active recreational uses represent about 30 percent of the campus.

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

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

- New facilities will be developed to contemporary standards, reducing their consumption.
- Development of campus will also follow the State's Net Zero policy.
- Over the long-term, the intent is to retire the natural gas fired steam boilers in favor of more sustainable energy sources.
- 4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for

governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

The proposed Master Plan improvements have been located in areas that avoid impacts to streams, wetlands, and floodplains. No designated parks, wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, or prime farmlands are present on the Campus. No populations of threatened or endangered species or their habitats have been identified on the Campus. The Campus includes historic and culturally important features (such as architecturally or historically significant buildings and structures and historically significant trees) that would be removed in order to construct new buildings on the Campus.

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

The Proposed Master Plan improvements will be designed and constructed in a manner that preserves and maintains environmentally sensitive areas to the maximum extent practicable while achieving the goals of this essential public facility in providing healthcare services to the residents of western Washington.

Each of the individual projects will conduct site-specific studies to identify the presence of populations of threatened or endangered species or their habitats. Proven concepts and designs would incorporate measures to avoid or minimize any potential impacts to these important resources. Similarly, the projects will incorporate measures to sensitively address architecturally or historically significant buildings and structures on Campus.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed Master Plan improvements are wholly consistent with the current land use designation and zoning for the campus, and do not allow or encourage incompatible land or shoreline uses.

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

The Master Plan based on a more compact facility design. This compact footprint allows for more efficient use of space, increased the efficiency utility services by reducing length of utility lines, and

provides increased security for employees, staff, and neighbors by consolidating the facilities and incorporating interior fencing.

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

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

- As noted elsewhere, traffic impacts are projected to decrease over the course of the master plan's implementation.
- New facilities will be developed to current standards for energy and water efficiency.
- 7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The Master Plan will be consistent local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment including compliance with the planning processes for Pierce County and the City of Lakewood regarding the siting essential public facilities. This compliance will include consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan, Master Plan, Zoning, and SEPA processes, including any public involvement components of these processes.

Individual Master Plan projects will use a similar approach, conducting any site-specific studies necessary, and revising concepts and plans to comply with all applicable permitting and regulatory requirements, including building, critical areas, SEPA (if applicable), and zoning requirements.







Tab	le of	Contents
-----	-------	----------

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
PROJECT NEED	III
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	IV
DEVELOPMENT PATTERN AND PRINCIPLES	IV
INFRASTRUCTURE & SUPPORTING SYSTEMS	V
APPROVALS PROCESS	V
PLANNING CONTEXT	
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSES OF THE MASTER PLAN	1
DSHS MISSION, VISION, & VALUES	2
HISTORIC PRESERVATION INITIATIVES	3
HOSPITAL HISTORY	3
SITE HISTORY: TIMELINE	4
PLANNING REGULATORY CONTEXT	5
CITY OF LAKEWOOD	5
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY	5 7
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING	5 7 9
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON	5 7 9 9
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES	5 7 9 9 9
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES EXISTING CONDITIONS.	5 7 9 9 9
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES EXISTING CONDITIONS. SITE OVERVIEW	5 7 9 9 9 9 9
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES EXISTING CONDITIONS. SITE OVERVIEW PATIENT POPULATIONS & CARE APPROACH	5 7 9 9 9 9 11 11 18
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES EXISTING CONDITIONS. SITE OVERVIEW PATIENT POPULATIONS & CARE APPROACH PATIENT RELEASE PROCEDURES	5 7 9 9 9 9 9 11 11 18 18
CITY OF LAKEWOOD PIERCE COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING STATE OF WASHINGTON COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES EXISTING CONDITIONS. SITE OVERVIEW PATIENT POPULATIONS & CARE APPROACH PATIENT RELEASE PROCEDURES EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE	5 7 9 9 9 9 11 11 18 18 18

20
20
21
22
))))

MASTER PLAN

GUIDING PRINCIPLES	25 25
FACILITIES DEVELOPMENTNEW FACILITIESDEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTIONRENOVATIONSDEMOLITIONSDOCUMENTATION OF LISTED STRUCTURESOPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS DESCRIPTION	27 29 29 31 31 32
ACCESS, CIRCULATION, & TRANSPORTATION MODES OF TRAVEL TO WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL VEHICULAR ACCESS & CIRCULATION VEHICULAR PARKING PATHS & PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION	35 35 35 36 36
OPEN SPACE & LANDSCAPE	39 39 39 39 39 39 39
SITE SECURITY ADULT FORENSIC FACILITIES CHILD STUDY & TREATMENT CENTER (CSTC)	41 41 41
UTILITIES & INFRASTRUCTURE	43 43 46
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	48
APPENDICES	. A-1



List of Figures

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
- APPENDIX 2 POLICY BRIEF
- APPENDIX 3A TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS
- APPENDIX 3B TIA SUPPLEMENTAL MEMO
- APPENDIX 4 PROPERTY SURVEY
- APPENDIX 5 PBS REPORT
- APPENDIX 6 STORMWATER CREDIT FEASIBILITY STUDY
- APPENDIX 7 PATIENT RELEASE PROCEDURES
- APPENDIX 8 SEPA CHECKLIST

List of Tables

TABLE 1: EXISTING & PROJECTED BED COUNTS	IV
TABLE 2: SITE CAPACITY, NEW CONSTRUCTION & DEMOLITIONS	V
TABLE 3: WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL PARCELS & LAND AREA	12
TABLE 4: EXISTING BUILDINGS	15
TABLE 5: PATIENT BED COUNT, BY WARD & BUILDING	17
TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF NEW PROGRAM ELEMENTS	22
TABLE 7: HEIGHT LIMITS & SETBACKS, NEW CONSTRUCTION	28
TABLE 8: FACILITY STATUS UNDER MASTER PLAN	31
TABLE 9: PROJECTED TRIPS & CHANGE FROM EXISTING CONDITIONS	36
TABLE 10: PARKING INVENTORY	37

FIGURE 1: CAMPUS FRAMEWORK, DEVELOPED AREAS FIGURE 2: GOVERNOR INSLEE AT WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL 1 FIGURE 3: REGIONAL VICINITY 2 4 FIGURE 4: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CIRCA 1892 FIGURE 5: FORT STEILACOOM CIRCA 1960 4 6 FIGURE 6: SITE CONTEXT & SURROUNDING USES FIGURE 7: WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL, AERIAL VIEW 10 FIGURE 8: FORT STEILACOOM COTTAGES ON THE WSH CAMPUS 11 FIGURE 9: WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL LANDS 12 FIGURE 10: EXISTING FACILITIES 13 FIGURE 11: EXISTING FACILITIES, WEST CAMPUS 14 FIGURE 12: EXISTING FACILITIES, EAST CAMPUS 16 FIGURE 13: MIX OF PATIENTS BY TYPE 18 FIGURE 14: CAMPUS FRAMEWORK 23 FIGURE 15: FUNCTIONAL ZONES 24 FIGURE 16: CONNECTING TO NATURE 25 FIGURE 17: MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT 26 FIGURE 18: COURTYARDS FOR DAYLIGHT & VIEWS 27 FIGURE 19: MASSING APPROACH 28 30 FIGURE 20: ANTICIPATED BUILDING & PARKING DEMOLITIONS FIGURE 21: CIRCULATION & PARKING 34 FIGURE 22: PARKING SHIFTS 37 FIGURE 23: LANDSCAPE & OPEN SPACES 38

FIGURE 24: SITE SECURITY APPROACH42FIGURE 25: TACOMA POWER FUEL MIX44FIGURE 26: UTILITY SERVICES & OPPORTUNITIES45



LU-20-00027

RECEIVED

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT NEED

The primary intent of this master plan is to accommodate a set of facility improvements to the existing Western State Hospital (WSH) campus in Lakewood, Washington. Many of the existing facilities are aging and no longer comply with federal standards for the care of mental health patients.

The approach to behavioral health care has also evolved, meaning that many of the WSH facilities are no longer well-suited to the provision of core services. Significantly, the State has adopted a new approach to behavioral health care, recognizing that the needs of "forensic commitment" patients (those accused of a crime) are different than those of "civil commitment" patients (those determined by the courts to be a potential danger to themselves or the public, but not accused of a crime).

A core goal of the new state policy is to distribute services for civil commitment patients throughout the state, so that patients can be near family and community support. The model for this care is a combination of community hospitals and residential treatment facilities of 16 to 48 beds each.

As new civil commitment facilities become available in western Washington, civil patient capacity at WSH will be reduced. Under this model, Western State Hospital itself will concentrate on treatment of forensic-commitment patients.



Figure 1: Campus Framework, Developed Areas III

PROJECT DESCRIPTION To address the needs described above, the master plan for WSH calls for a new 350-bed forensic hospital. This will include demolition of several existing buildings that are out-moded. At the CSTC, a second 18-bed residential cottage will be developed, as well as a treatment and recreation center. Minor additions

to existing CSTC facilities will and classrooms to the high school and administrative space.

The WSH master plan also allocates space for a new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, as one possible site within the western Washington region identified for such a facility. The siting of this residential facility on the WSH campus is not a certainty. The facility would likely be 3 buildings of 16 beds each.

Taken together, the changes in WSH and CSTC facilities will support the patient projections shown in "Table 1: Existing & Projected Bed Counts". The development of specific projects and their effect on overall capacity at the WSH Site is shown in "Table 2: Site Capacity, New Construction & Demolitions". While these two tables show similar and related information, the difference between them is:

- Table 1 indicates the actual patient population that is projected.
- Table 2 shows how many beds would be in the Hospital's inventory at any point in time - recognizing that there will be times that new facilities are on-board but previously existing bed spaces are not yet demolished.

Through a combination of demolitions and renovations, DSHS will manage capacity on the Western State Hospital campus, to ensure that bed capacity remains under key thresholds identified in this planning process. The planned projects, renovations and demolitions are further described in the section "Facilities Development" on page 27.

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

Table 1: Existing & Projected Bed Counts*						
Date Range	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
M.P. Year:	Base	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Bed Type						
Center for Forensic Services (CFS) - Buildings 21, 27, 28, 29	387	445 [†]	415	180	180	18
Civil Commitment - Buildings 17, 19, 20, 21, 27 & 29	470	415	325	95	95	14
Child Study & Treatment Center (CSTC) Adolescent Services	65‡	65	83	83	83	8
New Forensic Hospital	n/a	n/a	n/a	350	350	35
New Community Residential Treatment Facility	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	48
Total:	922	925	853	768	768	86
					·	

RECEIVED LU-20-00027 03/11/2022 ity of Lake

180

143

83

350

48[§]

864

See "Western State Hospital Goals" on page 20 for further description of goals and needs.

Includes 58 new beds in Building 28, approved prior to the master plan.

An 18-bed residential cottage for the CSTC facility has been developed concurrently with the preparation of this master plan.

[§] The residential treatment facility may be sited at WSH, or may be located at another site in the western Washington region.

Table 2: Site Capacity, New Construction & Demolitions

Date Range	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25	2025-27	2027-29	2029-31
Master Plan Year:	Base	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Additions:						
New Forensic Hospital	-		-	+ 350	-	-
New Community RTF	-	-	-	-	-	+ 48
CSTC Cottages	+18*	-	-	+ 18	-	-
Renovations:						
Building 28		+ 58†		-118‡		
Building 29		-55 [§]				
Buildings 17, 19, & 20 [¶]			-45			
Demolitions:						
Building 21			-167			
Buildings w/o beds ^{**} : 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14a, 14b, 15, 16a, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 44						
Total Site Bed Capacity:	922	925	713	963	963	1,011

* An 18-bed residential cottage for the CSTC is in development, approved separately from this master plan.

† The addition to Building 28 was approved separately from the master plan update.

‡ Treatment wards to be repurposed as admin or program support space.

§ Treatment wards to be repurposed as a Treatment & Recovery Center

As part of the overall effort to reduce civil commitment patients on the campus, a combination of demolitions and renovations of residential capacity achieve the reduction shown here. See "Renovations" on page 29 for more information.

** See also "Table 8: Facility Status under Master Plan" on page 31

DEVELOPMENT PATTERN AND PRINCIPLES

The overall development pattern of the master plan is shown in Figure 1. The plan is defined by several key physical planning principles and goals:

- 1 Transform The Model Of Care
 - Develop a new forensic hospital, supporting contemporary treatment approaches
 - Shift civil commitment patients to modern treatment facilities distributed throughout the region

- 2 Improve Campus Efficiencies
 - Move Toward a More Zoned Campus based on Program Areas
 - Modernize Campus Infrastructure
 - Improve Site Access and Way-finding

The plan recognizes City of Lakewood zoning of the northwestern portion of the campus as Open-Space/Recreation, and supports the conservation and visitation of the Historic Fort Steilacoom in the south-center portion of the site.

RECEIVED

03/11/2022 City of Lakewor

LU-20-00027

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

INFRASTRUCTURE & SUPPORTING SYSTEMS

In support of the primary program-based investments, infrastructure and circulation improvements are planned, including:

- Improved internal circulation for cars and other modes of travel
- Potential shifts in the vehicular access points to the campus to reduce congestion and direct site access to entries along Steilacoom Boulevard
- Parking to be updated, expanded, and re-allocated to meet demand and reduce past informal parking practices on open space areas
- Upgrades to the sewer system and rainwater management infrastructure
- Improved gas and electricity service, as well as investments aligned with the State's zero net energy policy
- Improved public access to extant facilities associated with Historic Fort Steilacoom
- Continued access to open space and recreational lands on the northern area of the site
- Protection of natural resources on and bordering the site
- Evaluation of the potential for conversion of water service from the existing on-site system to the Lakewood Water District system

APPROVALS PROCESS

This campus master plan has been prepared for submission to the City of Lakewood for approval, consistent with the state Growth Management Act and policies stemming from that Act at the local, county, and regional level. Primary requirements of these policies are addressed in the section "Planning Regulatory Context" on page 5.

Western State Hospital, the Child Study and Treatment Center, and the new Residential Treatment Facility are recognized as "Essential Public Facilities" under these policies. As a state facility, the requirements of the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) apply to these state facilities.



Figure 2: Governor Inslee at Western State Hospital The governor announced the State's new approach to behavioral health care at the Hospital in May 2018

PLANNING CONTEXT

Introduction

LU-20-00027

ECEIVE

In May of 2018, Governor Jay Inslee came to Western State Hospital (WSH) to make a significant policy statement, launching a major shift in how the State of Washington will manage behavioral health going forward.

This policy shift recognizes that the needs for patients committed on a 'civil' basis are different than the needs of patients with a 'forensic' commitment. The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) - with other state agencies and community partners - is charged with developing new facilities to be distributed throughout the state to serve the civil commitment patients.

Under the new policy, WSH itself is to be modernized with new facilities. This master plan identifies facilities investments needed to modernize the WSH campus recognizing that many of the legacy facilities are poorly suited to contemporary treatment practices and the significant recent investments in the existing campus.

PURPOSES OF THE MASTER PLAN

This master plan for the WSH campus is both an internal document for DSHS to guide facility investments and a land use plan for coordination with local and regional jurisdictions.

Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA) requires county and municipal governments to engage in comprehensive planning, and requires that planning be integrated with state agencies. State agencies are specifically required to comply with local comprehensive plans^{*}.

WSH is located in Pierce County and the City of Lakewood (see "Figure 3: Regional Vicinity" on page 2). This plan has been developed to comply with the current adopted plans of those jurisdictions. Coordination with regional plans is also addressed (see "Planning Regulatory Context" on page 5 for more detail).

^{*} RCW 36.70A.103 This code section also clarifies that local compliance does not affect the state's authority to site essential public facilities.



DSHS Mission, Vision, & Values

Mission

As a Department we are tied together by a single mission: to transform lives. Each administration within DSHS has a refined focus on this mission. Individually we have the following missions:

- Aging and Long-term Support Administration to transform lives by promoting choice, independence and safety through innovative services.
- Behavioral Health Administration to transform lives by supporting sustainable recovery, independence and wellness.
- Developmental Disabilities Administration to transform lives by creating partnerships that empower people.
- Economic Services Administration to transform lives by empowering individuals and families to thrive.
- Facilities, Finance and Analytics Administration to transform lives by promoting sound management of Department resources.
- Office of the Secretary to transform lives by helping those who serve succeed.

Values

DSHS is also tied together by the following set of values:

- Honesty and Integrity because leadership and service require a clear moral compass.
- Pursuit of Excellence because it is not enough to get the job done, we must always challenge ourselves to do it better.
- Open Communication because excellence requires teamwork and a strong team is seen, heard and feels free to contribute.
- Diversity and Inclusion because only by including all perspectives are we at our best and only through cultural competency can we optimally serve our clients.
- Commitment to Service because our challenges will always exceed our financial resources, our commitment to service must see us through.

Vision

- People are healthy.
- People are safe.
- People are supported.
- Taxpayer resources are guarded.



Figure 3: Regional Vicinity
Historic Preservation Initiatives

Multiple organizations are working to preserve and interpret the history of the Fort Steilacoom/WSH site.

- The **Historic Fort Steilacoom Association (HFSA)** is dedicated to preservation of elements of the fort itself. The Association operates the Fort Steilacoom Museum, focusing on the four extant cottages and associated grounds - a portion of the former parade groundsimmediately east of Circle Drive. The HFSA seeks to create a visitor center in this area to expand its interpretive efforts.
- A committee of WSH staff manages elements considered by DSHS to be of historical significance to the hospital.
- The **Grave Concerns Association** is engaged in the Western State Hospital Cemetery Restoration Project, which is located at Fort Steilacoom Park, south of Steilacoom Boulevard and east of Lake Waughop. This site is the burial site of patients associated with the hospital. By contrast, the smaller cemetery on the WSH grounds is associated with early American settlers in the area.

Registrations

The WSH grounds and surrounding area are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Washington Heritage Register (WHR) as the Fort Steilacoom Historic District.

The structures listed as 'Primary" in the NRHP listing are:

- "Ft. Steilacoom Officers Row" the four surviving 1-story cottages constructed in 1857.
- State Hospital Buildings specifically, the morgue and bakery, dating from 1887-89.

Additional structures are listed as 'Secondary" in the NRHP listing, including several proposed for demolition/removal in this master plan.

The 2008 Cultural Landscape Assessment identified multiple facilities of the hospital as 'Contributing' to the historic character of the WSH campus, and recommends a period of significance dating up to 1961.

HOSPITAL HISTORY

Western State Hospital has grown over its history, in response to both growing demand and changes in treatment practices.

The site that houses Western State Hospital was developed for agriculture by Euro-American settlers. The U.S. government developed Fort Steilacoom beginning in 1849 (see sidebar "Site History: Timeline" on page 4). Several facilities are extant from the Fort's era and are identified as an historic resource. In 2008 a cultural landscape assessment^{*} was prepared, followed in 2011 by a resource management plan[†] detailing the status of historic resources and identifying priorities for preservation.

The hospital was established in the 1870's, growing in cycles over the decades. The most prominent building - Administration Building #2 - was built in the 1930's, replacing a prior building on the same site. The Administrative Building faces the parade grounds of the former fort.

In recent years, WSH has been challenged to adapt to contemporary models of care, in part due to the out-dated facilities. The State has committed to reinvesting in behavioral health care through a combination of distributed residential treatment facilities and new hospital facilities for forensic care patients.

Physical growth has included the addition of multiple support facilities to the west of the main administration building, and later companion facilities have been developed in separate clusters to the east. These include the Child Study & Treatment Center (CSTC), as well an "East Campus" cluster at Buildings 28 & 29.

^{*} Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment

Western State Hospital Cultural Resource Management Plan, by MSGS Architects



Site History: Timeline

Pre-1840s	Steilacoom tribe active in the area
1840s	Early Euro-American settlers
1849-68	Site used as Fort Steilacoom
1871	Hospital established by Washington Territory as "Insane Asylum"
1870s	WSH patients and staff clear nearby lands for agriculture, establishing vegetable gardens and orchards and starting a farming operation that would last until 1965.
1886-87	Administration Building #1 built
1889	Washington statehood; the facility is renamed Western State Hospital
1880s-90s	Significant growth in facilities
1914-16	Rock wall and gates built on south of campus
1930s-40s	Expansion utilizing WPA & CCC, including infrastructure upgrades, i.e. wells and pipe system.
1934-35	Main wing of Administration Building #2 built, with WPA grant, replacing earlier Administration Building on the site. Additional wings added over time.
1950s-60s	Expansion to west to meet growing need for additional wards. Former Military Cemetery remains relocated to S.F. Presidio, to accommodate commissary expansion.
1965	On-site Farm closed after declining use.
1982	Building 29 constructed for geriatric patients
2000	CFS Building 28 constructed



Figure 4:

Administration Building, circa 1892 (Source: Pacific Coast Architecture Database commons.wikimedia.org)



Figure 5:

Fort Steilacoom circa 1960 (Source: fortwiki.com, Creative Commons)



Planning Regulatory Context

CITY OF LAKEWOOD

The Western State Hospital campus lies within the City of Lakewood. The City's Development Code includes the following provisions that are particularly relevant to this master plan:

• Comprehensive Plan (Future Land Use) Designation: Public & Semi-Public Institutional, and;

Designation of the surrounding Oakbrook/Fort Steilacoom area as a Center of Local Importance (CoLI), which recognizes the role of civic facilities such as the hospital, Pierce College - Fort Steilacoom, and the historic Fort Steilacoom lands, among other uses.

- Zoning Designation: Public/Institutional (PI): Mental Health facilities require a Conditional Use permit under Lakewood Zoning (18A.40.060.A).
- Essential Public Facilities proposals are required to include (per 18A.40.060.B.2):
 - Documentation of Need
 - Consistency with Sponsor's Plans
 - Consistency with Other Plans
 - Minimum Site Requirements
 - Alternative Site Selection
 - Distribution of Essential Public Facilities
 - Public Participation
 - o Consistency with Local Land Use Regulations
 - Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses
 - Proposed Impact Mitigation
- Lakewood Zoning includes "Additional Siting Criteria for Mental Health Facilities" (18A.40.060.B.4). These include:
 - Provisions for infrastructure and services
 - Protection of Critical Areas
 - Provision of Usable Open Space
 - o Transportation and Circulation, including sidewalks
 - Measures for the safety of the general public

Each of these considerations are addressed in the corresponding section of this master plan document.

• EPFs on lands zoned PI and over 20 acres in aggregate are required by Lakewood Zoning to be governed by a master plan (18A.40.060.B.5).

Policies related to a master plan for an essential public facility include:

- Requirement to provide an Operational Characteristics Description
- Requirement for a Compatibility Study
- Adaptive Reuse of facilities would require an amendment to the adopted master plan
- Provision for multi-modal transportation
- Provision of utility infrastructure, roads and emergency services
- Public safety and safety of visitors and staff
- Protection of critical areas and provision of usable open space

Compatibility of Uses

Lakewood's Development Code requires that the following criteria be addressed as part of a Compatibility Study for an Essential Public Facility (18A.40.060.B.6.):

- a. The purpose of the proposed essential public facility civic use
- b. An operational characteristics description of the proposed essential public facility civic use and an operational characteristics description of the existing use or uses
- c. An evaluation of the potential effects of the proposed essential public facility civic use upon the existing use or uses
- d. An evaluation of the potential effects of the proposed essential public facility civic use upon the adjacent properties
- e. An evaluation of the potential effects of the proposed essential public facility civic use upon at-risk or special needs populations, including but not limited to children and the physically or mentally disabled and
- f. Identification of any applicable mitigation measures designed to address any potential effects identified through the evaluation required herein

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN



Figure 6: Site Context & Surrounding Uses

15 DEC 2021

Each of these six criteria are addressed below:

a. Purpose of the Proposed use:

The master plan does not propose a change in the general use of the site, but does propose modernized facilities to improve care within the facilities. The Goals and Purpose of the developments under the plan are to modernize existing facilities, addressing deferred maintenance, and adapting to new models of care for behavioral health.

In the process, multiple facility improvements will be made, including:

- Demolition of several buildings
- Improved circulation and parking
- o Improved access to historic facilities of pubic interest
- Improved security measures

These are more fully described in the sections "Goals & Project Needs" on page 20 and "Facilities Development" on page 27.

b. Operational Characteristics

These are fully described in the section "Operational Characteristics Description" on page 32.

c. Potential Effects on Existing Uses

The proposed uses are explicitly to modernize the Hospital's facilities. The new facilities will be fully integrated with those existing facilities that will remain.

d. Potential Effects on Adjacent Properties

Given the age of the hospital, the surrounding uses have changed through economic expansion and local planning over its history. Current surrounding uses are indicated in Figure 6 on page 6.

The effects from this plan and related projects should be neutral to positive on surrounding areas. Programs provided will be internal to the WSH campus.

Travel to and from the campus will be similar to current patterns, with potential improvements from potential changes in entry points (see item f, below).

e. Potential Effects on At-Risk & Special Needs Populations

The Hospital's purpose and program directly serve a segment of Washington's special needs population, specifically those with behavioral health needs. The investments being proposed are being made to improve the delivery of those services.

With regard to children, the WSH site includes the Child Study & Treatment Center (CSTC), which provides services to minors with behavioral health treatment needs.

f. Applicable Mitigation Measures

The modernization of the facilities is largely "self-mitigating", in the sense that consolidation of programs into a contemporary facility with enhanced security will further reduce any potential effects of the WSH operations on the surrounding community.

Regular staff access to the campus from the east (87th Ave.) and west (Sentinel Drive), will be reduced by access control, and changes to the access points from Steilacoom Blvd. are suggested to reduce congestion along that route.

PIERCE COUNTY

Pierce County also has regulatory jurisdiction affecting WSH planning. The primary planning policy for the County is the **Countywide Planning Policies for Pierce County, Washington**. One key section of that policy addresses the "Siting Of Essential Public Capital Facilities of a Countywide Or Statewide Significance".

Key provisions of the Essential Public Facilities (EPF) policy dictate that:

- EPFs must have a useful life of 10 years or more and must serve the entire County, multiple counties, or the whole state (Policy EPF-1.1.)
- County and local implementing policies shall require that: "the state provide a justifiable need for the public facility and for its location in Pierce County based upon forecasted needs and a logical service area, and the distribution of facilities in the region and state." (Policy EPF-3.1.)
- "A requirement that the state establish a public process by which the residents of the County and of affected and 'host' municipalities have a reasonable opportunity to participate in the site selection process." (Policy EPF-3.2.)

KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA

As identified in Pierce County requirements (Policy EPF-4), a master plan for Essential Public Facilities should address the following. For each item, the reader is directed to the pertinent information.

- Specific facility requirements:
 - Minimum acreage
 - See "Facilities Development" on page 27
 - Accessibility; transportation needs and services

See "Access, Circulation, & Transportation" on page 35

- Supporting public facility and public service needs and the availability thereof
 - See "Utilities & Infrastructure" on page 43
- Health and safety

Behavioral Health is a primary function of the facility, See "Western State Hospital Goals" on page 20 for a description of care. For safety and security measures, refer to "Site Security" on page 41

Site design

See "Figure 14: Campus Framework" on page 23, "Figure 17: Master Plan Development" on page 26 and ""Open Space & Landscape" on page 39.

Zoning of site

Public/Institutional See Figure 9 on page 12

Availability of alternative sites; community-wide distribution of facilities

For a discussion of site selection criteria, see "Facility Siting" on page $21\,$

- Natural boundaries that determine routes and connections
 These are described in "Hospital History" on page 3 and illustrated in "Figure 9: Western State Hospital Lands" on page 12
- Impacts of the facility:
 - Land use compatibility

The site is specifically zoned for Public/Institutional uses

• Existing land use and development in adjacent and surrounding areas; existing zoning of surrounding areas; existing Comprehensive Plan designation for surrounding areas

See"Figure 6: Site Context & Surrounding Uses" on page 6

- Present and proposed population density of surrounding area
 The residential areas to the north and east of the site are single-family and low-rise multi-family estimated to range in density from 4 to 15 units per gross acre.
- Environmental impacts and opportunities to mitigate environmental impacts

A summary of potential impacts is included in the SEPA checklist, included with this report. See "Appendix 8: SEPA Checklist"

• Effect on agricultural, forest or mineral lands, critical areas and historic, archaeological and cultural site

No agricultural, forest or mineral lands are impacted by this campus redevelopment. Parts of the site are within the Fort Steilacoom Historic District, which is on the National Register of Historic Places as well as the Washington Heritage Register. See "Documentation of Listed Structures" on page 31.

• Effect on areas outside of Pierce County

WSH serves needs throughout the western portion of the state, and will continue to do so for forensic patient services. The State is studying a revised care model for civil commitment patients that would distribute services to multiple localities, throughout the state. That process is proceeding in parallel to this planning process.

• Effect on designated open space corridors

The currently designated open space is not proposed for development in this plan. The plan proposes increasing public access to connect between open space areas to the south - Fort Steilacoom Park - and the ravine to the north, which in turn connects to Chambers Bay.

• "Spin-off" (secondary and tertiary) impacts

The only potential "spin-off" from the modernization investments on the WSH campus would be the increased distribution of facilities serving civil commitment patients. As described in the program, one community treatment facility of 48 beds may be accommodated on the campus, while others would be developed in other communities around the state.

• Effect on the likelihood of associated development being induced by the siting of the facility

15 DEC 2021

Since staffing is not projected to grow significantly, a growth inducement impact is not expected. Staff spending in the community is anticipated to remain fairly constant, as the plan does not propose significant new amenities on campus that would shift patterns of behavior.

- Impacts of the facility siting on urban growth area designations and policies:
 - Urban nature of facility

The hospital's services are an urban use, and there are direct benefits to patient care by being near the state's major population centers. The ability of family and friends to readily visit patients is a factor in their care and recovery.

Existing urban growth near facility site

Surrounding uses include single-family and multi-family housing to the east and northeast, commercial development along Steilacoom Boulevard to the east, open space and a campus of Pierce College to the south, and Steilacoom High School to the northwest. All of these uses post-date the hospital's presence on the site and its last major period of growth.

o Compatibility of urban growth with the facility

The proposed uses in the area surrounding the hospital are similar to existing adjacent uses.

 Compatibility of facility siting with respect to urban growth area boundaries

The facility is being sited on the existing WSH campus, generally infilling over existing structures and sites of existing buildings to be demolished. There is no shift in siting relative to the urban growth area boundaries.

• Timing and location of facilities that guide growth and development. The projected timing of the WSH facilities are indicated in Table 1 on page iv.

REGIONAL PLANNING

The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) provides coordination across the region, focusing on growth management, economic development and transportation.

PSRC policy documents include:

• Vision 2050, draft plan (Summer 2019)

The draft plan identifies Lakewood as one of 16 "core cities", a category of major cities second only to the largest "metropolitan cities" in their influence on the economy

- Vision 2040 the fully adopted regional growth strategy, preceding the current Vision 2050 process
- Regional Transportation Plan (adopted 2018), prioritizing transportation investments

PSRC's draft Vision 2050 plan extends policies from the Vision 2040 plan calling for growth to be concentrated in established urban areas, protection of existing open space and sprawl reduction.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

Land Use in Washington is governed primarily by the Growth Management Act (GMA). This law establishes the requirements for planning by cities and counties, and requires that agencies of the state comply with local comprehensive plans and development regulations.(RCW 36.70A.103).

State law also addresses the siting of Essential Public Facilities, requiring that "each county and city ... shall include a process for identifying and siting essential public facilities" (RCW 36.70A.200).

Additional requirements derive from the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA), specifically to assess the potential impacts of planned development on natural systems and related infrastructure. A SEPA checklist is included in "Appendix 8: SEPA Checklist".

Executive Order 21-02 - replacing E.O. 05-05 and effective April, 2021 - requires that "Agencies shall consult with DAHP and affected tribes on the potential effects of projects on cultural resources proposed in state-funded construction or acquisition projects..."

COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS & AGENCIES

Entities that will be affected by this plan were contacted as the plan took shape, to hear their issues of interest or concern, and these meetings will continue through the master plan review process. These meetings are summarized in "Appendix 1: Stakeholder Meetings" and updates to this appendix will be provided as additional meetings are held.





Existing Conditions

SITE OVERVIEW

The full WSH campus site is about 288 acres in size. Table 3 on page 12 details the site area by parcel number and City zoning designation. As a legacy of the site's gradual evolution, the WSH campus includes many facilities from different eras and functions.

The total building area serving DSHS programs is 1,435,000 gross square feet (GSF). Table 4, along with Figure 11 and Figure 12 list the existing facilities on the campus, including their current function and year built. This master plan addresses replacement and/or renovation of those facilities that have significant deferred maintenance, and especially those that are poorly suited to providing restorative care to patients.

OPEN SPACE AREAS

The northwestern area of the site includes open spaces of varying types. The former golf course is zoned for open space uses and the ravine to its south is an area of sensitive lands with steep slopes around the gulch that holds Garrison Springs, site of a fish hatchery dating from the 1970s.

FORT STEILACOOM LANDS

While much of Fort Steilacoom laid on lands south of what is now Steilacoom Boulevard, the area immediately east of the main Administration Building includes a core cluster of historic cottages dating from the original fort settlement. The Historic Fort Steilacoom Association has stated a preference to restore this area to be an open parade grounds type of environment. This initiative would remove roads from the area. This objective is reflected in the planning for the hospital's facilities and circulation planning.

Three other key historic facilities are extant west of the Administration Building: i) a settlers' cemetery, ii) a morgue structure immediately south of the cemetery and iii) a former bakery/butchery structure from the early hospital era.

COTTAGE ROW

Two sets of cottages exist to the east of the Administration building:

• A set of four dating from the Fort Steilacoom era (1850s) and organized in a partial crescent around a central open space and allée of trees

This group is managed by the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association along with other areas associated with the fort. The hospital and DSHS are collaborating with the society on the preservation of these facilities.

• A cottage dating from the 1930s, the last remaining from a former row of cottages along Cottage Row to the east of the Fort-era structures

This latter group were built to house hospital staff, and had been vacant and are no longer contributing to the hospital's functions. The last of them will be demolished under this plan.

EAST CAMPUS EDGE

Two independent facilities are on campus lands facing 87th Avenue SW:

- A fire station operated by West Pierce Fire & Rescue
- Oakridge Community Facility, operated by the Department of Children, Youth and Families

These lands are leased and are not part of the WSH campus master plan.



Figure 8: Fort Steilacoom cottages on the WSH campus

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

Table 3: Western State Hospital Parcels & Land Area

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN



Figure 9: Western State Hospital Lands

The boundary between the OSR zone and the Public/Institutional Zone is as defined by the Lakewood Zoning Map. This is understood to be the southern and southeastern edges of Tax Parcel 0220321007. The boundaries of the Sensitive Area surrounding Garrison Creek are the predominant break in slope at the head of the slopes on the south and north of the creek. On the east, the boundary is 20 feet west of the existing road.



0.2

RECEIVED

03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

LU-20-00027





Facilities listed as historic assets are as determined in the listing of the Fort Steilacoom Historic District for the National Register of Historic Places and/or the **Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment.** See "Documentation of Listed Structures" on page 31.

Figure 11: Existing Facilities, West Campus

*

15 DEC 2021

Table 4: Existing Buildings

Bldg.	Building Use	Built	GSF	Bldg.	Building Use	Built	GSF
1	MOD Maintenance Office	1937	7,623	28	Center for Forensic Services Patient Wards F1 - F8 &	2000	202,160
2	MOD Storage	1958	3,936		Ireatment Mall		
3	MOD Plumbing, Garage, Glass, Sign, Paint &	1917	9,382	28	Patient Wards F9 & F10	2020	40,742
	Machine Shops			29	Patient Wards E1 - E8, Treatment Mall & Clinic	1982	186,628
4	MOD Boiler House	1917	26,376	30	Connex Container: Emergency Management Supplies	2016	160
5	MOD Laundry & Grounds Shop	1917	19,892	31	Connex Container: Emergency Management Supplies	2016	160
6	Art Center, Infinity Center, Beauty/Barber Shop, etc.	1933	31,797	32	Inventory Control Warehouse	1985	6,161
8	Library, Key Shop & Staff Offices	1948	25,448	33	MOD Life, Health & Safety Shop	1979	5,600
9	Staff Offices	1948	114,327	34	MOD Carpentry Shop	1972	5,641
10	Staff Development Training Center & HMH Carpentry	1960	41,227	35	Maintenance Materials Warehouse & HMH Program	1982	12,000
11	Commissary	1934	22,620	36	MOD Main Chiller Plant	1994	2,079
12	MOD Storage	1986	1,560	37	Prime Mover Enclosure: Generator No. 1	1994	476
13	Pharmacy & Central Services	1975	15,235	38	Prime Mover Enclosure: Generator No. 2	1994	476
14A	Vacant - Historic Bakery	1904	880	40	HFSA Cottage No. 1	1855	2,602
14B	Vacant - Historic Morgue	1888	1,516	41	HFSA Cottage No. 2	1855	3,400
15	Green House & Industrial Hygienist	2000	1,826	42	HFSA Cottage No. 3	1855	2,600
16A	Main Kitchen & HMH Java Site	1908	33,275	43	HFSA Cottage No. 4	1855	3,450
16B	Staff Offices, Fashion Center & Laundry Folding	1930	18,180	44*	Vacant: Cottage No. 5	1934	1,350
17	Patient Wards & Treatment Mall	1934	44,091	FP	Fuel Pump Station	1993	32
18	Communications Center & Administration Offices	1938	36,662	Child	Study & Treatment Center (CSTC) Facilities		
19	Patient Wards C1 - C3	1938	46,633	50	CSTC Administration & Elementary School	1995	36,105
20	Patient Wards C4 - C6	1934	44,328	51	CSTC High School	1992	19,816
21	Patient Wards S1 - S10	1948	149,865	52	CSTC Residential Unit (Camano)	1987	11,209
22	Patient Support Center	2019	48,190	53	CSTC Residential Unit (Orcas)	1987	11,984
23	Chapel	1925	7,492	54	CSTC Residential Unit (Ketron)	1987	10,484
24	Employee Health, Infection Prevention & Patient Financial Services	1937	11,149	55	CSTC Residential Unit (San Juan)	2020	19.360
25	North West Justice, Legal Services & Department of	1938	22,001	00	Total Eacilities in planning area	1301	9,394
	Assigned Council					l	1,493,204
26	Vacant - Not in Use	1945	75,644		Cles owned/operated by others	1	
27	WSH: Patient HMH Wards W1N & W1S and Fort	1960	37,980		Uakriage Community Facility		
	Stellacoom Residential Treatment Facility			WPF5	west Pierce Fire & Rescue, Station #24		

* Cottages 6-10 - totaling 7,108 GSF - were demolished in 2021.

LU-20-00027

RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood





 Facilities listed as historic assets are as determined in the listing of the Fort Steilacoom Historic District for National Register of Historic Places and/or the Western State Hospital Cultural Landscape Assessment. See "Documentation of Listed Structures" on page 31

Figure 12: Existing Facilities, East Campus

Table 5: Patient Bed Count, by Ward & Building data is as of Fall 2019

	Bldg	Center	Physical Ward	Logical Ward	Service Type	Beds	BI
	17	PTRC*	C7	WS56	Rehabilitation	30	2
	17	PTRC	C8	WS77	Acute	30	2
	19	PTRC	C2	WS63	Rehabilitation	30	2
	19	PTRC	C3	WS31	Acute	30	2
	20	PTRC	C5	WS41	Acute	30	2
	20	PTRC	C6	WS25	Acute	30	2
	21	CFS^\dagger	S4	WS83	Transitional/Extended	15	2
	21	CFS	S10	WS82	Rehabilitation	30	2
	21	PTRC	S3	WS76	Rehabilitation	30	2
	21	PTRC	S7	WS73	Rehabilitation	32	2
	21	PTRC	S8	WS72	Rehabilitation	30	2
	21	PTRC	S9	WS74	Rehabilitation	30	2
	27	HMH [‡]	W1N	WS47	Rehabilitation	15	2
	27	HMH	W1S	WS45	Rehabilitation	15	2
	27	FSCRP §	W2N	WS47	Rehabilitation	15	2
	27	FSCRP	W2S	WS45	Rehabilitation	15	2
*	Pevc	hiatric Treatn	nent and Reco	werv Cente	r		BI

Psychiatric Treatment and Recovery Center

Center for Forensic Services †

Habilitative Mental Health ŧ

§ Fort Steilacoom Competency Restoration Program

Bldg	Center	Physical Ward	Logical Ward	Service Type	Beds
28	CFS	F1	WS48	Admission	29
28	CFS	F2	WS14	Admission	29
28	CFS	F3	WS85	Admission/Acute	31
28	CFS	F4	WS61	Acute	31
28	CFS	F5	WS50	Admission	29
28	CFS	F6	WS18	Rehabilitation	29
28	CFS	F7	WS62	Rehabilitation	31
28	CFS	F8	WS16	Rehabilitation	31
29	CFS	E1	WS51	Rehabilitation	30
29	PTRC	E2	WS81	Rehabilitation	27
29	CFS	E3	WS09	Admission	21
29	CFS	E4	WS78	Admission	21
29	PTRC	E5	WS05	Admission	30
29	PTRC	E6	WS08	Rehabilitation	26
29	PTRC	E7	WS70	Rehabilitation	28
29	PTRC	E8	WS59	Rehabilitation	27
Bldg	Center	Cottage	e Name	Service Type	Beds
52	CSTC	Cam	iano	Children	15
53	CSTC	Ord	cas	Children	16
54	CSTC	Ket	ron	Children	16
55	CSTC	San	Juan	Children	18
Total B	ed Count				922

LU-20-00027

RECEIVED

03/11/2022 City of Lakewor

PATIENT POPULATIONS & CARE APPROACH

Washington's two state psychiatric hospitals today serve patients with differing backgrounds and needs. Patients are served in two primary categories:

Civil Commitment Patients

Individuals determined by the Court system to be a danger to themselves or others may be civilly committed to the state hospitals for care and treatment. These individuals have not been accused of a crime.

Forensic Commitment Patients

Forensic patients are those patients that have been accused of a crime. In the process of a prosecution, the Courts may commit an individual to the state hospital for a competency evaluation to stand trial. If found competent, the individual is returned to jail to stand trial. If found not competent, the individual stays in the hospital until competency is restored.

Another population of forensic patients are those who have been found by the Courts to be not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI). These individuals are committed to the state hospitals for care and treatment.



Figure 13: Mix of patients by type

Models of Care

Civil patients receive care in Buildings 17, 19-21, 27 and 29. The environment of care differs from building to building, but generally consists of 25-30 bed units connected end to end.

The organization of the facilities lend themselves to an archaic custodial model of care, where large numbers of patients are housed with limited opportunity for on-unit therapy. For those farther from the Treatment Mall, access to program space becomes more challenging and often results in an inadequate amount of active therapy. Thus, length of stay is often longer than can be achieved with a more contemporary model of care.

Forensic patients reside and receive treatment in a secure environment in Buildings 28 and 29. Inpatient Units are typically comprised of 30 beds supported by 2 group activity spaces and a porch. A generous amount of circulation space surrounds the Nurse Station allowing a high degree of direct observation but little opportunity for staff and patient interaction. All 30 patients share the same limited amount of social space, resulting in a high social density and/or many patients remaining in their rooms, disengaged.

The only significant place for therapy in the forensic hospital is the Treatment Mall. This portion of Building 28 is strategically located between the residential units of 28 and 29. It offers a variety of program space including a gym, fitness rooms, classrooms and multi-purpose rooms.

Child Study & Treatment Center (CSTC)

The Child Study and Treatment Center (CSTC) provides culturally competent care to children and youth with severe psychiatric, emotional, and behavioral disorders complicated by medical, social, legal, and developmental issues. CSTC treats the most complicated and challenged kids. Some of the challenges addressed are psychiatric disorders, ADHD, Bipolar, learning disorders, behavior disorders, sexually inappropriate behavior, aggressive behavior, and conditions where there is the potential for self-harm or physical harm to others.

Although it is not the norm, CSTC also treats some kids with autism. Many of the kids have more than one of these challenges. Almost all have demonstrated an increasing display of the potential to be unsafe for themselves and others. This aggressive behavior tends to continue to escalate. Without appropriate training and treatment, it poses a clear and ever present danger.

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

15 DEC 2021

Children are placed at CSTC through the Children's Long-term Inpatient Program (CLIP). CLIP is the only publicly funded, longer-term inpatient program for youth in Washington State where youth ages 5-17 years old may be voluntarily committed and those from 13-17 years old may be involuntarily committed. CSTC is under the authority of the Behavioral Health Administration (BHA) within the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

CSTC provides a variety of programming and treatments. The psychiatric treatment/therapy program is based on the most current evidence-based practices including, but not limited to:

- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT)
- Dialectical Behavioral Therapy, and
- Trauma-Focused CBT.

Additionally, CSTC provides life and relationship skills development, family, recreational, and other specialized therapies. Clinical services include psychiatric/medical oversight, medication management, and 24-hour nursing services.

Licensed as a hospital, CSTC welcomes families, guardians, and community supporters to participate in treatment and discharge planning so children can successfully return to their family home or communitybased foster placement.

While at CSTC, patients attend school year-round on campus through educational programs offered by the Clover Park School District (CPSD). The hospital counselors work alongside teachers and para-educators to maintain a safe, therapeutic learning environment. CPSD works with families and homeschool districts to make sure the student's transition into their next school is successful following discharge from the hospital.

Patient Release Procedures

The process for release of patients from facilities on the Western State Hospital campus varies by population. See "Appendix 7: Patient Release Procedures" for a description of release procedures for adult patients.

Children at the CSTC are discharged when they meet discharge criteria established as part of their care and treatment. Their discharge placement can range broadly from their family home to a structured group home or other residential setting.

EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE

This section provides a brief summary of existing services and known constraints that should be addressed in implementing this plan. Systems are further described and proposed solutions addressed in "Utilities & Infrastructure" on page 43.

- **Electrical** service to the WSH campus is provided by Tacoma Power via two feeder connections, fed from separate utility substations, as shown in Figure 26 on page 45.
- **Natural gas** is provided to the Western State Hospital campus by Puget Sound Energy (PSE). There are three feeds to the campus, shown in Figure 26 on page 45. Each building provided with a natural gas connection is individually metered by the utility.
- **Steam Heat**: Boilers in Building 4 provide steam to most of the campus for heating, domestic water, and process loads. Facilities currently served by steam heat are indicated in Figure 26 on page 45.
- Water Supply: Western State Hospital currently acts as its own Water District; all of the water supplied to and used by the campus is owned, operated, and maintained by Western State Hospital, from groundwater wells on Fort Steilacoom; see "Figure 26: Utility Services & Opportunities" on page 45.
- **Sanitary Sewer**: The campus sewer system is privately owned and maintained, and discharges to the public sewer system operated by the Town of Steilacoom. The Town's collection system feeds via pump to the Pierce County Wastewater Plant, located along Chambers Creek.
- **Rainwater:** Currently, catch basins flow to a combination of campus retention ponds and the gulch above Garrison Springs.

Goals & Project Needs

DSHS GOALS

As a result of the State's policy directive, a core goal for DSHS is to provide more of the state's services to civil commitment patients through distributed models, both private and state-run. These facilities are projected to be a combination of small Residential Treatment Facilities (RTFs) of 16 or 48 beds per facility. During this master planning process, DSHS initiated a predesign study for up to three of these facilities.

The distributed Residential Treatment Facilities will provide stabilization of individuals in psychiatric crisis or experiencing an episode of acute mental illness. These RTFs provide clinical and therapeutic services to people on a short-stay basis and connect them to the continuum of psychiatric services upon discharge.

The model relieves the pressure on local emergency departments to address the emergent needs of people in distress who require short, focused, person-centered care so that they can re-enter their communities as quickly as possible.

The Residential Treatment Facilities provide care to those individuals who are managing their mental illness but still require the support that a structured residential environment can offer. This type of facility may provide social services in-house, but facilitates its residents' outpatient psychiatric care. By living in a residential setting with a small number of peers, people are able to exercise their coping skills and connect with others in a more manageable group size.

The distributed facilities for civil commitment patients will be coupled with reinvestment in Western State Hospital's campus and facilities, which will continue to serve forensic commitment patients and a limited number of civil commitment patients. This approach recognizes the significant investments that have been made in the current site over the years.

ESTABLISHING HOSPITAL DEMAND

In establishing the demand for services at the hospital, DSHS follows state laws and protocols, including the "bed need model" established by Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1109 (Chapter 415, Laws of 2019). Projections of demand are inherently dynamic and responsive to fluctuations in need as a result of the patient commitment process which includes evaluations, court hearings and other factors.

ESHB 1109 directed that the bed need models incorporate factors such as:

- The capacity in state hospitals as well as contracted facilities which provide similar levels of care
- Referral patterns
- Lengths of stay
- Wait lists
- Other factors (e.g., capacity utilization rates) identified as appropriate for predicting the number of beds needed to meet the demand for civil and forensic state hospital services.

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL GOALS

The primary goal of the 2020 master plan is to prepare for the investments in new and renovated facilities anticipated by the governor and legislature's policy directives. To support this goal, several objectives have been identified:

- 1 Establish a planning framework for the entire campus, recognizing the multiple functions accommodated on the site.
- 2 Identify a site for a hospital facility to serve forensic commitment patients, replacing the existing outmoded facilities.
- 3 Accommodate a potential 48-bed Residential Treatment Facility to serve civil commitment patients.
- 4 Accommodate a second new cottage and a treatment/recreation facility for the Child Study and Treatment Center (CSTC).

FACILITY SITING

The decision to site the new replacement facility on the current campus was made based on several key considerations:

Washington State Demographics

The current State population of 7.67 Million is expected to increase to 8.90 Million by 2040. Over half of the State population resides along the I-5 corridor between Olympia to the South and Everett to the North. The counties with the highest population in Washington are King and Pierce. A 2015 report from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy found that the prevalence rates for mental health conditions in the state are among the highest in the U.S., with 7% of the population meeting the criteria for "serious" mental illness. The WSH Lakewood Campus is located within this population center, close to where patients and their immediate family members live.

Replacement Cost

The State of Washington has made significant investment in WSH facilities, infrastructure and operations over its history. Replacing the property, facilities and programs in-kind would result in costs ranging from \$1.76 to \$1.83 Billion, including:

- Land value, 80 acres @ \$300,000/acre⁺: \$24 million
- Replacement structures, construction cost 1.3 million GSF @ \$880/GSF: \$1,144 million \$286-\$343 million
- Associated project costs, 25% to 30%:
- Escalation @ 3.5 %/year for 6 years:

\$328-\$341 million

- 5 The WSH Campus has reduced its size over time from a total of 762 acres to 286 acres today, donating over 470 acres to the City of Lakewood and Pierce College for public parks and educational facilities.
- 6 WSH employs over 2,800 people, most residing in the City of Lakewood and Pierce County.
- 7 WSH's annual operating budget is \$225 million and has a staff payroll that exceeds \$14 million per month.

Qualified Physicians and Staff

The highest concentration of qualified physicians and staff (3,600) in the State needed for the care of the patient population reside in the 1-5 corridor, between Olympia and Everett. They are supported by the highest concentration of education institutions that provide training and certification for mental health professionals.

History

A hospital for individuals with mental illness was established at this location in 1871, 18 years before Washington became a state and 125 years before Lakewood incorporated as a city.

Community Benefit

The operation of the Western State Hospital facilities provides the following benefits to the local community:

Based on review of industrially zoned lands in the Pierce County area (Pierce County GIS), and assumes that land could be re-zoned to meet project goals. If appropriate industrial lands could not be secured, other lands could have significantly higher acquisition costs.

PROJECT PROGRAM

The program for projected facilities is summarized in Table 6.

As described above, the new forensic hospital will be the major change on the campus, and a Residential Treatment Facility is included in the allowed project under the master plan, although that facility may be sited elsewhere in the state.

In addition to projects for the hospital under this master plan, Table 6 includes:

- "San Juan Cottage A", in the Child Study and Treatment Center (CSTC). This project has been approved prior to this master plan (permit number BP-0035). Given this prior approval, it is not included in the development totals for this master plan.
- A projected Visitor Center for the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association. This project would be developed by the HFSA, but is included in the plan totals as it is on the WSH campus.

Reduction in Civil Commitment Capacity

In parallel to the development of new facilities for the forensic hospital and in alignment with legislative directives, DSHS is projecting a reduction of 180 beds for civil commitment patients at WSH by April 1, 2023.

This reduction will manage the quantity and type of development on the campus and will be achieved through a combination of renovations and demolitions - see "Renovations" on page 29.

Table 6: Summary of New Program Elements

Program Element	Bed #	Change in GSF					
Projects in Development							
CSTC San Juan Cottage A*	18	19,360					
Above figures are counted separately from the program under the master plan.							
Addition to Building 28 ⁺	58	40,472					
MASTER PLAN PROJECTS							
New Construction							
Renovations to Building 28	-118	0					
Building 29: Gymnasium at TRC	-	approx. 5,700‡					
CFS: New Forensic Hospital	350§	approx. 571,000					
Community Residential Treatment Facility	48	60,000					
CSTC Cottage	18	18,000					
CSTC Treatment/Recreation Facility	0	30,000					
CSTC High School - 2 new classrooms	0	2,400					
CSTC Admin. & Elementary School	0	16,000					
Demolitions [¶]							
Building 21	-167	-126,574					
Others, w/o inpatient beds	n/a	approx325,500					
WSH projects under master plan, net:	296	approx. +217,630					
Uses on site by others							
Fort Steilacoom Visitor Center	n/a**	4,000					

* This project has been submitted for a permit as BP-0035

† This project was submitted prior to the master plan, under separate approval.

‡ Gymnasium/recreation

§ Maximum bed count for this proposed project.

¶ See Table 8 on page 31 for list of buildings projected for demolition.

** This use is not related to Hospital or DSHS operations. It would be developed and operated by the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association.

MASTER PLAN

LU-20-00027

RECEIVED

03/11/2022 City of Lakewood



Figure 14: Campus Framework

102





Figure 15: Functional Zones

10121



Guiding Principles

Several high-level principles have informed the planning for the next generation of investments at Western State Hospital.

TRANSFORM THE MODEL OF CARE

Providing a new facility that serves contemporary standards of care is a central consideration in the redevelopment of the campus. Western State Hospital is committed to establishing a forensic service that embodies the recovery model of care. This model is person-centered; care staff and the patient work together, often with the involvement of family, to develop a specific and holistic treatment plan for each individual suffering from mental illness.

In addition to acceptance of medical treatment that can alleviate some of the symptoms of mental illness, the patient is guided through multiple therapies that assist in the acquisition and exercising of coping skills. The path to recovery belongs only to each individual patient.

The hospital's delivery of the recovery model of care can and should, within the constraints of the justice system, lead to the return of the individual to the community with the goal of leading a fulfilling life.



Figure 16: Connecting to Nature Views of plants, daylight, and fresh air all support a restorative environment.

IMPROVE CAMPUS EFFICIENCIES

In the process of modernizing the approach to behavioral health care at WSH, this master plan seeks to address inherent inefficiencies that have resulted from prior *ad hoc* site development.

Primary functional areas of the overall Western State Hospital campus have been identified as part of this planning process. These are intended to cluster uses with similar needs and issues together in order to enhance security and reduce a sprawling distribution of services.

The areas are shown on Figure 15 on page 24 and provide several benefits:

- Delineation of open space areas along the northern campus edge. These open spaces are of three types:
 - o Lands zoned as "Open Space/Recreation" by the City of Lakewood
 - Lands with steep slopes along Garrison Springs
 - Lands that are zoned for Institutional development, but are not proposed for development under this master plan
- Separation of the campus areas serving adult populations the western and central areas from the youth-serving facilities at the CSTC area.
- Recognition of the Pioneer Cemetery and historic Fort Steilacoom facilities as unique resources on the WSH campus grounds.





Figure 17: Master Plan Development

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

In order to modernize the WSH facilities, a combination of new and renovated facilities are projected under this master plan. Development standards for new development are indicated in Table 7 on page 29.

NEW FACILITIES

The largest and most transformative development on the campus will be the development of a new 350-bed forensic hospital in the western campus area. This will be developed to contemporary standards with a focus on treatment over incarceration.

The new forensic hospital will be a free-standing facility in which all residential and treatment services are provided in one building. The new construction will also include administrative and support services.

The newly constructed Patient Support Center will continue to provide nutrition and pharmacy services to this new forensic building as well as other treatment buildings on campus. The new building will be designed in conformance with all applicable Codes and FGI^{*} Guidelines for the Design and Construction of Hospitals. The building and its program will adhere to the CMS[†] Conditions of Participation.

NEW HOSPITAL AND MODERNIZED CARE

The new hospital building will support WSH's commitment to the recovery model of care. It will be comprised of 25-bed inpatient units that are subdivided into smaller apartments of 8-9 patient bedroom pods, each with their own social spaces. The organization of the units will allow care staff to observe and engage patients in a variety of spaces of differing character.

By creating a greater number of smaller social spaces, patients have more opportunity to choose where to be and with whom they want to socialize, and thus experience a lower social density. This factor of choice

- in addition to access to nature, personal privacy and the opportunity



Figure 18: Courtyards for Daylight & Views

Internal Courtyards of varying scales will allow daylight into core areas, views of nature, and recreational opportunities that meet security requirements.

to control one's own environment - is proven to reduce the incidence of violence and aggression.

Within the new forensic hospital, in-patient units are connected by neighborhood zones which offer a multitude of consultation, therapy, and activity spaces that allow patients to emerge from their residential area to join neighboring patients in a different environment. These neighborhoods are where recovery work takes place.

Beyond the comfort of the neighborhood is the downtown which offers the unique real-life places where patients can demonstrate their recently acquired skills for coping with their illnesses and prepare for life in the community. The new facility takes advantage of its building perimeter to enclose outdoor courtyards for patient use. There will be no significant amount of security fence visible from the surrounding public ways.

^{*} Facility Guideline Institute, an independent, not-for-profit organization developing guidance for the planning, design, and construction of hospitals and health care facilities.

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, an agency of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)





Figure 19: Massing Approach Preliminary studies illustrate the design intent, including residential wings that would shape courtyard areas and reduce the scale of the building.

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

15 DEC 2021 CONFIGURATION ALTERNATIVES

Through this master planning process as well as a pre-design study[‡] for the forensic hospital, multiple sites and building configurations have been tested. While the building footprint shown in this plan represents the principles and size of the hospital, the final design may vary from the specific footprint shown.

Consistent with LMC 18A.30.150, "Minor Modifications to Approved Conditional Use Permits," building configurations that are equivalent in program and massing shall be considered as minor modifications to this master plan. With regard to location, the LMC provides that:

"The minor modifications shall not relocate a building, parking area, street or other use or built feature in such a way that visual, light, noise, vibration or other impacts as experienced from surrounding properties and public rights-of-way are intensified, and shall not reduce any required yard, setback, buffer or open space below the area or dimensions established by code or conditions of CUP approval, whichever is more restrictive;" (18A.30.150.B.)

As the hospital design is finalized, it will adhere to the "Development Standards for New Construction" on page 29 and is expected to fall within the parameters defined above for a minor modification.

POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT FACILITY (RTF)

In addition to the new forensic hospital, land is identified that would be appropriate for a Residential Treatment Facility to serve civil commitment patients. As described further in "Goals & Project Needs", facilities of this type are to be developed state-wide, and will typically have 16, 32, or 48 beds.

Table 7: Height Limits & Setbacks, New C	Fable 7: Height Limits & Setbacks, New Construction						
Maximum Height of New Construction	up to 5 stories, and less than 100 ft.						
Minimum Setbacks from Street Frontages							
Steilacoom Boulevard SW	75 ft.						
Sentinel Dr.	100 ft.						
87th Avenue SW (no projects proposed along this frontage at this time)	general alignment with existing structures, 45 ft. +/-						

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION

Consistent with the City of Lakewood's Public/Institutional Zoning designation, new facilities developed at the WSH campus will follow provisions of the City of Lakewood's Development Standards (LMC 18A.70.A "Community Design, Landscaping and Tree Preservation, Commercial Uses and Zones"), except where provisions are explicitly overridden by this section of the master plan.

Exceptions to Community Design, Landscaping & Tree Preservation Standards

The following provisions are specific to the WSH aster Plan:

- Heights and Setbacks for development under this master plan shall comply with "Table 7: Height Limits & Setbacks, New Construction".
- 2 Development at WSH shall follow the tree preservation goals to the greatest extent feasible while meeting project needs. See "Tree Retention & Protection" on page 39 for objectives specific to this master plan.
- **3** The design of facilities shall follow contemporary best practices for architectural design, scale and composition, including place-making, sustainable design and daylighting. This approach is in lieu of prescriptive requirements of 18A.70.040.2.

RENOVATIONS

Two existing facilities at the East Campus - **Buildings 28 and 29** - are proposed for significant renovation. Building 28 is operated under the Center for Forensic Services, while Building 29 houses both forensic and civil commitment patients. Together, these two buildings provide patient wards, treatment malls, and a clinic. The renovations are primarily to better serve patients found to be not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI), as well as patients with special needs and security requirements.

Renovations to Buildings 17, 19 and 20 will convert residential wards to other uses, to manage overall site capacity and address unmet needs for staff support, storage and similar uses

Additionally, minor renovations to portions of the Administration Building are expected, to serve administrative functions of the hospital. These will not result in a change of use for the facility and are likely to be phased.

the pre-design study is available on the DSHS website: www.dshs.wa.gov/sites/default/files/FFA/capital/Projects/2020_0821_WSH Predesign Report_reduced.pdf





Figure 20: Anticipated Building & Parking Demolitions

15 DEC 2021

DEMOLITIONS

Several outmoded facilities are proposed for demolition, both to clear land for the new facilities and to address deferred maintenance on older facilities of marginal useful value. These are indicated in Figure 20 on page 30 and summarized in Table 8 on page 31.

DOCUMENTATION OF LISTED STRUCTURES

The Cultural Resources Assessment considers four generally distinct eras as part of the historic assessment:

 Aboriginal 	pre-historic to ongoing
 Exploration and settlement 	1830s to 1849
 Fort Steilacoom 	1849 to 1868
 Western State Hospital 	1871 to 1961

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing for the Fort Steilacoom Historic District identifies as "primary resources" the extant structures from the fort era - the four cottages on the parade grounds and two buildings from the 19th Century associated with the early hospital era - the Morgue and Bakery.

The four cottages at the parade grounds are maintained under this master plan, as is the Settlers' Cemetery and the parade grounds landscape. The bakery and morgue will be demolished.

Several structures that are proposed for demolition in this master plan are listed in the NRHP listing as secondary resources, and are identified as "Contributing" to the Hospital era in the Cultural Landscape Assessment. These secondary resources include (see Figure 11 and Figure 12):

- The last extant cottage, remaining from of a row of five 1930s-era cottages to the east of Officer's Row
- "Powerhouse, Heating Plant and Utility Structure" (Building 4)
- "South Hall and Wards D, E, F, G, and W-I" (1940's)
- "Nurses' Dormitory and Geriatrics Building" (1945)

As described elsewhere, site structures that may be removed in whole or in part include the rock wall along Steilacoom Blvd. and the pedestrian tunnel under that roadway.

Mindful of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of *Historic Properties*, DSHS will take appropriate action prior to demolition of any of these structures.

Table 8: Facility Status under Master Plan

#	Facility Name/Function	Area
New Con	struction	(estimated)*
-	Forensic Hospital	571,000
-	Residential Treatment Facility (48-bed)	60,000
-	Future Cottage (CSTC)	18,000
-	Gymnasium Addition at TRC, Bldg. 29	5,700
-	CSTC Treatment/Recreation	30,000
-	CSTC Admin. & Elem. School Addition	16,000
-	CSTC High School, 2 Classroom Add.	2,400
-	CSTC Ketron Addition	1,300
-	Historic Fort Visitor Center [†]	4,000
	Total New Construction	= 704,400
Demoliti		
9	Staff Offices	96,121
10	Training Center/Carpentry	41,227
11	Commissary	22,350
12	CMO Storage	1,560
13	Pharmacy & Central Services	15,235
14a	Bakery	880
14b	Morgue	1,516
15	Green House	1,826
16a	Main Kitchen & HMH Java Site	33,275
21	Patient Wards	126,574
23	Chapel	7,492
24	Health/Financial Services	11,149
25	Legal Services	15,555
26	not in use	75,644
30 & 31	Connex Containers	(2x160) = 320
44	Cottage	1,350
	Total Demolitions	= 452,074

^{*} New Construction areas are based on preliminary facility planning.

[†] The Fort Visitor Center is a non-hospital facility, to be operated by others.

LU-20-00027 RECEIVED 03/11/2022 City of Lakewood

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS DESCRIPTION

As noted in "Planning Regulatory Context" on page 5, a description of the WSH facilities' operational characteristics is required for approval by the City of Lakewood. The following are the criteria to be addressed in that description, with notes on the criterion and references to other sections with relevant information.

- 1 Description of proposed use/project application.
 - Modernization of WSH facilities through a combination of building replacements and renovations, addressing facility conditions and changes in behavioral health care practices.
 - The largest project will be a new 350-bed forensic hospital on the western area of the current WSH campus. See "Figure 17: Master Plan Development" on page 26.
 - Space for a 48-bed community residential treatment facility is reserved. The State is identifying sites for these facilities, to be distributed around the state, where patients can have access to family and other community support.
 - A new 18-bed residential cottage or the Child Study and Treatment Center (CSTC).
 - A new treatment/recreation center for CSTC.
 - Land is identified for a potential Visitor Center for the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association.
 - A full description of the project elements can be found in the section "History" on page 21.
- 2 Extent and type of proposed improvements to the site and/or interior or exterior building remodeling to existing building(s) (i.e. additions to buildings, interior building improvements or alterations, landscaping, proposed signs, additional parking spaces, etc.).
 - Refer to "Table 8: Facility Status under Master Plan" on page 31, "Figure 17: Master Plan Development" on page 26, and "Figure 20: Anticipated Building & Parking Demolitions" on page 30.
- 3 Proposed number of full and part-time employees.
 - Current staffing is 2,800 full-time equivalents (FTE) across multiple shifts. At build-out, staffing is projected to be up to 3,035 (3,155 with an RTF) with 2,700 FTE on site at any given time; see question 5.
- 4 Proposed number of students on the site at any one time if application is for a day care or educational facility.

- Not applicable
- 5 Maximum numbers of employees on the site at any one time.

Staffing of the hospital varies by shift, as indicated below. Also, staffing levels can fluctuate based on services and the needs of patients. These figures are estimates based on the bed counts indicated in the program, which exceeds the current census. Maximum staff on site at one time would be periods of about 1 hour when the day and swing shifts would overlap, for a total of 2,695.

Shift	Staff FTE (Hospital + CSTC)	Potential RTF
Day	2,040	80
Swing	655	25
Night	340	15

- 6 Proposed hours, days, place and manner of operation.
 - The facilities on the WSH campus operate continuously, with services to residential patients. This pattern is in alignment with existing operations on the site.
- 7 Type of products or services proposed to be available on the site.
 - The services of the site are behavioral health care treatment and related services.
- 8 Number of commercial vehicles proposed to be parked or stored on the site.

Currently, there are approximately 150 commercial or fleet vehicles on the campus, and future numbers are expected to fluctuate around that figure by +/- 10%. They are of several types:

- Maintenance vehicles (currently 82)
- Vehicles assigned to on-site departments (currently 45)
- Motor pool vehicles for regional use by staff (currently 19)
- **9** Traffic (vehicular trips to and from site per day) generated by the use, including deliveries and client-related trips (i.e. any proposed shipping and receiving activities, projected employee trip generation, projected customer trip generation).
 - See "Vehicular access & circulation" on page 35.

10 Total square footage of the floor area of the tenant space.



15 DEC 2021

- There are no significant tenant spaces on the campus. Some administrative offices are used by the Courts and the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association. No change in this current use is proposed under this plan.
- **11** Proposed type of equipment/machinery to be used by the business or stored on site (i.e., office equipment, manufacturing equipment, construction equipment).
 - General maintenance equipment for landscape and facilities maintenance is currently used. No significant change in these operations are anticipated.
- 12 Proposed use of outdoor space on lot (i.e., outdoor storage, outdoor display and sales of merchandise, parking/open space, recreation space).
 - As part of the treatment process, future facilities are expected to have courtyards for patients to recreate and socialize outdoors. These will most likely be fully or partially enclosed by contiguous buildings, as appropriate for treatment and security needs.
 - Existing recreation uses such as the play field at the CSTC facility are to remain and may have minor improvements.
 - The intent of the master plan is to welcome the general public onto areas of interest on the campus grounds, including the Fort Steilacoom area and the former golf course - working with the City, the County, and others as new uses for that site are proposed.
- **13** If more than one tenant on the site, provide the square footage of each tenant space, business names of tenants, and type of business.
 - Western State Hospital's facilities are the primary use of the site.
 - The Historic Fort Steilacoom Association maintains a cluster of historic cottages on the site.
 - Oakridge Community Facility operates under a ground lease with the Department of Children, Youth, and Families.
 - West Pierce Fire & Rescue operates a fire station on the eastern end of the property.
 - Facilities for all of these uses are identified in Table 4 on page 15.

14 Previous use of property.

- Fort Steilacoom was the first Euro-American use of the site and some buildings are extant from that era.
- The hospital has been on the site since the 19th Century, although its facilities and site uses have changed over time.

- See "Hospital History" on page 3 for more detail.
- **15** Existing number of parking spaces.
 - Existing and proposed parking is detailed in Table 10 on page 37.
- **16** Surrounding uses and businesses next to proposed business/project site.
 - Surrounding uses are noted in Figure 6 on page 6.
 - Specific adjacent businesses and institutions include:
 - Oakridge Community Facility (on WSH lands, but independently operated).
 - Steilacoom High School, located across Sentinel Drive to the west.
 - Pierce College at Fort Steilacoom, south of Steilacoom Boulevard.
 - Fort Steilacoom Park south of Steilacoom Boulevard.
 - Oakbrook neighborhood north of the site.
- 17 Operational characteristics or functions that create emission of gases, dust, odors, vibration, electrical interference, smoke, noise, air pollution, light, glare, odor or dust in a manner likely to cause offense or irritation to neighboring residents.
 - There are no industrial processes on the site that would contribute to these types of impacts.
 - Over the long-term, it is expected that energy loads will be shifted to electrical rather than boiler-based heating and cooling, reducing carbon emissions.

18 Site and building design features that minimize land use impacts, such as traffic, aesthetics, etc. or environmental impacts such as noise, vibration, dust or air pollution, glare, odor and dust, etc.

- The scale of new construction will be similar to the scale of existing facilities on the site, with landscaped setbacks from the campus edges.
- Parking is generally away from the campus edges, limiting the potential for glare from parked cars.
- Supporting facilities and service areas are internal to the site, away from campus edges, reducing incidental noise impacts off site.
- **19** Storage, distribution, production and/or operations that involve the use of toxic or flammable materials.
 - Materials used on campus include typical housekeeping cleaning and maintenance supplies and fuel for emergency generators.





Figure 21: Circulation & Parking

100 m

Access, Circulation, & Transportation

MODES OF TRAVEL TO WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL

The majority of staff and visitors to Western State Hospital currently arrive by private vehicle. WSH participates in the State's Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program, providing information on commute options to all new hires and various forms of outreach to build awareness of the program.

Alternatives to drive-alone travel include:

• Public transit service: **Pierce Transit** operates regularly scheduled buses, as well as van-pool support and para-transit services. Route 212 serves the site, with stops along Steilacoom Boulevard, and service west to the Steilacoom ferry landing and east to the Lakewood Transit Center.

Transfers at Lakewood provide connections to the rest of Pierce Transit's service area, including Tacoma, Gig Harbor, and Puyallup.

Approximately 900 employees receive an employer purchased transit pass for Pierce Transit, while 2,023 receive an ORCA pass, for use on the larger regional transit network.

- Carpooling: WSH provides ride-matching services both internal and regional as well as dedicated carpool parking based on demand (see "Table 10: Parking Inventory" on page 37).
- Bicycle and pedestrian network: While the bicycling network around the WSH campus is incomplete, there are paths that would serve local trips well. A trail system in Fort Steilacoom Park - including a multi-use path paralleling Steilacoom Blvd. - help connect the campus to Steilacoom and central Lakewood.

Pierce Transit provides bike racks on all of their buses, providing support for blended bus/bike commuting for longer commutes.

Other programs in place to support commute trip reduction include:

- An internal circulator system for internal campus trips
- A guaranteed ride home program, to support carpool riders who may need to work late or leave early for unscheduled circumstances

VEHICULAR ACCESS & CIRCULATION

The projected traffic volumes are expected to decline as a result of the master plan, as summarized in Table 9 on page 36. These are based on the projected bed counts described in the program.

This master plan proposes several improvements to the vehicular circulation system, to address the following objectives:

• Relocation of vehicular entries to reduce congestion risk on Steilacoom Boulevard.

Moving the eastern Steilacoom Blvd. entry westward will increase separation from the intersection at 87th Av. SW and help separate CSTC-bound trips from those accessing the adult forensic facilities to the west.

- Simplification of the on-site circulation system, to improve way-finding and reduce internal traffic and taking advantage of changes in the campus security system, *i.e.*, with main routes not needing to enter secured areas to cross the site.
- Collaborate with the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association on removal of roads and parking within the core Fort area, east of the main Administration Building.

Steilacoom Boulevard Projects and WSH Access

In preparation of this plan, the City of Lakewood has shared its plans to improve Steilacoom Boulevard. The initial phase, including the WSH frontage has been funded and the plans are being finalized. DSHS and WSH will coordinate with the City to refine the plans to address the revisions to the site access, with the goal of doing all required work on the frontage in one iteration.

VEHICULAR PARKING

Table 10 summarizes both existing and planned parking areas. Lots that will be removed to accommodate planned development will be offset with new spaces.

Currently, most of the staff parking demand is accommodated in parking lots, but there is also a significant amount of informal parking on lawn areas. An objective of this plan is to provide parking that is well distributed

LU-20-00027

RECEIVED

03/11/2022



	Projected	Change from Existing
Average Daily Trips	5,709	-5%
AM trips, 6:30 - 7:30	782	-5%
AM trips, 7:00 - 8:00	639	-5%
PM trips, 2:15 - 3:15	721	-5%
PM trips, 4:00 - 5:00	345	-5%

 * Per TSI, Traffic Impact Analysis Amendment Memo, WSH Master Plan, July 31, 2020, Tables 2 & 3. See Appendix 3B

and will meet the needs of staff and visitors. Parking will be provided in lots developed to City of Lakewood standards and near facilities with significant staffing.

- In addition to the existing lot on the west campus, a new lot will be built north of the new forensic hospital.
- A lot will be provided adjacent to the potential residential treatment facility.

As shown in Table 10 on page 37, parking capacity is projected to exceed the maximum parking counts listed in the Lakewood Zoning Code (18A.80.030,F "Parking Standards Table"). As identified in the Zoning Code, a hospital has a minimum of ½ parking space per bed and a maximum of 1 space/bed.

The reason for the space count shown in Table 10 is related to operational factors. Staff of an incoming shift overlap their time on-site with the prior shift that is ending. This facilitates staff communication and provides continuity of patient care. The maximum space count indicated in the LMC would serve the largest shift, but it does not provide for this period of overlap. This has been a contributing factor to the past practice of staff parking in areas not designated for parking.

SERVICE & LOADING

Service access to the site will be accommodated at the main entries from Steilacoom Boulevard, as well as a service entry from Sentinel Drive to the west. Distribution facilities and loading areas for primary facilities are indicated in the circulation diagram, Figure 21 on page 34.

PATHS & PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

Currently, the WSH campus has some dedicated pedestrian paths between major facilities. Many pedestrians also choose to walk along the roadways on the site. Given the numerous building access points within the central quadrangle of the campus, pedestrian circulation within this area connects to the larger campus system at limited points.

With the change in service model and security approach (see "Site Security" on page 41), there will be opportunities to develop a more deliberate path system. The WSH master plan proposes a path network to connect major facilities while reducing the potential for pedestrian/ vehicular conflict along primary roadways.

Pedestrian Tunnel, Steilacoom Boulevard

The pedestrian tunnel that crosses under Steilacoom Boulevard was built in approximately 1916 and served to connect the southern Fort lands and the hospital area once the road was built. It is in right-of-way but has had significant investment by DSHS in the 2000s.

It is proposed that DSHS and the City coordinate on its management and jointly determine if it will continue to have value through the upcoming improvements to Steilacoom Boulevard. If a decision is made to remove the tunnel, it will be documented as appropriate for contributing historic resources. If the tunnel is left in place, DSHS and the City will seek a maintenance agreement that clarifies their respective roles and responsibilities.

^{*} Per LMC 18A.80.030.D., the Parking Standards Table applies to Commercial, Office and Industrial uses. The table has been used as a guideline for this planning study.

15 DEC 2021

Table 10: Parking Inventory

					Spa	aces	Status	
Area	Tag [*]	General	ADA	Fleet	2020 ⁺	Future	Under Master Plan	Net
EXIST	ING P	ARKING L	OTS					
Hosp	P-1	39	2	0	41	0	Demo	-41
Hosp	P-2	29	2	0	31	0	Demo	-31
Hosp	P-3	116	6	0	123	123	Modify	0
Hosp	P-4	15	1	16	32	32	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-5	350	3	0	355	355	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-6	12	2	0	16	16	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-7	68	2	3	73	73	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-8	22	0	0	22	22	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-9	5	0	0	0	0	Demo	-5
Hosp	P-10	93	2	0	99	99	Modify	0
Hosp	P-11	7	4	2	15	15	Modify	0
Hosp	P-12	5	8	1	16	16	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-13	11	4	3	21	21	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-14	22	6	10	41	41	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-15	25	0	0	25	0	Demo	-25
Hosp	P-16	17	0	0	17	0	Demo	-17
Hosp	P-17	39	0	0	39	0	Demo	-39
Hosp	P-18	26	0	0	26	26	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-22	175	0	0	175	220	Expand, pave	45
Hosp	P-23	34	0	9	43	43	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-24	65	23	13	108	108	Maintain	0
Hosp	P-25	118	6	0	126	126	Maintain	0

Parking lots are shown in Figure 21 on page 34

† 2020 Total includes "General", ADA & Fleet spaces - as listed - as well as Carpool, electric vehicle charging and short-term visitor spaces not itemized here.

					Spa	aces	Status		
Area	Tag [*]	General	ADA	Fleet	2020†	Future	Under Master Plan	Net	
SVC	P-X	0	0	150	150	150	Maintain	0	
CSTC	а	19	1	0	20	20	Maintain	0	
CSTC	b	8	1	0	9	9	Maintain	0	
CSTC	С	19	1	0	20	20	Maintain	0	
CSTC	d	41	0	0	41	41	Maintain	0	
CSTC	е	10	2	0	12	12	Maintain	0	
CSTC	f	11	1	0	12	12	Maintain	0	
CSTC	g	6	0	0	6	6	Maintain	0	
CSTC	h	18	0	0	18	18	Maintain	0	
CSTC	i	6	1	0	7	7	Maintain	0	
CSTC	j	18	1	2	21	21	Maintain	0	
NEW	PARKI	NG LOTS		0	0	·			
Hosp	P-A	-	tbd	-	n/a	400	New	400	
RTF	P-B	-	tbd	-	n/a	160	New	160	
ΤΟΤΑ	LS							·	
-	-	1,442	80	168	1,598	2,045	-	447	



This plan seeks to remove parking from the Fort Steilacoom parade grounds and lawn areas, adding parking near major facilities.





Figure 23: Landscape & Open Spaces

02


Open Space & Landscape

RECREATIONAL USES

The former golf course is zoned by the City of Lakewood as Open Space and Recreation, Type 1 (OSR1). This category is intended for passive recreation and limits any development to uses that are accessory to recreation. This area has historically been accessible to the public and this master plan does not propose to alter that.

Other areas on the site are used for recreation, either by patients of WSH or by others. For example, the CSTC facility includes a playfield to the east of the building complex for use by patients of the facility. In recent years, a disc golf course has been established by a local club on hospital property; DSHS seeks to formalize that use with a new lease of the former golf course.

OPEN SPACE & TREATMENT

Managed open space supports treatment practices. Outdoor walks and recreation for patients provide many wellness benefits. The campus grounds are at times utilized for supervised walks.

While specific design is yet to be developed, the new forensic hospital will include courtyards and other appropriate open areas for patient activities. These will allow regular access to outdoor areas by patients.

HISTORICAL LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

The WSH site has a unique character that reflects the pre-settlement period, historic site development, and current development. There are large groves of Oregon White Oaks and individual Oregon White Oaks spread across the site that have been growing since pre-settlement times. There are also many large Douglas-fir trees across the site that are second growth trees, the old growth Douglas-firs would have been logged at the time of settlement. The old-growth oaks still exist because there was not a market for their wood. There are also many native Madrone trees growing across the site. The Madrone trees are faster growing and shorter lived that the Oaks and Firs and the oldest would be around 100 years old.

With the development of the site rows of trees were planted along roads and hedges were planted between sites to delineate and organize spaces. This combination of existing old growth trees and the rows of street trees and hedges significantly contribute to the unique character of the site.

Some elements of the landscape have been identified in the Cultural Landscape Assessment report as contributing to the historic character of the Fort Steilacoom Historic District. The primary elements of concern are:

- The former settler cemetery
- The parade grounds east of Circle Drive and partially enclosed by the Fort-era cottages.

These facilities are not impacted by proposed projects under this master plan. DSHS and WSH will continue to collaborate with the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association on measures to protect and restore the parade grounds, in relation to that organization's preservation and interpretation mission.

Steilacoom Boulevard Frontage: Rock Wall & Pedestrian Tunnel

The rock wall that lines the site north of Steilacoom Boulevard may be removed, in whole or in part to accommodate new access points, support street improvements, and achieve other project goals. The wall will be documented appropriately prior to its demolition. Additionally, the tunnel under Steilacoom Boulevard may be removed as part of improvements to that corridor.

SENSITIVE LANDS

The ravine between the existing hospital and the former golf course has steep slopes and supports the Garrison Springs fish hatchery. No development is proposed in these areas.

TREE RETENTION & PROTECTION

The new forensic hospital has been sited in a previously developed area of the site, significantly reducing the potentiality impact on trees relative to other areas studied.

The identified oak tree stands on the site are indicated in Figure 23 on page 38. Facilities anticipated in this master plan have been sited to reduce impacts on the oaks to the greatest extent possible. Impacts on the mature oaks can be further reduced in implementation of the plan:

Open Space & Landscape (continued)

- As site-specific designs are prepared, care should be taken to avoid development of hardscapes and building footprints under the drip line of the oaks.
- Irrigation plans for future landscaped areas near the oak stands should avoid over-watering of the root zone.

The Western State Hospital site has significant groves of large existing trees, many of them are older than the 19th century settlement of the site. These significant trees contribute to the character of the site and to the City of Lakewood and are subject to the City of Lakewood Municipal Code 18A.50.320 'Significant Tree Preservation'.

The Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) considers any Quercus garryana (Oregon White Oak) over 6 inch diameter (measured at 4.5' above ground) and any conifers or other deciduous tree species over 9 inch diameter to be 'Significant Trees' that are protected under the LMC.

During construction, all significant trees are to be protected by approved tree fencing located at the drip-line of the trees. There is to be no disturbance to the soil within the tree drip-line or materials store within the drip-line.

A tree retention plan locating all significant trees by species, caliper of each tree, and all tree drip-lines accurately located is required for project permitting. Any significant trees to be removed will need to be replaced according to a formula provided in the Code.



Site Security

Western State Hospital is dedicated to fostering an environment of safety and security for its patients, staff, and neighboring communities. In recent years, WSH has sought to strengthen its partnerships with the Lakewood Police Department and the Steilacoom Police Department to include joint exercises.

ADULT FORENSIC FACILITIES

Forensic patients will be housed in the new forensic hospital and the existing facilities in Buildings 28 and 29. The existing facilities will house patients found not guilty by reason of insanity (NGRI). All facilities for forensic patients are secured at the building perimeter with controlled locked perimeter doors, with vestibules and internal compartmentalization of sub-areas.

The proposed new forensic hospital will include modern security features, integrated with the approach to patient care. Modern design principles for psychiatric facilities include using aesthetically-pleasing walls and courtyards rather than fences, and inclusion of design features into the walls, making them more difficult to scale.

In addition to their security benefits, these design principles also help create more therapeutic facilities that are inviting, aesthetically appealing, and safe. Features like open, well-lit spaces will allow in daylight while using window features that are resistant to breakage.

In addition, the new facility will use key cards and magnetic locks. Key cards and the magnetic locks themselves may be deactivated should a key card become lost or unaccounted for, or if isolation of an area is required. Key cards also allow staff to move swiftly through doors to respond more quickly when needed.

The new facility will offer patients all of their treatment, services, and living arrangements in one facility so there will be minimal need for patients to be escorted across the campus. When patient transport is required, it will be managed with vehicle sallyports, as will deliveries.

The forensic hospital's built-in security features, along with significant security improvements at WSH in general over the past four years - such as fencing, windows, and additional cameras - will result in significantly lower risks of any escapes or unauthorized leaves from the new hospital.

CHILD STUDY & TREATMENT CENTER (CSTC)

As described in the section "Patient Populations & Care Approach" on page 18, the CSTC is a licensed hospital providing culturally competent care to children and youth with severe psychiatric, emotional, and behavioral disorders complicated by medical, social, legal, and developmental issues. CSTC includes families, guardians, and community supporters as participants in the treatment and discharge planning of patients.

CSTC is a locked 24/7 facility which provides a secure placement for patients. The CSTC portion of the WSH campus is not fenced, but the grounds are observed via electronic and general observation.

Staff members are well-trained in the areas of safety and security. Security checks are completed by staff members every 30 minutes to ensure that there have been no elopements. CSTC patients do not have independent grounds privileges and are constantly monitored while on the grounds.

Community outings take place with appropriate staff to patient ratios and contingency plans. Patients' behavior and community readiness are assessed before each outing into the community. Staff members are trained to observe for signs of behavioral escalation and intervene when necessary, both verbally and physically as a last resort.

CSTC utilizes Western State Hospital Security when necessary.



WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN



Figure 24: Site Security Approach

0.20



Utilities & Infrastructure

ENERGY SYSTEMS

Facilities built under this master plan are required to comply with the state's Net Zero Policy (see sidebar). The core requirement is that facilities be "net zero capable" for energy use. It is recommended that DSHS further explore strategies to migrate from gas-fired steam for thermal conditioning, and factor this transition into projections of gas and electrical demand.

ELECTRICAL SERVICE

Electrical service to the WSH campus is provided by Tacoma Power. The existing campus distribution system has two (12.47kV) feeder connections, fed from separate utility substations, as shown in Figure 26 on page 45.

Capacity

Each substation has a nominal capacity of 8MW with a short term thermal rating of 16MW. The conductors that feed that campus have a nominal rating of 4MW each. Tacoma Power has indicated that up to 1 MW of additional demand could be accommodated on each feeder, but that loads in excess of that would require a detailed study of the system^{*}.

A 2018 Campus Essential Electrical Systems assessment of the on-site DSHS distribution system indicated that a substantial portion of the campus essential electrical system is at the end of its useful life. The report recommends replacement of existing equipment to maintain operational redundancies including life safety systems.

Future Demand

With development under this plan - and assuming a similar blend of gas/ electrical fuel split as the campus currently uses - campus electrical use is projected to grow by 55%, with an estimated additional 1 to 2 MW of load on the Tacoma Power grid. There are no infrastructure upgrade projects currently planned for the two substations.

Therefore, if the campus growth does increase demand by more than the 1-2MW preliminary estimate, a new switch and/or new feeder at one

* The system study would require a fee to be paid by Western State Hospital.

or both of the utility substations may be required. Additionally, campus electrical upgrades and modification would likely be required downstream of the utility meter to support future growth. Future campus growth and redevelopment should integrate the 2018 report recommendations.

STEAM DISTRIBUTION & THERMAL CONDITIONING

The boilers in Building 4 - fueled by natural gas - provide steam to most of the campus for heating, domestic hot water, and process loads. Facilities served are indicated in Figure 26. Given the age of the steam system, the State's Net Zero policy, and limits on the gas feed to the boiler room (see below), this master plan assumes that future buildings will not utilize the central steam plant.

In the long-term, DSHS seeks to migrate all facilities from the steam boiler facility and retire it. It is recommended that strategies such as ground-source heat pumps ("geo-exchange") be studied as part of that overall campus conversion. At this time, there is not a specific schedule for doing that.

NATURAL GAS

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is the natural gas supplier to the WSH campus.

System & Capacity

Three gas feeds serve the campus, shown in Figure 26 on page 45. Their current capacities are:

1 A high-pressure (>60psig) service from Sentinel Drive SW to the campus steam system boilers in Building #4. The current demand on this feed is around 37 Therm/hour. This high-pressure line is at capacity and PSE recommends reducing demand on the line.

Depending on how DSHS approaches the State's Net Zero Policy, the demand on the campus steam system and therefore on this feeder line can be reduced significantly.



WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

Washington's Net Zero Policy

Executive Order 18-01, signed by Governor Inslee, requires that facilities be developed as net zero capable, and that renewable energy sources to achieve net zero should be developed when feasible. The order applies to state-owned facilities including new construction or major renovations at WSH.

"...all newly-constructed state-owned (including lease-purchase) buildings shall be designed to be zero energy or zero energy-capable and include consideration of net-embodied carbon. In unique situation where a cost effective zero-energy building is not yet technically feasible, building shall be designed to exceed the current state building code for energy efficiency to the greatest extent possible."

Meeting this goal at WSH will require investment in sources of thermal and electrical energy from non—fossil fuel sources. Examples of sources include:

Thermal Demand (i.e., space heating & cooling, domestic hot water heating):

- Solar thermal
- Bio fuels

Electrical demand:

- · On-site solar photovoltaic or wind generation
- Grid-based solar and wind production

A primary strategy for meeting net zero goals is migration from gas-fired equipment to electrical equipment, when performance and efficiencies can be achieved. Examples of High-Efficient Electric Based Thermal/Domestic Systems are: heat recovery chillers, thermal storage, ground source heat pumps, waterto-water heat pumps

Therefore, a result of meeting the net zero policy mandate over time could be an increase in electrical demand. It is recommended that DSHS develop scenarios to meet the Net Zero policy at WSH in conjunction with providing future demand to Tacoma Power.

Fuel Mix: Tacoma Power



Biomass

Nuclear

Hydro Wind

🔳 Nat. Gas 🔳 Coal

Figure 25: Tacoma Power fuel mix The fuel mix is is mostly hydropower. This will help the WSH campus to meet the Net Zero mandate

Data Source: mytpu.org/about-tpu/ services/power 2 The second service is an intermediate pressure (<60psig) feed from Steilacoom Boulevard near the current eastern driveway and serving the CSTC cluster (Buildings #50-56). The current estimated demand on this feeder is 3 Therm/hour with an estimated future demand of 6 Therm/ hour.

PSE has indicated this feed has no additional capacity, and noted that any modifications to the piping network from this feed could trigger a requirement for a complete natural gas service renovation to comply with current codes.

 3 The third service is also an intermediate pressure (<60psig) feed from Steilacoom Boulevard on the western end of campus serving Building #10. The current estimated demand on this feeder is 1 Therm/hour with an estimated future demand of 16 Therm/hour.

Future Demand

Based on the master plan building area growth projections, it is expected the natural gas demand may increase by 30% for the campus as a whole, assuming a more traditional building system design. Options for achieving an all-electric net zero capable building(s) or campus would reduce natural gas.

Puget Sound Energy has indicated the Far West Drive SW high-pressure utility distribution pipe and each of three campus feeds are near capacity. However, the Steilacoom Boulevard intermediate pressure utility distribution pipe has sufficient capacity to support campus growth.

While the two feeds from Steilacoom Boulevard are at capacity, the utility has indicated the intermediate pressure distribution main in that street has sufficient capacity for increased demand if a new service is brought onto campus.

Based on master plan development/expansion on the west side of campus, in particular, the current service would need replacement. Additionally, care should be taken for the routing of new services and avoid crossing over/under existing natural gas lines.



Figure 26: Utility Services & Opportunities



WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER PLAN

WATER SYSTEMS

WATER SUPPLY

Groundwater has met the needs of Fort Steilacoom and the hospital since the start of American settlement on the site that is now WSH. WSH maintains its water rights and wells to meet present needs. The campus system includes two wells with storage tanks and a network of supply lines.

Existing water main sizes vary from 4 inches to 8 inches and are made from various materials, as they have been extended over time. Fire suppression - including fire hydrants and sprinkler systems - and domestic services are tapped from these private water mains.

Lakewood Water District (LWD) and DSHS have had preliminary discussions regarding the potential to incorporate Western State Hospital into the LWD service area, either partially or entirely[†].

LWD has "connection-ready" services extended to each of the campus supply lines in the event the well supply is either unavailable or unsafe. These connection points would be utilized if a decision is made to fully connect the campus to the District's system.

Discussions on conversion of the overall system are on-going, although DSHS' intent is that new major facilities - the new forensic hospital and potential residential treatment facility - would be connected to LWD service.

Prior to assuming any of Western State Hospital's existing infrastructure into their purview, LWD would need to confirm the condition of the existing water infrastructure, including wells, storage facilities, and supply lines. Depending on results of these evaluations, LWD may incorporate only some of the existing water lines and the campus may elect to build new water infrastructure as part of a developer extension agreement.

If the District's service is extended to the WSH campus, the following criteria would apply:

- Provide at least two points of connection to the off-campus system, with interconnection on the campus.
- Upgrade the on-campus system wherever it will be part of the LWD main distribution network.
- + Lakewood Water District is an independent district e.g., not a city agency and secures its water fully from groundwater sources.

- Provide a through-campus connection to the existing LWD reservoir east of the former golf course site.
- Provide appropriate metering and backflow prevention at all points where the LWD mains will connect to WSH-maintained distribution lines.

SANITARY SEWER

The campus sewer system is privately owned and maintained and discharges to the public sewer system operated by the Town of Steilacoom. The Town's collection system feeds via pump to the Pierce County Wastewater Plant located along Chambers Creek.

Based on conversations with both WSH operations staff and Steilacoom Public Works, the internal collection system has adequate capacity, particularly since some new developments will replace existing developments, thus offsetting some of the additional capacity requirements. Determining the existing sewage flow through this campus sewer system is complicated since there are presently few water meters to provide a baseline for water use information. Also, many of the existing buildings are old enough, are varied in use, and have unique uses which make standard engineering estimates unreliable for this campus. As an assumed baseline, Steilacoom Public Works is charging Western State Hospital 1,500 REU's (residential equivalent units) each month.

The connection to the Steilacoom sewer system is at the southwest corner of the WSH campus, as indicated in Figure 26 on page 45. This connection is being upgraded, including the addition of a meter. Western State Hospital, in agreement with Steilacoom Public Works, will soon install a flume on the last section of private sewer main to measure the actual sewer flow discharging to the public sewer system. This data will allow for updated data on actual collection from the hospital campus.

Future development will require additional sewer capacity charges and will based on the calculated sewer demand from Pierce County Public Works and Utilities "Documented Water Use Data". The total future sewer capacity will be the current sewer capacity of the current campus development plus the sewer demand for any proposed developments and minus the removed buildings.

Pierce County Public Works has encouraged WSH to provide additional water monitoring on the campus, to support water conservation and support more accurate sewer demand estimates. WSH will evaluate enhanced water metering and monitoring as part of future projects.

15 DEC 2021

Any new developments which include food preparation facilities will need to include grease interceptors between the source of grease waste and the sewer main. These interceptors typically include exterior concrete vaults that will capture and store grease.

RAIN WATER

Western State Hospital is situated on gravely-sandy soils with medium to high infiltration rates. Currently, catch basins on campus are piped and flow to a combination of campus retention facilities or direct discharge to Chambers Creek. Infiltration systems range from 'formal' designed systems with a defined storage capacity sized per specific development requirements or 'informal' systems consisting of downspouts spilling onto the ground, for some older facilities.

Proposed developments will need to provide infiltration systems designed to address both treatment and infiltration requirements of the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and other applicable regulations as administered by the City of Lakewood. Existing storm systems will not need to be replaced unless they are determined to be undersized for runoff discharging from new, upstream developments.

Proposed systems may include open infiltration ponds (where space allows) and underground storage pipes, vaults, and/or trenches. Ideally, infiltration systems will be located near the development, but site-specific features may dictate other locations on campus are more suitable. The gravely nature of the native soils will be conducive for on-site stormwater management systems such as bio-retention areas or porous pavements, particularly for stormwater discharging from 'clean' areas such as roofs or plaza areas.

Runoff from pollution-generating surfaces (i.e. parking lots and access drives) will need to be routed to a water quality treatment facility to remove particulates before discharging to the native soils. Typical water quality treatment systems include bio-retention areas, cartridge media filters, or below-grade concrete storage vaults.

Specific engineering of future systems will be included at the project level. Site-specific geotechnical analysis will be required to determine infiltration rates in the native soil and location requirements (such as setback distances from sensitive areas).

Acknowledgments

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL & HEALTH SERVICES (DSHS) MASTER PLAN LEADERSHIP

- Robert Hubenthal, Chief, Office of Capital Programs
- Aarón Martinez, Project Manager

WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL LEADERSHIP

- David Holt, Chief Executive Officer
- Danielle Cruver, Chief Operating Officer
- Chris Campbell, Deputy Chief Operating Officer
- Charles Southerland, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
- Kathy Spears, Chief Director of Communications
- Daniel Davis, Chief of Safety & Security
- Dr. Katherine Raymer, Chief Medical Officer
- Karen Pitman, Chief Nursing Officer
- Brian Wood, Chief Nursing Officer
- Bill Hamilton, Deputy Chief Medical Officer
- Joey Roberts, Facilities Office
- Dolynda Allen, CFS Administrator
- Linda C. Silva, Chief Quality Officer
- Angel Lugo Steidel, Chief Clinical Officer
- Michael Rogers
- Dominique Jordan

DSHS - OTHER AFFILIATIONS

- Clynn Wilkinson, Project Manager
- Lea McCormick, Project Manager
- Sean Murphy, Assistant Secretary
- Ken Taylor, Special Assistant
- Tony Bowie, Chief Executive Officer at CSTC
- Rick Mehlman, Prior Chief Executive Officer at CSTC
- Erik Logan, Director of Nursing at CSTC
- Kristi Sigafoos, Administrative Assistant at CSTC
- Carl Gray, Safety Officer at CSTC
- David Luxton, Development Administrator

- Jennifer Masterson, Senior Budget Assistant
- Carly Kujath, Capital Budget Assistant
- Devon Nichols, Budget Assistant
- Dr. Bill Hamilton, Deputy Chief Medical Officer
- Richard Morris

CONSULTANT TEAM

SRG PARTNERSHIP

- Craig Tompkins
- Pierce McVey
- Jon Mehlschau
- Eric Ridenour
- Carl Hampson
- Eric Reynaert

ARCHITECTURE +

- Francis Pitts
- Sara Wengert
- Hiroki Sawai

TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS INC.

• Jeffrey Hee

COUGHLIN PORTER LUNDEEN

• Keith Kruger

AFFILIATED ENGINEERS/AEI

• Sean Lawler

MURASE ASSOCIATES

• Mark Tilbe

PBS ENGINEERING & ENVIRONMENTAL

- Patrick Togher
- Tom Mergy

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1	SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH
APPENDIX 2	POLICY BRIEF
APPENDIX 3A	TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSIS
APPENDIX 3B	TIA SUPPLEMENTAL MEMO
APPENDIX 4	PROPERTY SURVEY
APPENDIX 5	NATURAL RESOURCES RECONNAISANCE
APPENDIX 6	STORMWATER CREDIT FEASIBILITY STUDY
APPENDIX 7	PATIENT RELEASE PROCEDURES
APPENDIX 8	SEPA CHECKLIST

EXHIBITS 5-7 STAFF REVIEW/NOTICE OF APPLICATION DOCUMENTS



EXHIBIT #5

May 26, 2020

Don Anderson Mayor

Jason Whalen Deputy Mayor

Mary Moss Councilmember

Michael D. Brandstetter Councilmember

> John Simpson Councilmember

> Linda Farmer Councilmember

> Paul Bocchi Councilmember

John J. Caulfield City Manager DSHS Attn: Robert Hubenthal 1115 Washington Street SE Olympia, WA 98504

RE: Complete Application LU20-00027 & LU20-00030 Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan Site address: 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW (APN#0220283026; -027; 0220031007; 0220321022)

The Community & Economic Development Department (CED) staff has completed a third preliminary review of the Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan application submitted on February 14, 2020. This letter is being issued pursuant to LMC 18A.20.050 in order to provide written confirmation that all necessary documents have been provided and the application has been <u>deemed complete</u>.

CED Department staff will forward the proposal for review to any affected local and State agencies. Public Notice will be distributed to neighboring property owners, published on the City's website, in *The Tacoma News Tribune* and posted on the property's frontages. The public and relevant agencies will have 30 days from the date that the notice is issued to comment on the project.

If returned for additional modifications, the applicant shall submit the necessary revisions to the CED Department reflecting the required changes within ninety (90) days after said notice of correction is given by the reviewing City Departments.

If you have questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (253) 983-7839 or cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us.

Sincerely,

Courtney Brunell, MPA Planning Manager

Cc: Eric Ridenour, SRG Partnership

EXHIBIT #6



COMBINED NOTICE OF APPLICATION CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT June 10, 2020

To review the application, submittal documents and make comment please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has submitted project applications for a new Master Facilities Plan and SEPA Environmental Checklist with the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department. The following is a description of the applications and the process for review.

<u>APPLICATION NUMBER AND NAME</u>: LU-20-00027 Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan; LU-20-00030 Western State Hospital SEPA

<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>: The State Department of Social and Health Services has proposed a complete reconstruction of Western State Hospital and its campus. The proposed master plan update proposes an expansion of the hospital capacity including:

- 1. A new 350-bed forensic hospital on the property. This will require the demolition of several existing buildings on site.
- 2. A new 18-bed residential cottage at the Child Study and Treatment Center.
- 3. A new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region.

Long term, the state's goal is to transition the hospital to serve primarily forensic patients (those who have been processed through the criminal justice system) and fewer civil commitment patients, which make up the majority of the approximately 850 patients on site today.

To support the new buildings, infrastructure and circulation improvements are also included in the proposal.

PROJECT LOCATION: 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW (APN#0220283026; -027; 0220321007; 0220321022)

ZONING: Public Institutional (PI)

PERMIT APPLICATION DATE: February 14, 2020

DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: May 26, 2020

<u>OTHER PERMITS/PLANS WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED</u>: Design Review, Building Permits, Plumbing/ Mechanical Permits, Electrical Permits by L & I, Site Development Permits, Right-of-Way Permit, Tree Removal Permit, Water Main Extension, Sanitary Sewer Extension.

<u>SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS:</u> SEPA Application, SEPA Checklist, Master Facilities Plan Application, Master Plan Report, Natural Resource Reconnaissance, Policy Brief, Property Survey, Stakeholder Outreach, Storm water Credit study, Transportation Impact Analysis, Aerial Map, Assessor Map, Civil 16 Bed Study, Civil 48 bed Study, Title Report, Additional Siting Criteria for Mental Health Facilities

<u>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</u>: The City of Lakewood has been designated as lead agency for this proposal. At this time, the City is requesting a "pre-threshold consultation" prior to issuing a threshold determination on the submitted documents.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: June 10, 2020- July 10, 2020

All persons may provide written comments about the proposal to the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department at 6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, WA. 98499, online at https://wshmasterplan.org or by email to cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us. Comments must be received by 5 P.M. on July 10, 2020. Any person wishing to become a party of record should include the request with their comments.

TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING DATE: TBD

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Applicant: Bob Hubenthal, DSHS (all questions regarding the application should be forwarded to City staff below) **City:** Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager,6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, WA 98499. Contact: (253) 983-7839 or cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us



To review the application, submittal documents and make comment please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>



SECOND COMBINED NOTICE OF APPLICATION CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT June 7, 2021

To review the resubmittal and make comment please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>. Note: All comments received during the initial comment period (June 10-July 10, 2020) will be included in the project record.

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has resubmitted project applications for a new Master Facilities Plan and SEPA Environmental Checklist with the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department. The Application was resubmitted on May 12, 2021. The following is a description of the applications and the process for review.

<u>APPLICATION NUMBER AND NAME</u>: LU-20-00027 Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan; LU-20-00030 Western State Hospital SEPA.

<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>: The State Department of Social and Health Services has proposed a complete reconstruction of Western State Hospital and its campus. The proposed master plan update proposes an expansion of the hospital capacity including:

- 1. A new 350-bed forensic hospital on the property. This will require the demolition of several existing buildings on site.
- 2. A new 18-bed residential cottage at the Child Study and Treatment Center.
- 3. A new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region.

Long term, the state's goal is to transition the hospital to serve primarily forensic patients (those who have been processed through the criminal justice system) and fewer civil commitment patients, which make up the majority of the approximately 850 patients on site today.

To support the new buildings, infrastructure and circulation improvements are also included in the proposal.

PROJECT LOCATION: 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW (APN#0220283026; -027; 0220321007; 0220321022)

ZONING: Public Institutional (PI)

PERMIT APPLICATION DATE: February 14, 2020

DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: May 26, 2020

<u>OTHER PERMITS/PLANS WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED</u>: Design Review, Building Permits, Plumbing/ Mechanical Permits, Electrical Permits by L & I, Site Development Permits, Right-of-Way Permit, Tree Removal Permit, Water Main Extension, Sanitary Sewer Extension.

<u>REVISED SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS</u>: Master Facilities Plan Report was submitted on May 12, 2021.

<u>SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS</u>: Other documents received include the SEPA Application, SEPA Checklist, Master Facilities Plan Application, Master Plan Report, Natural Resource Reconnaissance, Policy Brief, Property Survey, Stakeholder Outreach, Storm water Credit study, Transportation Impact Analysis, Aerial Map, Assessor Map, Civil 16 Bed Study, Civil 48 bed Study, Title Report, Additional Siting Criteria for Mental Health Facilities

<u>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</u>: The City of Lakewood has been designated as lead agency for this proposal. At this time, the City is requesting a "pre-threshold consultation" prior to issuing a threshold determination on the submitted documents.

SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: June 7, 2021- July 7, 2021

All persons may provide written comments about the proposal to the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department at 6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, WA. 98499, online at https://wshmasterplan.org or by email to cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us Comments must be received by 5 P.M. on July 7, 2021. Any person wishing to become a party of record should include the request with their comments.

TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING DATE: TBD

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Applicant: Bob Hubenthal, DSHS (all questions regarding the application should be forwarded to City staff below) **City:** Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager,6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, WA 98499. Contact: (253) 983-7839 or cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us



To review the application, submittal documents, including a version that highlights the most recent changes, and make comment please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>

EXHIBITS 8-24 PUBLIC/AGENCY COMMENTS



Western State Hospital Master Plan Comment Matrix

The City of Lakewood received a proposed update to the Western State Hospital (WSH) Master Plan in fall 2020 that includes the complete reconstruction of the hospital and its campus near Fort Steilacoom Park. Lakewood is the lead agency for environmental review of the proposal under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). A Revised Master Plan application and Revised SEPA Checklist were submitted to Lakewood in May 2021. The City reopened public comment on both documents between June 7 and July 7, 2021. The period was extended to July 12, 2021 to account for unanticipated downtime of the City's web portal. The comments submitted from June 7 to July 12 are identified in the matrix below in summary fashion by the name, topics, and date of the letters/comments. The full set of comments are available, here: https://wshmasterplan.org/view-public-comments. The City is reviewing these comments along with the revised application material as the City considers a threshold determination under SEPA.

Western State Hospital Master Plan Comment Matrix

	Last Name	Full Name	Comment Topic Summary	Date
1	Adams	Ross Adams	request for notifications	6/12/2021
2	Agee	Jackie Agee	forest habitat clearance	6/24/2021
3	Andersen	Carol and Steve Andersen	request project notifications	6/14/2021
4	Bailey	Andrea Bailey	support for mentally ill population	6/21/2021
5	Bell	Jane Bell	opposition, siting, community safety	6/10/2021
6	Benedetti	Karla Benedetti	concern, siting	6/11/2021
7	Bergman	Zach Bergman	disc golf	6/15/2021
8	Boguszewski	Betty Boguszewski	opposition, community safety	7/10/2021
9	Bolstad	Maribeth Bolstad	siting, community safety	6/19/2021
10	Boucher	Jennifer Boucher	siting, community safety	6/20/2021
11	Campbell	Carol Campbell	support	7/7/2021
12	Campbell	Kevin Campbell	opposition, community safety, state mismanagement	7/12/2021
13	Chamberlain	Gina Chamberlain	mental health support	6/13/2021
14	Clauson	Sandra Clauson	opposition, cost, ineffectiveness of WSH system	6/21/2021
15	Dean	Melissa Dean	reintegration of patient population, group homes, community safety	6/29/2021
16	Disability	Disability Rights Washington	opposition to demolition of Fort Steilacoom Competency Restoration Program facility	7/9/2021
17	Eshelman	Virginia Eshelman	request project notifications and documents	6/16/2021

	Last Name	Full Name	Comment Topic Summary	Date
18	Facebook	Facebook comment thread (multiple commenters)	skepticism of need for new facility, support for upgrade	6/12/2021
19	Ferguso	Pamela Ferguso	mental illness treatment, criminalization of mental illness	7/2/2021
20	Fife	City of Fife	no comment	6/29/2021
21	Gallinatti	James and Linda Gallinatti	opposition, siting, community safety	6/11/2021
22	Garcia	Thomas Garcia	disc golf	6/15/2021
23	Godmintz	Joanne Godmintz	opposition, facility population	6/19/2021
24	Gorley	Judy Gorley	support for mentally ill population	6/19/2021
25	Graham	Jordan Graham	siting, property values	7/2/2021
26	Нарру	Rita Happy-Wheeler	historic preservation, siting	6/18/2021
27	Harris	Angela Harris	support for incarceration of mentally ill offenders	7/7/2021
28	Helland	Doug Helland	opposition, siting, community safety	7/9/2021
29	Historic	John McPherson, Historic Fort Steilacoom Association	support, historic preservation, site plan design	6/21/2021
30	Historic	Joe Lewis, Historic Fort Steilacoom Association	support, historic preservation, site plan design	6/25/2021
31	Hoglund	Jordan Hoglund	disc golf	6/13/2021
32	Jones	Patricia Jones	opposition, siting	6/11/2021
33	Keller	Anthony Keller	opposition, siting	6/13/2021
34	Lebegue	Breck Lebegue MD MPH	stepdown facilities, appearance and massing of buildings, landscaping	7/1/2021
35	Mack	Dennis Mack	oppose expansion beyond current footprint	6/19/2021
36	Mandeville	Kathy Mandeville	opposition, siting, community safety	6/11/2021
37	Matsukawa	Jennifer Matsukawa	opposition, community safety	6/21/2021
38	Меу	Sundegna Mey	opposition, siting, relocation, community safety	6/21/2021
39	Micone	Patty Micone	opposition, siting	6/11/2021
40	Mona Watson	Mona Watson	siting, community safety	6/22/2021
41	Morones	Joyce Morones	siting, community safety, facility security	7/3/2021
42	Munoz	Edward Munoz	park, disc golf	6/13/2021
43	Myers	Stephen Myers	opposition, siting	6/11/2021

	Last Name	Full Name	Comment Topic Summary	Date
44	Myers	Stephen Myers	opposition, siting	6/22/2021
45	Р	G P	support, institution name	6/22/2021
46	Peltor	Van Peltor	disc golf	6/14/2021
	Pierce Transit	Pierce Transit	bus stop, commuters	7/7/2021
47	PSCAA	Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	environmental regulations	6/7/2021
48	Public Works	City of Lakewood Public Works	traffic, bridge, future coordination	7/8/2021
49	Radzyminski	John Radzyminski	community safety, nuisances	7/10/2021
50	Reid	Christopher Reid	opposition, facility population	6/19/2021
51	Saylor	Maureen Saylor	support, hospital improvements	6/21/2021
52	Scott	Devin Scott	facility design, security, staff and patient safety	6/10/2021
53	Scott	Devin Scott	facility design, security, communication systems	6/14/2021
54	Shehan	Linda Shehan	opposition, siting	6/14/2021
55	Slusarenko	Meaghan Slusarenko	opposition, siting, community safety	6/15/2021
56	Smith	Lawrence Smith	opposition, siting, community safety	7/2/2021
57	Thompson	Harriett Thompson- Triquart	opposition, siting, community safety	6/10/2021
58	Thorne	Jan Thorne	opposition, siting, community safety	6/11/2021
59	Thornton	Mary Thornton	support for mentally ill population	6/21/2021
60	Trahan	Nicole and Mark Trahan	siting, community safety	6/11/2021
61	Troy	Kent Troy	reintegration of patient population	7/2/2021
62	Trueit	Jennifer Trueit	opposition	6/19/2021
63	Tyre	Diana Tyre	opposition, community safety	6/22/2021
64	Vonderscheer	Eric A Vonderscheer	opposition, siting, community safety, statewide resources for mentally ill	6/21/2021
65	Vonderscheer	Eric A Vonderscheer	public comment period, siting, community safety, reintegration of patient population, concentration of mental health facilities in Pierce County	7/9/2021
66	Wells	Michele Wells	opposition, mentally ill population	6/24/2021
67	Winchel	Jennifer Winchel	opposition, siting	6/20/2021

Courtney Brunell

From: Sent: To: Subject: Tiffany Speir Monday, June 29, 2020 1:40 PM Courtney Brunell FW: Reminder - please comment on Wester State Hospital Master Plan update by July 10, 2020

Tiffany Speir*, Esq., CPM® Planning Manager - Long Range/Strategic Planning CITY OF LAKEWOOD 253.983.7702 | c 253.204.9643 | <u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u>

*Tiffany Speir does not provide legal representation for the City of Lakewood

www.lakewoodstation.org



From: Steve Friddle [mailto:sfriddle@cityoffife.org]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 1:38 PM
To: Tiffany Speir <tspeir@cityoflakewood.us>
Cc: Jennifer Miller <jmiller@cityoffife.org>
Subject: Re: Reminder - please comment on Wester State Hospital Master Plan update by July 10, 2020

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood. Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.

- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hi Tiffany,

Thank you for the reminder. Fife has no comment.

Best wishes,

Steve Friddle Fife Community Development Director

From: Tiffany Speir <<u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u>>

Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 10:55 AM

To: Tiffany Speir <<u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u>>

Cc: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>

Subject: Reminder - please comment on Wester State Hospital Master Plan update by July 10, 2020

This is a reminder that there are only two weeks left to comment on the new Western State Hospital (WSH) Environmental Checklist (SEPA) and Master Facilities Plan. The City of Lakewood has been designated as lead agency for this proposal and is requesting comments on the SEPA checklist and associated documents prior to issuing a threshold determination.

Under the WSH Master Plan update application, it is proposed that the campus be entirely redeveloped and most civil patients that have historically been located at WSH instead be housed in community centers throughout the state.

To review the application, submittal documents and make comment please visit: https://wshmasterplan.org/ Comment Period: June 10- July 10, 2020

Proposal Name: Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan LU-20-00027; Western State Hospital SEPA LU-20-00030

Proposal: The State Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has proposed a complete reconstruction of Western State Hospital and its campus.

The proposed master plan update proposes an expansion of the hospital capacity including:

- 1. A new 350-bed forensic hospital on the property. This will require the demolition of several existing buildings on site.
- 2. A new 18-bed residential cottage at the Child Study and Treatment Center.
- 3. A new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region.

Long term, the state's goal is to transition the hospital to serve primarily forensic patients (those who have been processed through the criminal justice system) and fewer civil commitment patients, which make up the majority of the approximately 850 patients on site today.

To support the new buildings, infrastructure and circulation improvements are also included in the proposal.

Applicant: Robert Hubenthal, DSHS (all questions regarding the application should be forwarded to Courtney Brunell at <u>cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us</u>)

Location of Proposal: 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW (APN#0220283026; -027; 0220321007; 0220321022)

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Courtney Brunell, MPA Planning Manager City of Lakewood, WA (253) 983-7839 | <u>cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us</u> Like us on <u>Facebook</u> Follow us on <u>Twitter</u>

This is an external email. Please use caution when opening any attachments.

EXHIBIT #10



July 9, 2020

City of Lakewood Attn: Community and Economic Development Department 6000 Main Street SW Lakewood, WA. 98499 <u>cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us</u>

On behalf of the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce, thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment on the proposed changes outlined in the update to the Western State Hospital "Master Plan."

We understand there are currently two other proposals under consideration by the legislature. Unfortunately, we have not seen those proposals to determine if this "Master Plan" has merit.

In reading the "Master Plan," we have more questions than answers as presented.

Why does DSHS want to build another forensic hospital in Lakewood? We understand that Western State Hospital already has a forensic unit that is currently being used. If a new one is built, what would the existing forensic unit be used for, if at all?

The plan indicates that DSHS wants to "temporarily" expand hospital capacity ~ and in the long-term, transition the hospital to serve primarily forensic patients. That leaves 850 civilly committed patients to go where? The four (4) for-profit enhanced facilities for civilly committed patients don't appear to have a very good track record, and that appears to be the direction the state is looking at providing/building for current Western State patients. No specific plans for locations/facilities with occupancy information have been provided.

If we understand correctly, additional facilities with the capacity for at least 850 beds will be needed throughout the state. Preliminary numbers show Washington could lose \$7 billion in state revenue through 2023 as the coronavirus pandemic takes its toll. Where does that leave us in Lakewood? A partially built forensics unit? No budget to relocate current patients to proper facilities?

Will the state continue to abuse our city by allowing more adult residential homes? We already have a significant percentage ~ which is one-third of all adult family homes in Pierce County. Our concern is the state will undoubtedly run out of money with no well thought out plan ~ thus, overburdening the City of Lakewood with more social service needs.

It is our hope that DSHS will come back with a more thoughtful and detailed plan. Clearly, the health and safety of our community do not seem to be taken into consideration at all.

Thank you for this opportunity to add our voice.

Best regards,

Linda Smith President/CEO



Don Anderson Mayor

Jason Whalen Deputy Mayor

Mary Moss Councilmember

Michael D. Brandstetter Councilmember

John Simpson Councilmember

Linda Farmer Councilmember

Paul Bocchi Councilmember

John J. Caulfield City Manager July 17, 2020

Courtney Brunell Planning Manager City of Lakewood

Courtney,

The purpose of this letter is to provide comments from the Lakewood Police Department on the Western State Hospital (WSH) Master Plan submitted to the City for review.

In reviewing the plan (Revision #3, LU-20-00027), I understand that it calls for the construction of a new 350-bed Forensic Hospital on the grounds. This is in addition to two current projects designed to increase the existing Center for Forensic Services (CFS) by 98 beds. Simultaneously, it calls for a reduction in Civil Commitment beds from 500 down to 153. They indicate this is part of their overall strategy of distributing new civil commitment treatment facilities in communities throughout the state, rather than consolidated at WSH. Although, this Master Plan does call for a possible new 48-bed Residential Treatment Facility on the campus.

In general, the Police Department is not opposed to the strategy of transitioning WSH into a largely forensic hospital with a much lower civil commitment population. From our experience, we receive far fewer calls for service and reports of criminal acts occurring in the forensic wards, largely due to the higher security and staffing levels found in those facilities versus the lower levels in the civil wards. In that sense, we would prefer properly designed, constructed, and managed forensic wards over civil commitment wards.

We do, however, have three primary concerns as illustrated in this Master Plan. The first is the design and security protocols in the new forensic hospital. This Plan seems to indicate less restricted patient movement and increased interaction, with both staff and other patients. This is a cause for concern as it increases the risk of assaultive behavior, one of the more common police calls for service to the WSH. We would ask for much more

EXHIBIT #11



detail on the design and operation of this planned forensic hospital to be included in this Master Plan.

The second area of concern is the planned Residential Treatment Facility (RTF). In this Plan, they indicate they are reserving space for such a facility. This type of facility would not have the same level of security and supervision as a forensic hospital and, in our experience, would create an increase in calls for service. We would like more information on what process will be used to determine whether this facility is located on the WSH campus and how its' impacts would will be mitigated.

The third area of concern is whether the total number of forensic beds does, in fact, decrease as depicted in Table 1, Page iii. This Plan states that the current addition and renovation to the CFS will add 98 beds within the next 1-5 years to a total of 458 forensic beds. According to the plan, these beds would decrease to 183 once the new forensic hospital is built. Our concern is that after spending significant capital to add and renovate to these existing structures, they will not be downsized but kept near full occupancy or transitioned to other use, such as civil commitment beds. This would create the potential for 808 forensic beds in three separate buildings on the campus. The Plan indicates that the projected population of the CFS is "TBD" after ten years. This indicates that the CFS very well could return to full occupancy, as needed, in the future.

We enjoy a great partnership with the Western State Hospital and have every hope that this will continue to be a lasting, positive relationship. We look forward to additional information regarding our concerns outlined above. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Unfred

John C. Unfred Assistant Police Chief

July 10, 2020

Courtney Brunell, MPA Planning Manager City of Lakewood 6000 Main Street Lakewood, WA 98499



RE: Western State Hospital Master Site Plan 2020

Dear Mrs. Brunell

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Western State Hospital Master Site Plan 2020. The City of University Place has the following questions and comments regarding the proposal.

1) Under Project Need in the Master Site Plan Executive Summary it states in part "A core goal of the new state policy is to distribute services for civil commitment patients throughout the state, so that patients can be near family and community support. The model for this care is a combination of community hospitals and residential treatment facilities of 16 to 48 beds each."

While under Project Description it states in part "The master plan also allocates space for a new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region."

Taking these two statements together it would appear that the intent is to site services for civil commitment patients throughout the state, but only site community residential treatment facility throughout the region. To be equitable community residential treatment facilities should be sited across the state rather than just the region.

- 2) The statement "The master plan also allocates space for a new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region." is somewhat confusing. Does this mean the 48-bed facility will not be sited at the WSH campus until the study is complete and if so, will the civil commitment patients remain in existing facilities at the WSH campus until the study and the 48-bed facility are both completed?
- 3) Is the parallel study available for review and comment?
- 4) The Executive summary states in part "The approach to behavioral health care has also evolved, meaning that many of the WSH facilities are no longer well-suited to the provision of core services..." making a distinction between forensic patients and "civil commitment" "patients (those determined by the courts to be a potential danger to themselves or the public, but not accused of a crime)." The Executive Summary also states in part "A core goal of the new state policy is to distribute services for civil commitment patients throughout the state, so that patients can be near family and community support."

A significant problem with this approach is the lack of support from communities and families that do not have the financial resources or ability to cope with patients that are a potential danger to themselves or the public. As a result, many of these patients end up amongst our homeless population to fend for themselves with very little support.

5) The Environmental Checklist asks, "Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?" To which the Applicant replied "Approval of the Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in displacement. However, the WSH MSP states a core goal of the project is to displace or move the majority of the civil commitment patents offsite and resettle them across the region.

Tel 253.566.5656 Fax 253.566.5658

www.CityofUP.com

The Applicant should address this displacement and state how the impacts associated with this displacement will be mitigated.

6) Likewise, the Applicant states the hospital is not considered housing units and therefore there will be no impacts associated with housing.

"Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

None proposed. The Master Plan and construction of the individual projects will not result in housing impacts."

If civil commitment patients are to be moved into adult family homes and other types of housing, there will be housing impacts associated with the project.

- 7) In the Environmental Checklist under Public Services the Applicant responded to the following questions as follows:
 - 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 proposed Master Plan improvements will not result in an increased need for public services, including fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, or schools.

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

None proposed. The proposed Master Plan improvements will not result in an increased need for public services. The environmental checklist

The Applicant should explain how increasing the population at WSH with a concentration of forensic patients will not have an impact to public services. Likewise, the Applicant should address what impacts will result from distributing the civil commitment patient population into other locations in the state / region and mitigation for those impacts.

- 8) Civil commitment patients have been moved into numerous adult family homes in the vicinity of WSH. Will this practice continue? If so, are there any efforts to distribute the location of these adult family homes to areas where patients originated from rather than concentrating them in the greater Lakewood, Steilacoom and University Place area.
- 9) University Place Police operate well below any peer jurisdiction regarding staffing and available resources. Until and unless additional funding is identified to be address acute mental health emergency response services, the City of University Place needs to take pro-active measures to mitigate these calls on our calls for service volume. We hope that the Western State Hospital planners consider the unintended consequences of these decisions into consideration as patients are re-integrated into our region.

Should you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact me a DSwindale@cityofup.com.

Sincerely,

Courtney Brunell, MPA July 21, 2020 Page 3

David Swindale, AICP Director, Planning and Development Services

_

Courtney Brunell

EXHIBIT #13

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Squarespace <no-reply@squarespace.info> Thursday, July 9, 2020 4:54 PM Courtney Brunell Form Submission - New Form

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood. Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk. - helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Name: Beth Leonard

Email: bethl@dr-wa.org

Message: Disability Rights Washington (DRW) has significant concerns about the proposed Western State Hospital (WSH) Master Plan. This Plan would result in the demolition of buildings that currently provide inpatient treatment to Washingtonians with psychiatric disabilities. The proposed demolition includes Building 27, which houses the recently renovated and opened Fort Steilacoom Competency Restoration Program (FSCRP) that is a product of the A.B. v. D.S.H.S. (Trueblood) lawsuit. DRW is uniquely situated to comment on this Master Plan because it is the designated protection and advocacy program for Washingtonians with disabilities (RCW 71A.10.080) and it is the organizational plaintiff and class counsel in the Trueblood lawsuit.

DRW's primary concern is the proposed destruction of FSCRP, which provides critically needed competency restoration services and was renovated and opened for service only last year. Washington State lacks the necessary capacity to provide timely competency restoration to all the individuals who meet clinical evaluation criteria for this treatment. Through the Trueblood lawsuit, a Federal Court found that the State's inability to provide timely competency restoration services to Trueblood class members violated class member's constitutional rights. Opening FSCRP in August 2018 to provide competency restoration treatment is part of a time-intensive and years-long process aimed at bringing the State into compliance with constitutionally required timeframes for providing competency restoration treatment to vulnerable class members waiting in jail. If FSCRP is demolished, there is a significant likelihood that the loss of capacity to provide competency restoration services would further exacerbate the State's ongoing non-compliance with constitutionally required competency restoration treatment timeframes.

The 2018-2019 renovation of FSCRP was funded by the Federal Court using millions of dollars in contempt fines paid by Washington State due to its failure to provide competency restoration treatment within constitutionally required timeframes. The purpose in spending these contempt fines on FSCRP was to benefit Trueblood class members by investing in a facility that could help alleviate suffering—class members decompensate and are harmed as they wait for months in jail for restoration treatment.

Washington State has also spent significant amounts of its own money to hire staff and operate FSCRP. The state has taken great pride in the facility and its operations. Demolishing FSCRP after only recently initiating operation would result in a significance waste of public funds, is counter to the spirit of investing on behalf of Trueblood class members, and endangers the state's commitment to the Trueblood 2018 Settlement Agreement. Demolition of this facility prolongs the already significant time that the state has been subject to the Trueblood Court Order and contempt order, and risks re-initiation of millions of dollars in monthly contempt fines against the state.

FSCRP should be preserved so as not to waste contempt funds and other public monies spent to benefit vulnerable Washingtonians and Trueblood class members in need of treatment. For the foregoing reasons, DRW opposed the proposed WSH Master Plan.

(Sent via <u>WSHMasterPlan.org</u>)

Courtney Brunell

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

info@historicfortsteilacoom.org Thursday, June 25, 2020 5:19 PM Courtney Brunell Comments on WSH Master Plan

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood. Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.

- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

Hello Courtney

The officers and directors of the Historic Fort Steilacoom Association support the DSHS proposal. Implementation will improve public access to our historic buildings and the parade ground by parking shifts and traffic revisions. DSHS recognized that our museum is a unique resource on the campus and invited us to participate in the development process. We shared our ideas with the planning team as documented in Appendix 1. Once the new hospital and associated parking in the western end of the campus is built, our museum guests will be able to view the historic markers placed by the Lakewood Historical Society and gain easier access to our buildings. Currently visitors can do this only on a weekend day when far fewer hospital employee vehicles are present. We appreciate that land in the Historic Fort Zone has been identified for a potential visitor center that will greatly enhance our interpretive efforts. In conclusion, this plan provides for historic preservation initiatives that will benefit our museum mission and attract more visitors to Lakewood.

The Historic Fort Steilacoom Association requests to become a party of record.

Joe Lewis Secretary



July 01, 2020

Record ID: SR0251816



ATTN COURTNEY BRUNELL CITY OF LAKEWOOD 6000 MAIN ST SW LAKEWOOD WA 98499 CBRUNELL@CITYOFLAKEWOOD.US

RE: SEPA Review, Western State Hospital Master Plan LU-20-00027 & LU-20-00030

Dear Courtney Brunell:

The Tacoma-Pierce County Health Department's Environmental Health Program received the above mentioned checklist on June 10, 2020 and has reviewed your proposal.

There are no comments at this time to the proposal as presented.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

Erica Welborn Environmental Health Specialist II Environmental Health Division



Town of Steilacoom comments on the Washington State Hospital Master Plan revision

Courtney Brunell Planning Manger City of Lakewood

July 13, 2020

Ms Brunell:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Sentinel Drive

This roadway provides access to Steilacoom High School and the residents on Pickett Street, Heath Court and Tolmie Court. The roadway was recently upgraded with sidewalks on both sides. The Department of Social and Health Services granted two easements across the Western State Hospital campus to the Town of Steilacoom for the roadway.

The Town concurs with the traffic study's recommendation to reduce the amount of on-going traffic on Sentinel Drive. Shutting the South Street access off Sentinel Way and moving Hospital access to the proposed Chapel Gate access will result in less traffic on Sentinel Way.

The Town is concerned that Sentinel Way not be used during construction. There is only one way in and out for the high school and residents in the area and adding construction traffic to the road will overtax its capacity.

Steilacoom Boulevard

The Town of Steilacoom and the City of Lakewood jointly planned improvements to Steilacoom Boulevard from Puyallup Street in Steilacoom to Phillips Road SW in Lakewood. Steilacoom has completed its upgrade of the roadway and sidewalks in accordance with that plan.

Opening two new gates to the Hospital will require changes to the City's plan for Steilacoom Boulevard, with additional right of way acquisition for turn lanes or roundabouts. The Town believes the pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle improvements planned for the Boulevard should remain regardless of the configuration ultimately approved.

Should the State or City determine that Steilacoom Boulevard should be reduced to two traffic lanes and a center turn lane along the front of the Hospital, the Town requests that the impact on traffic at the Steilacoom Boulevard/Farwest Drive/Sentinel Dive intersection be reviewed.

Sanitary Sewage

The description of the proposed upgrades to the Hospital's sanitary sewage system is accurate. It is imperative that the Hospital install the meters on the sewage discharge pipes so that an accurate measurement of the flow can be made.

48 bed facility

The 10-year plan includes a possible 48-bed civil residential treatment facility (RTC) in addition to the "forensic" hospital and the CSTC. The Town respectfully points out that the accompanying evaluation of the RTC recommends that it be built in Vancouver, rather than Lakewood. Those reasons include the current lack of any type of residential treatment facility in Southwest Washington.

Adding the RTC to the WSH campus will unduly concentrate the mental health treatment facilities in one place, contrary to the Governor's expressed desire that mental health treatment be community based. It will also deprive Southwest Washington of a treatment facility close to family and support groups in Vancouver and the surrounding area.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment,

Doug Fortner Town Planner Town of Steilacoom


Allyson Brooks Ph.D., Director State Historic Preservation Officer



July 8, 2020

Ms. Courtney Brunell Planning Manager City of Lakewood 6000 Main Street, SW Lakewood WA 98499 cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us,

In future correspondence, please refer to: Project Tracking Code: 2020-07-04363 Property: Western State Hospital/Fort Steilacoom Historic District Re; WSH Master Plan

Dear Ms. Brunell:

The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) is in receipt of the Western State Hospital (WSH) Draft Master Plan and SEPA Checklist pertaining to proposed demolition and new construction at the WSH campus. The Master Plan and Checklist have been reviewed on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) under the auspices of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Our review is based upon the documents accessed at WSHMasterPlan.org and consists of the following comments and recommendations for your consideration:

- 1. On page 9 in the Planning Context of the Master Plan and under the "State of Washington" heading, the document mentions the Growth Management Act and SEPA as well as applicable State land use review statutes and regulations. We recommend also mentioning Governor's Executive Order 0505. Executive Order 0505 requires State agencies (Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) in this instance) to consider the effect of Capital Budget funded actions on cultural and historic resources by consulting with interested and affected Tribes and DAHP. While the Master Plan itself may not be subject to 0505 review by Tribes and DAHP, clearly proposed demolition and construction at the WSH campus will require that consultation to take place. More information on the Executive Order can be found at DAHP's website here: https://dahp.wa.gov/project-review/governors-executive-order-05-05.
- 2. We note and support the Master Plan has a stated commitment to preserve the four Fort Steilacoom structures (40-43) as well as the settler's cemetery, Morgue (14b), and the former Bakery (14a). DAHP looks forward to close and continued coordination with the City, DSHS, Tribes, and Historic Fort Steilacoom on short and long-term management of these properties as significant cultural resources.



Ms. Courtney Brunell July 8, 2020 Page Two

- 3. We also note that the Master Plan calls for demolition of a substantial number of buildings on the campus including those considered as "contributing" resources to the historic district at WSH. According to Figure 11, buildings proposed for demolition date to the WPA era and comprise a significant portion of the total square footage of space proposed for removal. In view of the significant impact to historic buildings, we recommend that alternatives to demolition be considered, whether for all or for a select number. If demolition of all or a selection of the buildings is still the preferred alternative, then appropriate measures should be identified and implemented to mitigate for the loss of these resources. Potential mitigation scenarios should receive input from interested and affected parties and be commensurate to the degree of loss or damage to resources contributing to the historic character of the historic district.
- 4. Much of the WSH campus falls within the boundaries of archaeological site 45PI105, which contains artifacts dating from the Precontact Period through the Hospital Period. It is likely that additional archaeology is located outside of the current site boundaries. Any demolition or construction work within the archaeological site will require either a DAHP Monitoring Permit or a DAHP Site Alteration & Excavation Permit. Project areas that have not been previously surveyed by a professional archaeologist will need to be surveyed prior to ground disturbing activities associated with demolition or construction.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. Please ensure that the DAHP Project Number (a.k.a. Project Tracking Code) is shared with any hired cultural resource consultants and is attached to any communications or submitted reports. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at <u>greg.griffith@dahp.wa.gov</u> or Stephanie Jolivette at <u>Stephanie.jolivette@dahp.wa.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

ng Onfith

Gregory Griffith Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

C: Brad Beach, Nisqually Indian Tribe, THPO Department Lakewood Historic Preservation Commission c/o Courtney Brunell Bob Hubenthal, Department of Social and Health Services Joe Lewis, Historic Fort Steilacoom Danny K. Marshall, Steilacoom Indian Tribe, Chair Brandon Reynon, Puyallup Tribe, Cultural Resources Sue Scott, President, Lakewood Historical Society







STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47775 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 • (360) 407-6300 711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

July 9, 2020

Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager City of Lakewood Community Development Department 6000 Main Street Lakewood, WA 98499

Dear Courtney Brunell:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the prethreshold consultation for the Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan Project (LU-20-00027, SEPA LU-20-00030) located at 9601 Steilacoom Boulevard Southwest as proposed by Robert Hubenthal, DSHS. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT: Derek Rockett (360) 407-6287

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing structure(s). In addition to any required asbestos abatement procedures, the applicant should ensure that any other potentially dangerous or hazardous materials present are removed prior to demolition. It is important that these materials and wastes are removed and appropriately managed prior to demolition. It is equally important that demolition debris is also safely managed, especially if it contains painted wood or concrete, treated wood, or other possibly dangerous materials. Please review the "Dangerous Waste Rules for Demolition, Construction, and Renovation Wastes," on Ecology's website at: Construction & Demolition Guidance.

All removed debris resulting from this project must be disposed of at an approved site. All grading and filling of land must utilize only clean fill. All other materials may be considered solid waste and permit approval may be required from your local jurisdictional health department prior to filling. Contact the local jurisdictional health department for proper management of these materials.

TOXICS CLEANUP/TACOMA SMELTER PLUME: Eva Barber, Technical Assistance Coordinator (360) 407-7094

This proposed project is located in an area that may have been contaminated with heavy metals due to the air emissions originating from the old Asarco smelter in north Tacoma (visit Ecology's Tacoma Smelter Plume map search tool: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/smeltersearch/).

Courtney Brunell July 9, 2020 Page 2

Soil contamination from the former Asarco smelter poses a risk to human health and the environment. Children are at especially high risk from direct exposure to contaminated soil. Construction workers, landscapers, gardeners, and others who work in the soils are also at risk.

Ecology recommends that the lead agency include the following as conditions of approval, prior to the issuance of any site development permits or the initiation of grading, filling, or clearing:

- Sample the soil and analyze for arsenic and lead following the <u>2012 Tacoma Smelter</u> <u>Plume Guidance</u>. The soil sampling results shall be sent to Ecology for review. If the project includes open space areas, contact the Technical Assistance Coordinator, Eva Barber, for assistance in soil sampling methodology within the open space area.
- If lead or arsenic are found at concentrations above the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) cleanup levels (Chapter 173-340 WAC); the owners, potential buyers, construction workers, and others shall be notified of their occurrence. The MTCA cleanup level for arsenic is 20 parts per million (ppm) and lead is 250 ppm.
- If lead, arsenic and/or other contaminants are found at concentrations above MTCA cleanup levels, the applicant shall:
 - 1) Develop soil remediation plan and enter into the Voluntary Cleanup Program with Ecology. For more information on the Voluntary Cleanup Program, visit Ecology's website at: <u>http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/tcp/vcp/vcpmain.htm</u>.
 - 2) Obtain an opinion letter from Ecology stating that the proposed soil remediation plan will likely result in no further action under MTCA. The applicant shall provide to the local land use permitting agency the opinion letter from Ecology.
 - 3) Prior to finalizing site development permits, provide to the local land use permitting agency "No Further Action" determination from Ecology indicating that the remediation plans were successfully implemented under MTCA.
- If soils are found to be contaminated with arsenic, lead, or other contaminants, extra precautions shall be taken to avoid escaping dust, soil erosion, and water pollution during grading and site construction. Site design shall include protective measures to isolate or remove contaminated soils from public spaces, yards, and children's play areas. Contaminated soils generated during site construction shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with state and local regulations, including the Solid Waste Handling Standards regulation (Chapter 173-350 WAC). For information about soil disposal contact the local health department in the jurisdiction where soils will be placed.

The link below provides a fact sheet that explains more how the arsenic and lead clean-up levels were set and why Ecology sees that they are protective for human health: <u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1109095.html</u>.

For assistance and information about Tacoma Smelter Plume and soils contamination, the applicant shall contact, Eva Barber with the Toxics Cleanup Program at (360) 407-7094 or via email at <u>Eva.Barber@ecy.wa.gov</u>.

Courtney Brunell July 9, 2020 Page 3

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology Southwest Regional Office

(GMP:202003072)

cc: Derek Rockett, SWM Eva Barber, TCP



EXHIBIT #19

July 17th, 2020

Western State Hospital 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW Lakewood, WA 98498

Re: Western State Hospital Campus, Lakewood WA

To whom it may concern,

Puget Sound Energy (PSE) will extend gas service to the site noted above according to the terms and conditions of gas Rule 6, on file with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

The extent of work needing to be performed will vary based on the natural gas usages needs of the customer. This may include, but is not limited to, public right of way work, private property work, system improvements, system and service extensions, and gas meter work.

You may request the applications by calling 1-888-321-7779 or visiting <u>www.pse.com</u> and download the Customer Service Information Sheet and Non-Residential Service Applications.

Please contact me with any questions:

Thank You,

Daniel Herbst Puget Sound Energy Phone: (253) 476-6036 E-mail: daniel.herbst@pse.com



9850 64th Street West University Place, Washington 98467-1078 piercecountywa.gov/ppw



July 23, 2020 U-115769

Ms. Courtney Brunell City of Lakewood 6000 Main Street SW Lakewood, WA 98499

Subject: Western State Hospital 2020 Master Plan

Dear Ms. Brunell:

We at Pierce County Planning and Public Works Sewer Division appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed Western State Hospital 2020 Master Plan.

Pierce County strongly encourages the Water and Sanitary Sewer sections of the Master Plan (page 41) include near-term improvements to water use monitoring in the facility. Good water usage data will support water conservation and improve sewer demand estimates throughout the implementation of the Master Plan.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. If you have questions, please contact Carla Vincent at <u>Carla.vincent@piercecountywa.gov</u> or f253.798.2467.

Sincerely,

gane Vandenberg

Jane Vandenberg, P.E. Wastewater Utility Manager Pierce County Planning and Public Works

JV:cv:kj CORS/U-115769

cc: Katherine Brooks Carla Vincent





STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47775 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 • (360) 407-6300 711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

July 7, 2021

Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager City of Lakewood Community Development Department 6000 Main Street Lakewood, WA 98499

Dear Courtney Brunell:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the prethreshold consultation for the Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan Project (LU-20-00027, SEPA LU-20-00030) located at 9601 Steilacoom Boulevard Southwest as proposed by Robert Hubenthal, DSHS. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and information provided. Ecology's previous comments submitted July 9, 2020 on the prethreshold consultation, still apply to the project described (see enclosure). After further review, Ecology has the following additional comment(s):

HAZARDOUS WASTE & TOXICS REDUCTION: Tara Davis (360) 407-6275

Demolition

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing structure(s). In addition to any required asbestos abatement procedures, the applicant should ensure that any other potentially dangerous or hazardous materials present, such as PCB-containing lamp ballasts, fluorescent lamps, and wall thermostats containing mercury, are removed prior to demolition. Also, be aware that PCBs are increasingly being found in caulking and paint. It is important that these materials and wastes are removed and appropriately managed prior to demolition. It is equally important that demolition debris is also safely managed, especially if it contains painted wood or concrete, treated wood, or other possibly dangerous materials.

Please review the "Dangerous Waste Rules for Demolition, Construction, and Renovation Wastes," on Ecology's website at: <u>https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Guidance-technical-assistance/Dangerous-waste-guidance/Common-dangerous-waste/Construction-and-demolition</u>. The applicant may also contact Robert Rieck with Ecology's Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction program (HWTR) at (360) 407-6751 for more information about safely handling dangerous wastes and demolition debris

TOXICS CLEANUP: Sandy Smith (360) 407-7269

If contamination is suspected, discovered, or occurs during future project actions, testing of the potentially contaminated media must be conducted. If soil or groundwater contamination is readily apparent, or is revealed by testing, the Department of Ecology must be notified. To

Courtney Brunell July 7, 2021 Page 2

notify Ecology, contact the Environmental Report Tracking System Coordinator at the Southwest Regional Office at (360) 407-6300. For assistance and information about subsequent cleanup and to identify the type of testing that will be required, contact Sandy Smith with the Toxics Cleanup Program at the Southwest Regional Office at (360) 407-7269.

WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED RESOURCES UNIT: Jessica Eakens (360) 407-0246

Erosion control measures must be in place prior to any clearing, grading, or construction. These control measures must be effective to prevent stormwater runoff from carrying soil and other pollutants into surface water or stormdrains that lead to waters of the state. Sand, silt, clay particles, and soil will damage aquatic habitat and are considered to be pollutants.

Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48 RCW, Water Pollution Control, and WAC 173-201A, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action.

Construction Stormwater General Permit:

The following construction activities require coverage under the Construction Stormwater General Permit:

- 1. Clearing, grading and/or excavation that results in the disturbance of one or more acres **and** discharges stormwater to surface waters of the State; and
- 2. Clearing, grading and/or excavation on sites smaller than one acre that are part of a larger common plan of development or sale, if the common plan of development or sale will ultimately disturb one acre or more **and** discharge stormwater to surface waters of the State.
 - a) This includes forest practices (including, but not limited to, class IV conversions) that are part of a construction activity that will result in the disturbance of one or more acres, **and** discharge to surface waters of the State; and
- 3. Any size construction activity discharging stormwater to waters of the State that Ecology:
 - a) Determines to be a significant contributor of pollutants to waters of the State of Washington.
 - b) Reasonably expects to cause a violation of any water quality standard.

If there are known soil/ground water contaminants present on-site, additional information (including, but not limited to: temporary erosion and sediment control plans; stormwater pollution prevention plan; list of known contaminants with concentrations and depths found; a site map depicting the sample location(s); and additional studies/reports regarding contaminant(s)) will be required to be submitted. For additional information on contaminated construction sites, please contact Carol Serdar at <u>Carol.Serdar@ecy.wa.gov</u>, or by phone at (360) 742-9751.

Additionally, sites that discharge to segments of waterbodies listed as impaired by the State of Washington under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act for turbidity, fine sediment, high pH, or phosphorous, or to waterbodies covered by a TMDL may need to meet additional sampling and record keeping requirements. See condition S8 of the Construction Stormwater General Permit for a description of these requirements. To see if your site discharges to a

Courtney Brunell July 7, 2021 Page 3

TMDL or 303(d)-listed waterbody, use Ecology's Water Quality Atlas at: <u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/waterqualityatlas/StartPage.aspx</u>.

The applicant may apply online or obtain an application from Ecology's website at: <u>http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/construction/ - Application</u>. Construction site operators must apply for a permit at least 60 days prior to discharging stormwater from construction activities and must submit it on or before the date of the first public notice.

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology Southwest Regional Office

(GMP:202102787) Enclosure

cc: Tara Davis, HWTR Sandy Smith, TCP Jessica Eakens, WQ



STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47775 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7775 • (360) 407-6300 711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

July 9, 2020

Courtney Brunell, Planning Manager City of Lakewood Community Development Department 6000 Main Street Lakewood, WA 98499

Dear Courtney Brunell:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the prethreshold consultation for the Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan Project (LU-20-00027, SEPA LU-20-00030) located at 9601 Steilacoom Boulevard Southwest as proposed by Robert Hubenthal, DSHS. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT: Derek Rockett (360) 407-6287

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing structure(s). In addition to any required asbestos abatement procedures, the applicant should ensure that any other potentially dangerous or hazardous materials present are removed prior to demolition. It is important that these materials and wastes are removed and appropriately managed prior to demolition. It is equally important that demolition debris is also safely managed, especially if it contains painted wood or concrete, treated wood, or other possibly dangerous materials. Please review the "Dangerous Waste Rules for Demolition, Construction, and Renovation Wastes," on Ecology's website at: Construction & Demolition Guidance.

All removed debris resulting from this project must be disposed of at an approved site. All grading and filling of land must utilize only clean fill. All other materials may be considered solid waste and permit approval may be required from your local jurisdictional health department prior to filling. Contact the local jurisdictional health department for proper management of these materials.

TOXICS CLEANUP/TACOMA SMELTER PLUME: Eva Barber, Technical Assistance Coordinator (360) 407-7094

This proposed project is located in an area that may have been contaminated with heavy metals due to the air emissions originating from the old Asarco smelter in north Tacoma (visit Ecology's Tacoma Smelter Plume map search tool: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/smeltersearch/).

Courtney Brunell July 9, 2020 Page 2

Soil contamination from the former Asarco smelter poses a risk to human health and the environment. Children are at especially high risk from direct exposure to contaminated soil. Construction workers, landscapers, gardeners, and others who work in the soils are also at risk.

Ecology recommends that the lead agency include the following as conditions of approval, prior to the issuance of any site development permits or the initiation of grading, filling, or clearing:

- Sample the soil and analyze for arsenic and lead following the <u>2012 Tacoma Smelter</u> <u>Plume Guidance</u>. The soil sampling results shall be sent to Ecology for review. If the project includes open space areas, contact the Technical Assistance Coordinator, Eva Barber, for assistance in soil sampling methodology within the open space area.
- If lead or arsenic are found at concentrations above the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) cleanup levels (Chapter 173-340 WAC); the owners, potential buyers, construction workers, and others shall be notified of their occurrence. The MTCA cleanup level for arsenic is 20 parts per million (ppm) and lead is 250 ppm.
- If lead, arsenic and/or other contaminants are found at concentrations above MTCA cleanup levels, the applicant shall:
 - 1) Develop soil remediation plan and enter into the Voluntary Cleanup Program with Ecology. For more information on the Voluntary Cleanup Program, visit Ecology's website at: <u>http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/tcp/vcp/vcpmain.htm</u>.
 - 2) Obtain an opinion letter from Ecology stating that the proposed soil remediation plan will likely result in no further action under MTCA. The applicant shall provide to the local land use permitting agency the opinion letter from Ecology.
 - 3) Prior to finalizing site development permits, provide to the local land use permitting agency "No Further Action" determination from Ecology indicating that the remediation plans were successfully implemented under MTCA.
- If soils are found to be contaminated with arsenic, lead, or other contaminants, extra precautions shall be taken to avoid escaping dust, soil erosion, and water pollution during grading and site construction. Site design shall include protective measures to isolate or remove contaminated soils from public spaces, yards, and children's play areas. Contaminated soils generated during site construction shall be managed and disposed of in accordance with state and local regulations, including the Solid Waste Handling Standards regulation (Chapter 173-350 WAC). For information about soil disposal contact the local health department in the jurisdiction where soils will be placed.

The link below provides a fact sheet that explains more how the arsenic and lead clean-up levels were set and why Ecology sees that they are protective for human health: <u>https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1109095.html</u>.

For assistance and information about Tacoma Smelter Plume and soils contamination, the applicant shall contact, Eva Barber with the Toxics Cleanup Program at (360) 407-7094 or via email at <u>Eva.Barber@ecy.wa.gov</u>.

Courtney Brunell July 9, 2020 Page 3

Ecology's comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they may not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments, please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Department of Ecology Southwest Regional Office

(GMP:202003072)

cc: Derek Rockett, SWM Eva Barber, TCP

EXHIBIT #22

From: SEPA Review Notices [mailto:SEPA@pscleanair.gov]
Sent: Monday, June 7, 2021 9:11 AM
To: Tiffany Speir <tspeir@cityoflakewood.us>
Cc: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Subject: RE: Notice - 2nd Combined Notice of Application to update Western State Hospital Master Plan
Public Comment period June 7 - July 7, 2021

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.

Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.

- helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us ext. 4357

The Puget Sound Clean Air Agency is submitting the following public comment to this project:

Any project where demolition of structure(s), earth moving and material handling, heavy equipment operations, and/or disposing of vegetative matter is to occur, is subject to Puget Sound Clean Air Agency regulations. The requirements may include, but are not limited to the following:

Agency Regulation I: Article 8 – Outdoor Burning Article 9 – Emission Control Standards, Section(s) 9.03, 9.11, and 9.15

Agency Regulation III: Article 4 – Asbestos Control Standards

Agency Regulations can be viewed in full on our website: <u>http://www.pscleanair.gov/219/PSCAA-Regulations</u>

Thank you,

Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Sepa@pscleanair.gov

From: Tiffany Speir <<u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u>>
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 6:25 PM
To: Tiffany Speir <<u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u>>
Cc: Courtney Brunell <<u>CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us</u>>
Subject: Notice - 2nd Combined Notice of Application to update Western State Hospital Master Plan Public Comment period June 7 - July 7, 2021



SECOND COMBINED NOTICE OF APPLICATION

CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

June 7, 2021

The Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) has resubmitted project applications for a new Master Facilities Plan and SEPA Environmental Checklist with the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department. The Application was resubmitted on May 12, 2021. The following is a description of the applications and the process for review.

To review the resubmittal and make comment please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>.

Note: All comments received during the initial comment period (June 10-July 10, 2020) will be included in the project record.

<u>APPLICATION NUMBER AND NAME</u>: LU-20-00027 Western State Hospital Master Facilities Plan; LU-20-00030 Western State Hospital SEPA.

<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>: The State Department of Social and Health Services has proposed a complete reconstruction of Western State Hospital and its campus. The proposed master plan update proposes an expansion of the hospital capacity including:

- 1. A new 350-bed forensic hospital on the property. This will require the demolition of several existing buildings on site.
- 2. A new 18-bed residential cottage at the Child Study and Treatment Center.
- 3. A new community residential treatment facility (RTF) of 48 beds, contingent on completion of a parallel study to site community facilities throughout the region.

Long term, the state's goal is to transition the hospital to serve primarily forensic patients (those who have been processed through the criminal justice system) and fewer civil commitment patients, which make up the majority of the approximately 850 patients on site today.

To support the new buildings, infrastructure and circulation improvements are also included in the proposal.

PROJECT LOCATION: 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW (APN#0220283026; -027; 0220321007; 0220321022)

<u>ZONING</u>: Public Institutional (PI)

PERMIT APPLICATION DATE: February 14, 2020

DATE APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: May 26, 2020

<u>OTHER PERMITS/PLANS WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED</u>: Design Review, Building Permits, Plumbing/ Mechanical Permits, Electrical Permits by L & I, Site Development Permits, Right-of-Way Permit, Tree Removal Permit, Water Main Extension, Sanitary Sewer Extension.

REVISED SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS: The revised Master Facilities Plan Report was submitted on May 12, 2021.

<u>SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS</u>: Other documents received include the SEPA Application, SEPA Checklist, Master Facilities Plan Application, Master Plan Report, Natural Resource Reconnaissance, Policy Brief, Property Survey, Stakeholder Outreach, Storm water Credit study, Transportation Impact Analysis, Aerial Map, Assessor Map, Civil 16 Bed Study, Civil 48 bed Study, Title Report, Additional Siting Criteria for Mental Health Facilities <u>ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</u>: The City of Lakewood has been designated as lead agency for this proposal. At this time, the City is requesting a "pre-threshold consultation" prior to issuing a threshold determination on the submitted documents.

SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: June 7, 2021- July 7, 2021

All persons may provide written comments about the proposal to the City of Lakewood Community and Economic Development Department online at https://wshmasterplan.org or by email to cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us. Comments must be received by 5 P.M. on July 7, 2021. Any person wishing to become a party of record should include the request with their comments. Please note, all comments received during the initial comment period, June 6-July 6, 2020 will be considered.

TENTATIVE PUBLIC HEARING DATE: TBD

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Applicant: Bob Hubenthal, DSHS (*all questions regarding the application should be forwarded to City staff below*)

City: Courtney Brunell, City of Lakewood Planning Manager, 6000 Main Street SW, Lakewood, WA 98499.



Contact: (253) 983-7839 or cbrunell@cityoflakewood.us

To review the application, submittal documents (including a version that highlights the most recent changes) and to submit your comments please visit: <u>https://wshmasterplan.org/</u>

Tiffany Speir*, Esq., CPM® Long Range/Strategic Planning Manager



6000 Main St SW, Lakewood, WA 98499 253.983.7702 | <u>tspeir@cityoflakewood.us</u> *Tiffany Speir does not provide legal representation for the City of Lakewood



EXHIBIT #23

From: Tina Vaslet [mailto:tvaslet@piercetransit.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Courtney Brunell <CBrunell@cityoflakewood.us>
Cc: Lindsey Sehmel <lsehmel@piercetransit.org>
Subject: RE: Notice - 2nd Combined Notice of Application to update Western State Hospital Master Plan
- Public Comment period June 7 - July 7, 2021

This email originated outside the City of Lakewood.

Use caution when following links or opening attachments as they could lead to malicious code or infected web sites. When in doubt, please contact the HelpDesk.

- <u>helpdesk@cityoflakewood.us</u> ext. 4357

Hi Courtney,

It was nice to speak with you today! Per our discussion, here are my comments:

Pierce Transit plans to remove one pair of stops in the vicinity of Western State – stops 2959 & 2961 (in red). All other stops in the area will remain.

Stops 2958 & 2960 (in blue) both have foundations, benches, and shelters and are in a good location due to the proximity of the tunnel crossing. When we spoke you said you were unsure whether or not that tunnel will remain. If the decision is made to remove the tunnel, Pierce Transit will require relocating this pair of stops to the east, at the intersection of Circle Drive SW, where there is an existing controlled crosswalk. Should this pair of stops have to be relocated, it would be the financial responsibility of the developer to install concrete pads to enable Pierce Transit to relocate the bus stops and all amenities.

With the proposed development of Western State, Pierce Transit is requiring a new pair of bus stops, as shown below (in green). The new stops require benches and concrete boarding pads, at a minimum (5ft x 8ft - for ADA accessibility). These stops may warrant shelters at the developers expense. We reserve the right to require shelters through the design phase.

Please contact me if you have any questions or to let me know if you need anything else from Pierce Transit as this project moves forward.



Kind Regards, Tina **Tina Vaslet** Planner II – Bus Stops P: 253.983.2706 | C: 253.255.8521 3701 96th St. SW, Lakewood, WA 98499



From: Lindsey Sehmel
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 8:14 AM
To: Tina Vaslet <<u>tvaslet@piercetransit.org</u>>
Subject: FW: Notice - 2nd Combined Notice of Application to update Western State Hospital Master Plan
- Public Comment period June 7 - July 7, 2021

Tina – Please take a look at this land use application and let's schedule a time to discuss in a meeting on the week of June 7th.

Respectfully,

Lindsey Sehmel, EMPA, AICP Principal Planner - Scheduling P: 253.581.8079 | C: 253.320.8767 3701 96th St. SW, Lakewood, WA 98499







Memorandum

Date: July 9, 2021(revisions 5/27/2022)

To: Courtney Brunell, MPA, Planning Manager

From: Weston Ott, PE, Engineering Services Manager, Public Works Engineering

RE: LU-21-00027 Western State Hospital Master Plan 2020 Comments

The Public Works Engineering (PWE) Department has reviewed the Western State Hospital Master Plan 2020.

Frontage Improvements (LMC 12A.09.031 and 032)

- Page 7 section f, indicates that access points for staff will be changed and include 87th Ave. SW, Sentinel Drive and to two new signalized access points on Steilacoom Blvd. SW and as shown in Figure 24 on page 34.
- Existing signal at Circle DR. will removed and returned to the City when new signals placed at Chapel Gate and CSTC gate. This will include adding a raised median island to restrict right in and right out access, type 4 ramps north side and signage that eliminate pedestrian crossings of Steilacoom Blvd.
- A task / project must be added to the Master Plan schedule for adding frontage improvements and signal revisions to Steilacoom Blvd. between Farwest Drive and 87th Ave. SW. It is the desire that improvements be coordinated as indicated on page 35.
- (*Rev 5/27/22*) *The City of Lakewood does NOT have secured construction funding for Steilacoom Blvd. from 87th Ave. SW to Farwest Drive SW.*
- (*Rev 5/27/22*) The City of Lakewood's current design for Steilacoom Blvd. from 87th Ave. SW to Farwest Drive SW does not incorporate DSHS's planned frontage improvements related to ingress/egress.
- The City requires the following frontage improvements to be made north side of the road:
 - Add sidewalk to the north side of Steilacoom Blvd. SW between Farwest Drive SW and 87th Ave. SW Street to City standards
 - Any roadway patching 6" HMA on 4" CSTC per City Standard for a Principal Arterial
 - Channelization or restriping as needed
 - Supplement street lighting on the north side to meet the City's Engineering Standards Manual(ESM).
 - o All new signalized intersections shall meet the ADA requirements of the City's ESM.
 - All roadway storm drainage systems shall meet the requirements of the City's ESM.
- Connect new signalized crossings to the south side of the road and the existing pedestrian path within Ft. Steilacoom Park.

Traffic (LMC 12A.09.028)

- When Circle DR. SW signal is removed, modify the intersection to a right in and right out only, and stripe double yellow.
- The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) will be maintained as Appendix 3A and B of the master plan, and will be updated one year following completion of each significant project.
- All traffic studies shall be consistent with the most recent edition of the Trip Generation Manual, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The TIA shall be reviewed and approved by Public Works Engineering Department prior to site development permit issuance.

Site development (LMC 12A.10)

• Site Development Permits and plans will be required for each phase of development.

Stormwater (LMC 12A.11)

• Stormwater plans will be developed in accordance with City requirements at the time of site development permit submittal.

Right-of-way dedication (LMC 12A.05.060)

• Any portion of new frontage sidewalk extending beyond the existing Steilacoom Blvd. SW ROW shall be dedicated to the City of Lakewood.

Other

- Permits must be acquired per City code for each phase of development.
- The existing tunnel shall be the sole responsibility of DSHS to own, operate, and maintain. *At* any point in the future the tunnel is required to be removed, DSHS shall assume all responsibility.
- The Town of Steilacoom has completed all roadway improvements within the Town along Steilacoom Blvd. (*Rev 5/27/22*) *If work is to occur in the Town of Steilacoom rights-of-way, coordination and review will be with Town of Steilacoom.*
- (*Rev 5/27/22*) Based upon Table 2, page V, offsite and frontage improvement project schedules are not shown. Provide a clear schedule related to frontage and signal improvements. All frontage improvements will be completed prior to signal completion along Steilacoom Blvd *at the time of the I*st *phase of site work*.

Questions or comments may be directed to Weston Ott at 253-983-7725.

EXHIBITS 25-27 TECHNICAL REPORTS (PROVIDED BY APPLICANT)





WESTERN STATE HOSPITAL MASTER

Appendix 5: Natural Resources Reconnaissance







February 7, 2020

Craig Tompkins, AIA SRG PARTNERSHIP, INC 621 SW Columbia Street Portland, Oregon 97201

Via email: ctompkins@srgpartnership.com

Regarding: Natural Resource Evaluation Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Lakewood, Washington PBS Project 41189.001, Phase 0001

Mr. Tompkins,

PBS has been retained to conduct initial site investigation to support City of Lakewood SEPA permitting for master planned improvements on the Western State Hospital Campus. The site investigation consists of an evaluation of the natural resource elements typically regulated under SEPA in the soils, water, plants, and animals' sections of SEPA. The following specific resources in these categories will be addressed:

- Soils. General characteristics of the soils present at the site
- Waters. A summary of mapped floodplains, wetlands, streams and other waters on the Campus or in the vicinity
- Plants. A summary of the plants present on the Campus, with particular emphasis on wetland plants; plants that are listed under the US Endangered Species Act as Endangered, Threatened, or Candidate; have been identified as rare or sensitive; have populations of high conservation value; or are considered noxious weeds.
- Animals that are listed under the US Endangered Species Act as Endangered, Threatened, or candidate; are otherwise federally regulated; are considered priority habitats or species by Washington State
 Department of Fish and Wildlife; or are defined by the City of Lakewood as Critical Fish or Wildlife species.

The following memorandum introduces the site and the master plan process and describes the methods and results of the initial environmental site investigation.

1 SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Western State Hospital (WSH) is located in the City of Lakewood, Washington (Figure 1). The City of Lakewood (City) is located in western Pierce County approximately seven miles south of the City of Tacoma, and 22 miles to the northeast of the state capital in Olympia.

The Western State Hospital Campus is located on the north side of Steilacoom Boulevard SW, extending from 87th Avenue SW on the east to Sentinel Drive on the west. The Campus extends northward from Steilacoom Boulevard SW to Golf course Road SW on the east side to approximately 79th Street SW on the west. The campus totals approximately 288 acres, and is composed of four separate tax parcels, described below.



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 2 of 22

The largest parcel (0220321022) is 215.71 acres is size, and includes the frontage of Steilacoom Boulevard SW from 87th Avenue SW westward to Sentinel Drive. This parcel contains most of the developed portions of the campus, as well as Garrison Springs and the associated forested valley slopes.

The second parcel (0220321007) is 36.73 acres in size, and extends northward from Garrison Springs. This parcel includes the majority of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course.

The third parcel (0220283027) is 29.75 acres in size, and is located to the north of Parcel 0220321007. This parcel includes the northern 1/4 of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course, the forested valley slope to the north, and the forested disc golf course area to the east.

The last parcel (0220283026) is located at the northeastern-most corner of the site and is 6.15 acres in size. The parcel is currently part of the disc golf course.

2 MASTER PLANNING

WSH was established on the site of historic Fort Steilacoom in 1871, and is one of only two state-owned psychiatric hospital for adults in Washington. WSH provides inpatient mental health services to adults from 20 western Washington counties. The hospital provides evaluation and inpatient treatment for individuals with serious or long-term mental illness, including patients referred through their Behavioral Health Organization, the civil court system (when individuals meet the criteria for involuntary treatment under RCW 71.05), or through the criminal justice system (RCW 10.77). WSH provides more than 800 beds for these patients, and employs approximately 2,200 staff members, making it the fourth largest employer in the City of Lakewood.

DSHS is engaged in an ongoing master planning effort for the WSH campus to: incorporate changing facility needs; address the growth management issues of stakeholders (including Pierce County and the City of Lakewood); and streamline the permitting process for future projects. The initial master plan for the campus was approved by the City in 1998 and is based on a 10-year planning period. An update to the Master Plan was prepared in 2008, and the latest planning efforts were initiated in 2018. As part of the current master planning update, DSHS has evaluated several alternatives for layout of the campus, including rehabilitating existing buildings and constructing new facilities.

3 METHODS

The presence of elements of the natural environment were evaluated using a two-step process. The first step consisted of an in-office evaluation based of existing maps and documents for the vicinity. The second step consisted of a reconnaissance level field evaluation to ground-truth the in-office evaluation and identify any additional resource present. Additional details of the methods used for these two steps are described below.

In-Office Evaluation

The office evaluation consisted of a review of online sources and documents to identify the presence of or conditions that would support the presence of natural resource elements (soils, water, plants, and animals). The Study Area for the in-office evaluation included the WSH Campus and adjoining areas within 200 feet as required by Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) 14.162.070. Specific documents reviewed included:

General site information:

• Current and recent historical aerial photographs (Google Earth, 2019)



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 3 of 22

• Climate and precipitation data (US Department of Agriculture National Resources Conservation Service [USDA NRCS] Field Office, 2019a)

Soils:

• Digital soil data for the Study Area (USDA NRCS, 2019b)

Water:

- FEMA floodplain maps (FEMA, 2019)
- Wetlands of High Conservation Value and USFWS National Wetland Inventory map (Washington Department of Natural Resources [WDNR], 2019b)
- Local critical area data from Pierce County PublicGIS (Pierce County, 2019)

Plants:

- Endangered species information (IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation; USFWS, 2019)
- Known rare plants and nonvascular species of high conservation value (WDNR, 2019b)
- County list of rare plants (WDNR, 2018)
- State noxious weed list (Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board, 2019)
- County noxious weed list (Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board, 2019)

Animals:

- Fish Passage online mapping application (WDFW, 2019a)
- Forest Practices Application Review System mapper (WDNR, 2019a)
- Priority Habitats and Species online mapping (WDFW, 2019c)
- Salmonscape (WDFW, 2019d)
- Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory Assessment Program Statewide Fish Distribution (SWIFD) Map (The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, 2019)
- Streamnet (Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, 2019)

Other documents:

- Lakewood Municipal Code
- Lakewood Shoreline Management Program

Field Evaluation

Following the in-office evaluation, a reconnaissance level field evaluation was conducted. The purpose of the field evaluation was to verify date from the in-office evaluation and identify any additional resources present on the Western State Hospital Campus or in the vicinity.

The field evaluation included resources in the water, plant and animal elements of the natural environment, including wetlands, streams, and wildlife. The field evaluation was restricted to the parcels within the Western State Hospital Campus, with supplemental information collected from publicly accessible rights-of-way.

Plants

Plant communities were visually evaluated, and species were identified using botanical reference books (Cooke, 1997; Hitchcock and Cronquist, 1973; Pojar and MacKinnon, 2004; and Taylor, 1990) and web sites (Giblin et al., 2003; Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board, 2019, WDNR, 2018 and 2019; and Washington Noxious Weed



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 4 of 22

Control Board, 2019). Plant nomenclature and wetland indicator status are consistent with the 2016 National Wetland Plant List (Lichvar et al., 2016).

Wetlands

The wetland component of the field evaluation was conducted in accordance with the definition from the LMC 14.162.020, using the methods outlined in the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) *Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory, 1987), the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Supplement (Version 2.0)* (WMVC Regional Supplement) (USACE, 2010), and the *Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual* (Ecology, 1997).

Wetlands on the WSH Campus were classified according to the habitat guidelines in *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin et al., 1979), and preliminary ratings were determined using the criteria the *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington* Revised (Hruby, 2014).

Streams

The presence of stream bed and bank features were identified based on the presence of an ordinary highwater mark (OHWM) consistent with the criteria listed in LMC 14.164.010. The presence of an OHWM was determined using the indicators described in *Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington State* (Anderson et. Al., 2016). Stream in on the WSH Campus were preliminarily rated using the criteria identified in the City of Lakewood's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Chapter 4 Section C.

Animals (Fish and Wildlife)

The presence of fish and wildlife were identified consistent with the requirements outlined for Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas in Pierce County Code (PCC) 18E.040.030.B and City of Lakewood Municipal Code requirements for Critical Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas (LMC 14.154.020).

The field evaluation of the presence of terrestrial wildlife and habitats was based on the presence of visual indicators such as nests, scat, trails, and audible such as calls and vocalizations. Stream habitats were identified consistent with the criteria in *The California Department of Fish and Game Salmonid Habitat Restoration Manual* (CDFG 1998) and *Stream habitat classification and inventory procedures for northern California* (McCain et al., 1990).

4 **RESULTS**

The results of the office review and the field investigation are provided below. Sections for both evaluations are divided by environmental element.

Office Evaluation

The following sections document the results of the in-office evaluation.

Topography and Soils

The Campus is primarily upland terraces with slopes less than 15 percent; with the overall topography sloping gently from the southeast corner to the northwest corner. Steeper slopes (up to 70 percent in some areas) are present on the forested valley slopes to the north and south of the golf course.



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 5 of 22

Three soil mapping units were identified in the study area: Spanaway gravelly sandy loam; Everett very gravelly sandy loam; and Xerochrepts (Web Soils Survey, NRCS, 2019b). The boundaries between these soil map units are shown in Figure 2, and a summary of the characteristics is provided below in Table 1.

Symbol	Map Unit Name	Slope	Landform	Parent Material	Drainage Class	Soils hydric? Hydric inclusions?
41A	Spanaway gravelly sandy Ioam	0 to 15%	Terraces and plains	Glacial outwash	Somewhat excessively drained	No (15% Spana, Yes)
13D	Everett very gravelly sandy loam	15 to 30%	Outwash terraces and escarpments, kames, moraines, eskers	Glacial outwash	Somewhat excessively drained	No (10% Alderwood, No but may support wetlands in some situations) (10% Indianola, No)
47F	Xerochrepts	45 to 70%	Valley sides	Sandy and gravelly outwash and/or glacial till	Well drained	No

Table 1 Soils present in the Study Area¹

¹ NRCS, 2019b.

Spanaway soils occur at elevations from 200 to 590 feet and are typically used for woodland, pasture, cropland, homesites, and wildlife habitat (NRCS, 2019b). Spanaway gravelly sandy loam is not considered a hydric (wetland) soil by the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils (NTCHS).

Everett soils occur at elevations from 30 to 900 feet and are typically used for livestock grazing, timber production, and urban development (NRCS, 2019b). Everett very gravelly sandy loam is not considered a hydric soil by the NTCHS, however this soil unit does include slopes of 15 to 30 percent.

Xerochrept soils occur at elevations from 0 to 980 feet on steep valley sides; these soils are not considered hydric soils by NTCHS, however this soil unit does include slopes of 45 to 70 percent.

Wetlands

The Washington Natural Resources Heritage Program (Figure 3), using the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data, identifies two riverine wetland systems (R4SBC; riverine intermittent streambed seasonally flooded) within the study area and one palustrine wetland (PUBKx; palustrine unconsolidated bottom artificially flooded excavated) to the west of the property (WDNR, 2019b). Pierce County PublicGIS does not identify wetlands on or within the vicinity of the Site (Figure 4) (Pierce County, 2019).

Streams and other Waters

Two streams were identified within the Study Area: Garrison Springs and an Unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek. The stream locations shown on maps from WDFW, WDNR, and Pierce County and fisheries resources are consistent with the riverine wetland systems identified in the National Wetland Inventory mapping (Figure 3).



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 6 of 22

Plants

The following sections detail the results for evaluation of plant species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act, plant species or habitats identified as rare or sensitive by the WDNR Natural Resources Heritage Program, priority habitats and species identified by WDFW; and noxious weeds identified by the Washington State and Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Boards.

Federally Listed Plants

A review of information from the USFWS IPaC database (Appendix A) identified three federally threatened or endangered plant species as potentially present in the vicinity of the project. These species are listed in Table 2 and described below.

Common Name Scientific Name		Federal ESA Listing Status	Critical Habitat Designated?
Golden Paintbrush	Castilleja levisecta	Threatened	No
Marsh Sandwort	Arenaria paludicola	Endangered	No
Water Howellia	Howellia aquatilis	Threatened	No

Table 2. Federally Listed Plant Species

Golden paintbrush is listed as Threatened under the ESA and is found in native northwest grasslands. There are no current or historic populations in Pierce County (USFWS, 2000). Marsh sandwort is listed as Endangered under the ESA. This species is found in swamps, wetlands, and freshwater marshes along the coast (WDNR, 2019c). In western Washington, water howellia occurs in low-elevation wetlands and small vernal pools (WDNR, 2019c).

Rare and Sensitive Plant Species

The WDNR Natural Resources Heritage Program website identifies three rare or sensitive species as potentially present on or near the WSH Campus. Characteristics of these species are listed in Table 3 and described below.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Historic or Current presence?	Washington State Status	Potential habitat present?
White-top aster	Seriocarpus rigidus	Current	Sensitive	Yes
Common bluecup	Githopsis specularioides	Historic	Sensitive	Possible
Giant chain fern	Woodwardia fimbriata	Historic	Sensitive	Yes

Table 3. Rare and Sensitive Plant Species

White-top aster is found in relatively flat, open grasslands of lowlands in gravelly, glacial outwash soils (WDNR, 2019c). White-top aster is mapped as occurring in the northeast corner of the WSH Campus (Figure 3) and has been identified by WDNR as present as recently as August 13, 2010 (WDNR 2019b).

Common bluecup is historically found in the vicinity of the WSH Campus. This species is found in dry, open places in lowlands, such as grassy balds, talus slopes, and gravelly prairies. There are no recent observations of common bluecup in Pierce County, and none of the habitats that support this species are present within the Study Area.



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 7 of 22

Giant chain fern is historically found in the vicinity of the WSH Campus. This species is found in stream banks, shaded wet road banks, the edges of bogs, and wet bluffs amongst coniferous trees and adjacent to saltwater. Similar habitats are present on the Western State Hospital Campus and nearby.

Native Plants

Mapping from the WDNR Natural Resources Heritage Program identifies a single native plant community as present on or near the WSH Campus. This plant community is Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*) dominated or co-dominated canopies. This community occurs in four locations on the Western State Hospital Campus: two on the eastern end of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course near Garrison Springs, and two to the east one either side of Kids First Lane. Location of these habitat area are shown on Figure 5.

Noxious, Invasive, and Non-Native Plants

No noxious weeds are mapped on the Western State Hospital Campus. Table 4 presents a list of noxious weeds and non-native plants identified in the Study Area or mapped within the vicinity.

Table 4. List of Noxious, Invasive, and Non-Native Plants

State Classification	Common Name (Scientific Name)
Class A Novieus Wood	Spotted knapweed (Centaurea biebersteinii, or C. maculosa)
Class A Noxious weed	Tansy ragwort (Senecio jacobaea)

¹ Non-regulated noxious weed per Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board

Future projects will meet Pierce County and City of Lakewood regulations with regard to the control of noxious and invasive weeds.

Animals

Federal and State-Listed Habitats and Species

The USFWS IPaC website (Appendix A), NOAA Fisheries ESA listings, and WDFW PHS data (Figure 6) identify several federally and state threatened or endangered species, as well as priority habitats and species in the vicinity of the project. The results are presented in Table 5.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Critical Habitat Designated?					
Puget Sound Chinook Salmon	Oncorhynchus tshawytscha	Federally Threatened	Yes					
Puget Sound Steelhead	O. mykiss	Federally Threatened	Yes					
Puget Sound-Coastal Bull Trout	Salvelinus confluentus	Federally Threatened	Yes					
Gray wolf	Canus lupus	Federally Endangered (Proposed for delisting)	No					
North American Wolverine	Gulo gulo luscus	Federally Threatened (Proposed)	No					
Marbled murrelet	Brachyramphus marmoratus	Federally Threatened	Yes					
Streaked horned lark	Eremophila alpestris strigata	Federally Threatened	Yes					
Yellow-billed cuckoo	Coccyzus americanus	Federally Threatened	Proposed					

Table 5. Listed Habitats and Species



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 8 of 22

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Critical Habitat Designated?
Oregon spotted frog	Rana pretiosa	Federally Threatened	Yes
Biodiversity area	N/A	State Priority Habitat	N/A
Little brown bat	Myotis lucifugus	State Priority Species	N/A
Slender-billed white- breasted nuthatch	Sitta carolinensis aculeata	State Candidate Species	N/A
Western Pond Turtle	Actinemys marmorata	State Endangered	N/A

Salmonscape (Figure 7) and StreamNet (Figure 8) were also reviewed for presence of anadromous fish, but no habitat was identified in either database. No invasive animals are known to be present in the Study Area.

Migratory Bird Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

The USFWS IPaC website (Appendix A) provided several species which are protected under the Migratory Bird Act that may be present in the Study Area. These species. The results are presented in Table 6.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Breeding Season ¹					
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	January 1 – September 30					
Black Turnstone	Arenaria melanocephala	Breeds elsewhere ²					
Great Blue Heron	Ardea herodias fannini	March – August 15					
Lesser Yellowlegs	Tringa flavipes	Breeds elsewhere ²					
Marbled Godwit	Limosa fedoa	Breeds elsewhere ²					
Olive-sided Flycatcher	Contopus cooperi	May 20 – August 31					
Red-throated Loon	Gavia stellate	Breeds elsewhere ²					
Rufous Hummingbird	Selasphorous rufus	April 15 – July 15					
Western Screech-owl	Megascops kennicottii kennicottii	March 1 – June 30					

Table 6. Listed Migratory Birds

¹ Noted by USFWS to be a liberal estimate of breeding season

² Indicates the species does not likely breed within project area



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 9 of 22

Critical Fish and Wildlife Species and Habitats

LMC 14.154.020 identifies a list of 11 critical fish and wildlife species and habitats, five of which are likely to occur on-site. Table 7 provides details on these critical fish and wildlife species and habitats.

Habitats and Species of Local Importance	Description
Priority Oregon white oak woodlands	WDNR identifies four patches of either oak-dominant forest or woodland canopy, or urban oak canopy (Figure 5). The four patches are located in the northern half of the property, and total 32.61 acres.
Snag-rich areas	Snag-rich areas are likely to occur adjacent to the two streams within the Study Area.
Rivers and streams with critical fisheries	Rivers and streams with critical fisheries are known to occur in the Study Area and are discussed above.
Waters of the state, including all water bodies classified by the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) water typing classification system as detailed in WAC 222-16- 030, together with associated riparian areas	WDNR Forest Practices Application Mapping Tool identifies Garrison Springs and the unnamed tributary to Chambers Creek within the Study Area (Figure 9).
Lakes, ponds, streams, and rivers planted with game fish by a governmental entity or tribal entity.	Garrison Springs Hatchery may meet the requirements of this habitat of local importance, the hatchery is run by WDFW (WDFW, 2019b).

Table 7. Critical Fish and Wildlife Species and Habitats

Field Evaluation

Patrick Togher (Professional Wetland Scientist) conducted the field evaluation of the project Study Area on June 27, 2019. The field evaluation was conducted from within the Western State Hospital Campus, with supplemental data collected from publicly accessible rights-of-way.

The level of effort for this field evaluation is consistent with a reconnaissance level analysis. As a result, formal delineations of wetlands and streams were not conducted, and formal presence studies were not complete for the presence of ESA species or rare plants.

Soils

No field evaluation was conducted for soils. Individual projects within the Master Plan will require preparation of a Geotechnical Memorandum or Geotechnical Report to assess soil and slope characteristics for compliance with SEPA and City of Lakewood permit requirements.

Wetlands

An evaluation of the presence of wetlands requires that the reviewer determine whether the recent rainfall reflects the normal precipitation for the area. For this evaluation, precipitation data was gathered from the Tacoma weather station #1, which is north nearest site with comprehensive precipitation records. Precipitation



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 10 of 22

measurements for the three months preceding the field visit were reviewed and area summarized in Table 8. Rainfall data for June 1 – 26 of 2019 is included in the table, but was not used in the calculation of normal rainfall.

Month	Mean ¹	30% chance less than ¹	30% chance more than ¹	Measured Rainfall	Condition	Value	Weight	Result ²
March	4.5	3.32	5.28	1.9	Below	1	1	1
April	3.19	2.13	3.82	2.65	Normal	2	2	4
May	2.07	1.11	2.53	0.4	Below	1	3	3
June 1-26 ³	1.52	0.95	1.84	0.14	Below			
Overall								8

Table 8. Monthly Precipitation in Inches and "normal" ranges and means for the Tacoma #1 Station,Tacoma, Washington1

¹ Agricultural Applied Climate System WETS Station in Tacoma#1 Weather Station, Tacoma, WA. Data for the normal range represents the period from 1983 to 2018 (USDA NRCS, 2019a).

² Results of 6-9 are below normal, results of 10-14 are normal, results of 15-16 are above normal.

³ Precipitation for the portion of June prior to the field visit.

Precipitation for the three months before the field evaluation was below normal, and the rainfall for the 26 days immediately preceding the field visit were also below normal for this period. However, seeps on the site were flowing freely and streams in the vicinity were near their normal water levels. As a result, we believe that sufficient primary and secondary indicators of wetland hydrology were present to assess the presence of wetlands on the Campus.

Two wetlands (GS South and GS North) were identified within or in the immediate vicinity of the project area (Figure 9). A description of the wetlands is provided in Table 9. The table summarizes the Cowardin classification, hydrogeomorphic class, and preliminary rating and buffer width per LMC 14.162.080.

Wetland	Wetland HGM Class ¹	Cowardin Classification ²	Dominant Species Observed	Wetland Hydrology Indicators Observed	Preliminary Wetland Rating ^{,3,4}	Preliminary Buffer Width4 ³
GS South	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225

Table 9. Potential Wetlands Present at the Site with Preliminary Ratings and Buffers



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update

Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 11 of 22

GS North	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, small- fruited bulrush, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225
----------	-------	------------------------------	--	--	--------	--------

¹ Hydrogeomorphic classification after Hruby (2014).

² Cowardian classification after Cowardin et al. (1979).

³ Preliminary rating based on Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Hruby, 2014).

⁴ Local wetland ratings and buffer widths are based on City of Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) Title 14 – Environmental Protection (LMC 14.162).

Wetlands GS North and GS South are slope wetlands associated with the Garrison Springs riparian corridor. Numerous areas of seepage were observed on the valley walls upslope of the stream during the site visit, and these areas were dominated by wetland plant species. Preliminary wetland ratings were completed with the 2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, consistent with LMC 14.162.030. Both wetlands fall on the margin of the Category II/III. Buffers for wetland with these ratings range from 60-225 feet, depending on the habitat score.

Streams

The presence of the two streams identified during the in-office evaluation were confirmed during the field evaluation. These streams, Garrison Springs and an Unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek, are shown on Figures 3, 7 and 8. A summary of the characteristics of these streams and preliminary stream rating and buffer widths are provided in Table 10.

Stream	Flows to	Preliminary Stream Rating ^{1,2}	Preliminary Buffer Width ²
Garrison Springs	Chambers Creek	Perennial, Fish-bearing (Type F)	65-150
Unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek	Chambers Creek	Perennial, Fish-bearing (Type F)	65-150

Table 10. Potential Streams present at the Site and preliminary rating

¹Water typing based on definition per 14.165.010

² Local stream ratings and buffer widths are based on Lakewood's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Chapter 4 Section C.

Garrison Springs/Garrison Creek is located in the central west portion of the Western State Hospital Campus. Garrison Springs, is a perennial stream, originating from seeps on the steep slopes on the western portion of the Campus and flowing northwest to the Garrison Springs Hatchery and the Chambers Creek Estuary on Puget Sound. Garrison Springs is approximately 5-15 feet wide at the ordinary high water mark and appeared to be channelized adjacent to the access road which leads to the hatchery. Current habitat in the stream is predominantly riffle and run type. Pools are largely limited to the areas above man-made structures on the stream. The stream substrate is primarily gravels with some fines, and the banks are somewhat incised. Mixed forest canopy and forested slope wetlands provided 100 percent canopy coverage, except where interrupted by



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 12 of 22

the hatchery access road. The stream flows beneath Chambers Creek Road, entering Chambers Creek through a concrete box outfall with a steel rack that limits access.

The unnamed stream is a tributary to Chambers Creek and is located beyond the Campus northern property line. As a result, most of the stream could not be evaluated during the site assessment. However, water could be heard flowing the deep, steep sided valley located to the north of the Fort Steilacoom Golf Course. The lower reach of this stream appears to be piped beneath the abandoned industrial facility at Chambers Creek Road. Several seeps areas were also identified in this area, and a concrete pipe outfall was located on the estuary of Chambers Creek, which likely represents the terminus of this stream. Flows were present at the outfall in July 2019, indicating that flows in this stream area likely perennial. Aerial imagery shows a densely vegetated, mixed forest riparian canopy in the riparian area, extending from the disc golf area northwest to Chambers Creek Road.

Future Master Plan projects at the Campus that require State or federal funding or permits will be required to assess the presence of wetlands and streams prior to funding or permit approval. More detailed field studies would be conducted at this time.

Plants

The majority of the Campus is developed, and vegetation in these areas consists of maintained lawn area with landscape trees. Species present in this area include common domestic grasses (bent grasses [*Agrostis* sp.], bluegrasses [*Poa* sp.], fescues [*Festuca* sp.], and rye grasses [*Lolium* sp.]) and disturbance tolerant forbs (e.g. common dandelion [*Taraxicum officinale*], hairy cat's ear [*Hypocharis radicata*], sheep sorrel [*Rumex acetosella*], etc.), and landscape trees (domestic cherry and flowering plums [*Prunus* sp.], European horse-chestnut [*Aesculus hippocastanum*], Norway maple [*Acer platanoides*], and Tree-of-Heaven [*Alianthus altissima*]), with scattered native trees (Douglas fir [*Pseudotsuga menziesii*], Sitka spruce [*Picea sitchensis*], and copses of Oregon white oak.

The Fort Steilacoom Golf Course is located the northwest corner of the property, and is also maintained as grass, with scattered native coniferous trees and Oregon White Oak. The disc golf area has a similar canopy to the golf course. In the open areas, the shrub community is dominated by Scot's brook (*Cytissus scoparius*). In areas where the canopy is denser, the dominant shrub species include California dewberry (*Rubus ursinus*), dull Oregon grape (*Berberis nervosa*), evergreen blackberry (*Rubus laciniatus*), Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and snowberry (*Symphicarpos albus*).

In the two ravine areas, the vegetation consists of a mixture of native and non-native species. The dominant species present include red alder (*Alnus rubra*) and bigleaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*) in the canopy, and California dewberry (*Rubus ursinus*), dull Oregon grape, evergreen blackberry, Himalayan blackberry, oceanspray (*Holodiscus discolor*), salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), snowberry, and vine maple (*Acer circinatum*). Dominant herbaceous species present include giant horsetail (*Equisetum telmateia*), orchard grass (*Dactylis glomerata*), reed cararygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), Pineland sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), and western lady fern (*Athyrium cyclosorum*).

Federally Listed Plants

The field reconnaissance did not identify any individuals of golden paintbrush, marsh sandwort or water howellia on the WSH campus. However, the protocols for identification of ESA plants require multiple field visits conducted over several years, and timed to match the emergence/flowering of the target species. Future projects in the Master Plan will need to conduct more comprehensive field studies to fully determine the presence of ESA listed plants.



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 13 of 22

Rare and Sensitive Plant Species

The field reconnaissance did not identify any individuals of white-top aster, common bluecup, or giant chain fern. However, the protocols for identification of rare and sensitive species may require multiple field visits timed to match the emergence/flowering of the target species. Considering the relatively recent identification of white-top aster (August 2010). This species should be presumed to be present, and future projects in the Master Plan will need to conduct more comprehensive field studies for the presence of rare and sensitive plant species.

Native Plants

Table 11 presents a list of the native trees, shrubs, and herbaceous species identified on the WSH Campus during the field evaluation.

Stratum	Common Name (Scientific Name)			
	Bigleaf maple (Acer macrophyllum)			
Tree	Oregon white oak (Quercus garryana)			
	Red alder (Alnus rubra)			
	California dewberry (Rubus ursinus)			
	Dull Oregon grape (Berberis nervosa)			
Chrub	Oceanspray (Holodiscus discolor)			
Silub	Salmonberry (Rubus spectabilis)			
	Snowberry (Symphicarpos albus)			
	Vine maple (Acer circinatum)			
	Giant horsetail (Equisetum telmateia)			
	Orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata)			
Herbaceous	Sword fern, or Pineland sword fern (Polystichum			
	munitum)			
	Western lady fern (Athyrium cyclosorum)			

Table 11. List of Native Plants on WSH Campus

Noxious, Invasive, and Non-Native Plants

No Class A noxious weeds were identified on the WSH Campus during the field investigation. Scattered knapweed specimens were present on the site, but were not positively identified as *C. biebersteinii*. A number of Class B and C noxious weeds were identified on the Campus. These species are listed below in Table 12.

State Classification	Common Name (Scientific Name)		
Class A Noxious Weed	Scattered knapweed specimens were present on the site, but were not positively identified as <i>C. biebersteinii</i> .		
Class B Noxious Weed	Scot's broom (Cytissus scoparius) ¹		
Class C Noxious Weed	English ivy (<i>Hedera helix</i>) Evergreen blackberry (<i>Rubus laciniatus</i>) ¹ Hairy cat's ear (<i>Hypochaeris radicata</i>) Himalayan blackberry (<i>Rubus armeniacus</i>) ¹ Reed canarygrass (<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>) ¹ Tree of Heaven (<i>Alianthus altissima</i>)		

Table 12. List of Noxious	, Invasive, and	Non-Native Plants
---------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------


Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 14 of 22

State Classification	Common Name (Scientific Name)
	Bentgrasses (<i>Agrostis</i> sp.)
	Bluegrass (<i>Poa</i> sp.)
	Cherry (likely cultivar varieties of the genus <i>Prunus</i>)
	Common sheep sorrel (Rumex acetosella)
Non-regulated, non-native	Eastern redcedar (Juniperus virginiana)
species	European horse-chestnut (Aesculus hippocastanum)
	Fescue grasses (<i>Festuca</i> sp.)
	Flowering plum (varieties of the genus Prunus)
	Lanceleaf plantain (<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>)
	Norway Maple (Acer platanoides)

¹ Non-regulated noxious weed per Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board.

Future Master Plan projects at the Campus will need to meet Pierce County and City of Lakewood regulations with regard to the control of noxious and invasive weeds.

Animals

The only positive wildlife identifications during the field evaluation were woodpeckers (identified by their sound), squirrels (likely eastern gray squirrel [*Sciurus carolinensis*] or eastern fox squirrel [*Sciurus niger*]), and American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*). However, considering the large size of the site and the presence of relatively undisturbed riparian areas in close proximity to Puget Sound, we would anticipate a variety of wildlife species that are adapted to proximity with suburban human populations, such as rats, mice, voles and similar rodents; North American raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), Virginia opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*), and passerine bird species. Deer (*Odocoileus* sp.) and coyote (*Canis latrans*) and were not observed on the Campus, but are likely present due the proximity of the riparian habitats on and near the Campus to Chambers Creek Estuary, which supports a variety of fish and wildlife species. A brief reconnaissance of the estuary area positively identified deer, great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), and bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*).

Federal and State-Listed Habitats and Species

Suburban developed areas in the Puget Sound do not provide suitable, usable habitat for large terrestrial predators such as Gray wolf or North American Wolverine. Oregon spotted frog requires relatively large areas of emergent wetland that are not present on the Campus.

Exposed gravel areas to the site could provide potential habitat for streaked horned lark, but the frequency of disturbance on the Campus makes nesting by this species unlikely. Nearby marine areas could potentially provide foraging habitat for marbled murrelet. Habitat suitable for use by yellow-billed cuckoo includes large tracts of riparian habitat with small trees and shrubs suitable for nesting. Some areas of similar riparian habitat are present on the Campus and nearby. Future projects should assume that streaked horned lark, marbled murrelet, yellow-billed cuckoo or suitable habitats <u>may</u> be present and should conduct more detailed studies.

Streams on the Campus and nearby have long culverted sections or other man-made barriers that preclude use by listed anadromous ESA listed fish species (Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout). However, these species are present in Puget Sound and likely use the nearby areas of Chambers Creek. As a result, future projects should assume the potential for impact to these species.



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 15 of 22

The riparian areas along Garrison Springs and the unnamed Tributary to Chambers Creek meet the definition of biodiversity areas and would be protected as critical areas. Similarly, habitats for little brown bat, slender-billed white-breasted nuthatch (mapped on the site) western pond turtle (mapped in the vicinity) would also need to be considered by future projects. Potential impacts to migratory birds during their breeding season would need to be considered by future projects.

Future Master Plan projects at the Campus should conduct detailed field studies to identify ESA listed, priority, and critical species and habitats in the immediate project vicinity.

5 CONCLUSIONS

We hope this memorandum has been responsive to your needs for a natural resource evaluation to support the preparation of a SEPA Checklist for the Western State Hospital Master Plan. Please feel free to contact me at 206.766.7618 or patrick.togher@pbsusa.com with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Patrick J Togher, Senior Project Manager

PJT:GP:EJ



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 16 of 22



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 17 of 22

6 REFERENCES

- Anderson, Paul S., Meyer, Susan, Olson, Patricia, and Stockdale, Erik. 2016. *Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington State*. October 2016 Final Review. Ecology Publication no. 16-06-029.
- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 1998. California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual. Third Edition. Inland Fisheries Division. California Department of Fish and Game. Sacramento, CA.
- City of Lakewood. 2019. City of Lakewood Municipal Code. Accessed online at: https://lakewood.municipal.codes/
- City of Lakewood. 2014. City of Lakewood Shoreline Master Program: Environment Designations, Policies, and Regulations. Available online at: http://cityoflakewood.us/wpcontent/uploads/2018/06/SMP_Final_Document_December_2014.pdf
- Cooke, S. S. 1997. A Field Guide to Common Wetland Plants of Western Washington and Northwestern Oregon. Seattle, WA: Seattle Audubon Society.

Cowardin, L.M., Carter, V., Golet, F.C., and La Roe, E.T. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. FWS/OBS79/31. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, D.C.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Technical Report Y-87-1. U.S. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2019. FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer. Accessed online at: https://hazardsfema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&extent=-122.68109821289039,47.103581842566264,-122.34876178710961,47.22029924549671

- Giblin, D.E. & B.S. Legler (eds.). 2003+. WTU Image Collection Web Site: Vascular Plants, MacroFungi, & Lichenized Fungi of Washington State. University of Washington Herbarium. Accessed 17 Jul 2019. http://biology.burke.washington.edu/herbarium/imagecollection.php.
- Google Earth. 2019. Online aerial photos.
- Hitchcock, C. L., and A. Cronquist. 1973. *Flora of the Pacific Northwest: An Illustrated Manual*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Hruby, T. 2014. *Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington: 2014 Update.* (Publication #14-06-029). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology.
- Lichvar, R.W., D.L. Banks, W.N. Kirchner, and N.C. Melvin. 2016. *The National Wetland Plant List: 2016 wetland ratings*. Phytoneuron 2016-30: 1-17. Published 28 April 2016. ISSN 2153 733X.
- McCain, M., D.Fuller, L.Decker and K.Overton. 1990. Stream habitat classification and inventory procedures for northern California. FHC Currents. No.1. U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.
- Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. 2019. Streamnet. A fisheries data project of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission. Available online at: http://www.streamnet.org/data/interactive-maps-and-gis-data/

Pierce County. 2019. Pierce County PublicGIS. Accessed online at: https://matterhornwab.co.pierce.wa.us/publicgis/



Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Environmental Evaluation Memorandum February 7, 2020 Page 18 of 22

- Pierce County Noxious Weed Control Board. 2019. Pierce County Noxious Weed List. Accessed online at: http://www.piercecountyweedboard.org/index.php/noxious-weeds/noxious-weeds-2
- Pojar J. and A. MacKinnon. 2004. Plants of the Pacific Northwest Coast Revised. Lonepine Publishing.
- Taylor, R. J. 1990. *Northwest Weeds: The Ugly and Beautiful Villains of Fields, Gardens, and Roadsides*. Missoula, MT: Mountain Press Publishing Company.
- The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. 2019. The Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program (SSHIAP) Statewide Integrated Fish Distribution (SWIFD) Interactive Map Tool. Available online at: http://maps.nwifc.org/swifd/
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region (Version 2.0). ed. J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-3. Vicksburg, MS. U.S. Army Corps of Engineer Research and Development Center.
- United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2019a. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Precipitation and WETS Data for Tacoma, Washington. Available online at: http://agacis.rcc-acis.org/?fips=53053. Accessed June 2019.
- NRCS. 2019b. Web Soil Survey. Accessed on-line at: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2019. Endangered Species and Critical Habitat Listing, IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation Website. Accessed online at: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/
- USFWS. 2000. Recovery Plan for the Golden Paintbrush (Castilleja levisecta). USFWS, Portland, Oregon. 51 pp.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2019a. Fish Passage Web Application. Accessed online at: https://geodataservices.wdfw.wa.gov/hp/fishpassage/index.html
- WDFW. 2019b. Hatchery Facilities. Available online at: https://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/management/hatcheries/facilities?county=43
- WDFW. 2019c. Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) on the Web. Accessed online at: http://apps.wdfw.wa.gov/phsontheweb/
- WDFW. 2019d. SalmonScape. Accessed online at: http://apps.wdfw.wa.gov/salmonscape/
- WDFW. 2019e. State Listed Species and State Candidate Species. Accessed online at: https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2019-06/threatened%20and%20endangered%20species%20list.pdf
- Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). 2019a. Forest Practices Application Mapping Tool. Accessed online at: https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/protectiongis/fpamt/default.aspx

WDNR Washington Natural Heritage Program. 2019b. Washington Wetlands of High Conservation Value. Accessed online at:

https://wadnr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5cf9e5b22f584ad7a4e2aebc63c47bda

- WDNR. 2018. Washington Natural Heritage Rare Plants and Nonvasculars. Accessed online at: https://www.dnr.wa.gov/NHPdata
- WDNR. 2019c. Rare Plant Field Guide. Accessed online at: https://www.dnr.wa.gov/NHPfieldguide.
- Washington Noxious Weed Control Board. 2019. Washington State Noxious Weed List. Accessed online at: https://www.nwcb.wa.gov/pdfs/2019-State-Weed-List_Scientific_Name-8.5x11_190102_151144.pdf

RECEIVED
02/14/2020
CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

RECEIVED
02/14/2020
CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Figures





VICINITY MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

1





Map Unit Symbol Map Unit Name		Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
13D	Everett very gravelly sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes	3.6	0.6%
41A	Spanaway gravelly sandy loam	536.7	84.7%
47F	Xerochrepts, 45 to 70 percent slopes	76.3	12.0%
48A	Xerorthents, fill areas	11.7	1.9%
Totals for Area of Interest		633.6	100.0%



WEB SOIL SURVEY MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

个 N

2











PIERCE COUNTY PUBLICGIS MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

4

个 N



PATCH NAME, PATCH SIZE IN ACRES

PATCH A, 2.7985 AC PATCH B, 1.9348 AC PATCH C, 18.3011 AC <u>PATCH D, 9.5754 AC</u> **PATCH TOTAL: 32.61 AC**

SOURCE: WDNR GIS OPEN DATA, DATED FEBRUARY 28, 2019



OREGON WHITE OAK WOODLANDS MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

个 N

5







WDFW PHS MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

N

6



SOURCE DATASET: PHSPlusPublic REPORT DATE: 06/25/2019 1.07

Query ID: P190625130711



Common Name Scientific Name	Site Name Source Dataset Source Record	Priority Area Occurrence Type More Information (URL)	Accuracy	Federal Status State Status PHS Listing Status	Sensitive Data Resolution	Source Entity Geometry Type
Notes	Source Date	Mgmt Recommendations				
Biodiversity Areas And	PUYALLUP STEEP OPEN	Terrestrial Habitat	1/4 mile (Quarter	N/A	z	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
	PHSREGION 902552	N/A		N/A	AS MAPPED	Polygons
		http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication:	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		
Biodiversity Areas And	PIERCE COUNTY CANDIDATI	E Terrestrial Habitat	1/4 mile (Quarter	N/A	Z	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
	PHSREGION	N/A		N/A	AS MAPPED	Polygons
		http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		
Little Brown Bat		Breeding Area	Map 1:12,000 <= 33	NA	~	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Myotis lucifugus	WS_OccurPoint 110873	Biotic detection		N/A	TOWNSHIP	Points
	June 01, 1997	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication:	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		
Slender-billed white-	WESTERN WA STATE	Breeding Site	1/4 mile (Quarter	N/A	Z	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Sitta carolinensis aculeata	WS_OccurPoint	Biotic detection		Candidate	AS MAPPED	Points
	January 01, 1983			PHS LISTED		
Western Pond Turtle		Occurrence	1/8 mile	N/A	٨	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Actinemys marmorata	WS_OccurPoint 110843	Biotic detection		Endangered	QTR-TWP	Points
	October 21, 2007	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication:	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		
Western Pond Turtle		Occurrence	1/8 mile	N/A	٨	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Actinemys marmorata	WS_OccurPoint 110841	Biotic detection		Endangered	QTR-TWP	Points
	April 19, 2006	http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication:	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		
Western Pond Turtle		Occurrence	1/8 mile	NA	٢	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Actinemys marmorata	WS_OccurPoint 110840	Biotic detection		Endangered	QTR-TWP	Points
		http://wdfw.wa.gov/publication:	s/pub.php?	PHS LISTED		

06/25/2019 1.07

~

Source Entity Geometry Type	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Points	WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife Polygons
Sensitive Data Resolution	Υ ΩΤR-TWP	Υ ΩΤR-TWP
Federal Status State Status PHS Listing Status	N/A Endangered PHS LISTED	N/A Endangered PHS LISTED
Accuracy (L) ions	1/8 mile blications/pub.php?	1/4 mile (Quarter Iblications/pub.php?
Priority Area Occurrence Type More Information (UF Mgmt Recommendat	Occurrence Biotic detection http://wdfw.wa.gov/pu	Occurrence Individual occurrence http://wdfw.wa.gov/pu
Site Name Source Dataset Source Record Source Date	WS_OccurPoint 110842 November 18, 2006	PHSREGION 912957
Common Name Scientific Name Notes	Western Pond Turtle Actinemys marmorata	Western Pond Turtle Actinemys marmorata



DISCLAIMER. This report includes information that the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) maintains in a central computer database. It is not an attempt to provide you with an official agency response as to the impacts of your project on fish and wildlife. This information only documents the location of fish and wildlife resources to the best of our knowledge. It is not a complete inventory and it is important to note that fish and wildlife resources may occur in areas not currently known to WDFW biologists, or in areas for which comprehensive surveys have not been conducted. Site specific surveys are frequently necesssary to rule out the presence of priority resources. Locations of fish and wildlife resources to vraition caused by disturbance, changes in season and weather, and other factors. WDFW does not recommend using reports more than six months old.



Hatcheries and Rearing

Hatchery
 Rearing Facility

FishTraps

- + Trap Adult
- + Trap Juvenile
- Trap Unknown Juvenile or Adult
- Major Dams

Spring Chinook ESUs

- Endangered, Accessible
 - Endangered, Historical Watershed: Man-Made Blockage
 - Threatened, Accessible
 - Threatened, Historical Watershed: Man-Made Blockage
 - Species of Concern, Accessible
 - Species of Concern, Historical Watershed: Man-Made Blockage
 - Not Warranted, Accessible

Not Warranted, Historical Watershed: Man-Made Blockage
 All SalmonScape Species

Culverts

+ Total Blockage

4

- Total Blockage, Fishway Present
 Partial Blockage
- Partial Blockage, Fishway Present
- Unknown Blockage

- Unknown Blockage, Fishway Present
- Dams Total Blockage
 - Total Blockage, Fishway Present
 - Partial Blockage
 - Partial Blockage, Fishway Present
- --- Unknown Blockage
- Unknown Blockage, Fishway Present

USG S/NHD

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User



SALMONSCAPE MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

7





PSMFC GIS, Sources Esti, HERE, Garmin, Internap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Orchance Survey, Esti Japan, METI, Esti China (Hong Kong), svisstopo, © OpenStreettVap contributors, and the



STREAMNET MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE





Map Symbols

~ ~ ~	Harvest Boundary	
	Road Construction	
\sim	Stream	
\boxtimes	RMZ / WMZ Buffers	
\propto	Rock Pit	

•	Landing
\bigtriangledown	Waste Area
\$	Clumped WRTS/GRTS
#	Existing Structure



DNR MAPPER

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

个 N



Wetland	Wetland HGM Class ¹	Cowardin Classification ²	Dominant Species Observed	Wetland Hydrology Indicators Observed	Preliminary Wetland Rating ^{,3,4}	Preliminary Buffer Width4 ³
GS South	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225
GS North	Slope	Palustrine Forested (PFO)	Red alder, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry, lady fern, giant horsetail, small-fruited bulrush, and English ivy	Saturation at the surface, shallow inundation/surface flows	11/111	60-225

¹ Hydrogeomorphic classification after Hruby (2014).

² Cowardian classification after Cowardin et al. (1979).

³ Preliminary rating based on Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington (Hruby, 2014).

⁴ Local wetland ratings and buffer widths are based on City of Lakewood Municipal Code (LMC) Title 14 – Environmental Protection (LMC 14.162).



WETLAND RECONNAISSANCE MAP

Western State Hospital Master Plan Update Natural Resource Reconnaissance Memorandum 9601 Steilacoom Blvd SW, Lakewood, WA 98498 FIGURE

RECEIVED
02/14/2020
CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



Appendix A USFWS IPaC Resource List

41189.001

IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as *trust resources*) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

Location

Pierce County, Washington



Local office

Washington Fish And Wildlife Office

<a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><a><

510 Desmond Drive Se, Suite 102 Lacey, WA 98503-1263

http://www.fws.gov/wafwo/



Endangered species

This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population, even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and projectspecific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can **only** be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

- 1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
- 2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
- 3. Log in (if directed to do so).
- 4. Provide a name and description for your project.
- 5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

Listed species¹ and their critical habitats are managed by the <u>Ecological Services Program</u> of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries²).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are **not** shown on this list. Please contact <u>NOAA Fisheries</u> for <u>species under their jurisdiction</u>.

- Species listed under the <u>Endangered Species Act</u> are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the <u>listing status page</u> for more information.
- 2. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

Mammals

NAME



Proposed Threatened

Gray Wolf Canis lupus

No critical habitat has been designated for this species.

North American Wolverine Gulo gulo luscus No critical habitat has been designated for this species. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5123</u>

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Marbled Murrelet Brachyramphus marmoratus There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4467</u>	Threatened
Streaked Horned Lark Eremophila alpestris strigata There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7268</u> Yellow-billed Cuckoo Coccyzus americanus	Threatened
There is proposed critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3911 Amphibians	STATUS
Oregon Spotted Frog Rana pretiosa There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6633	Threatened
Fishes	
NAME	STATUS
Bull Trout Salvelinus confluentus	Threatened

There is **final** critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8212</u>

Flowering Plants

NAME

STATUS

6/28/2019	RECEIVED 02/14/2020 CITY OF LAKEWOOD	IPaC: Explore Location	
Golden Paintbrush Castilleja levi No critical habitat has been desig https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/	secta ;nated for th <u>/7706</u>	nis species.	Threatened
Marsh Sandwort Arenaria palud No critical habitat has been desig <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/</u>	icola ;nated for th (<u>2229</u>	nis species.	Endangered
Water Howellia Howellia aquatili No critical habitat has been desig <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/</u>	S ;nated for th <u>/7090</u>	nis species.	Threatened

Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

zUL

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS AT THIS LOCATION.

Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act^{1} and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act^{2} .

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described <u>below</u>.

- 1. The <u>Migratory Birds Treaty Act</u> of 1918.
- 2. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/birds-of-conservation-concern.php
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/</u> <u>conservation-measures.php</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/nationwidestandardconservationmeasures.pdf</u>

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the <u>USFWS Birds of</u> <u>Conservation Concern</u> (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ <u>below</u>. This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list 6/28/2019

RECEIVED	1
02/14/2020	L
CITY OF LAKEWOOD	L
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	

will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the <u>E-bird data mapping tool</u> (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found <u>below</u>.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME

BREEDING SEASON (IF A BREEDING SEASON IS INDICATED FOR A BIRD ON YOUR LIST, THE BIRD MAY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA SOMETIME WITHIN THE TIMEFRAME SPECIFIED, WHICH IS A VERY LIBERAL ESTIMATE OF THE DATES INSIDE WHICH THE BIRD BREEDS ACROSS ITS ENTIRE RANGE. "BREEDS ELSEWHERE" INDICATES THAT THE BIRD DOES NOT LIKELY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA.)

-ON Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus Breeds Jan 1 to Sep 30 This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626 Breeds elsewhere Black Turnstone Arenaria melanocephala This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. Great Blue Heron Ardea herodias fannini Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 15 This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA Breeds elsewhere Lesser Yellowlegs Tringa flavipes This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679

Marbled Godwit Limosa fedoa



Breeds elsewhere

Breeds elsewhere

Breeds May 20 to Aug 31

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9481</u>

Olive-sided Flycatcher Contopus cooperi This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914</u>

Red-throated Loon Gavia stellata This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Rufous Hummingbird selasphorus rufus This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8002</u>

Western Screech-owl Megascops kennicottii kennicottii This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA Breeds Mar 1 to Jun 30

Breeds Apr 15 to Jul 1

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

- 1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
- 2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week



of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is 0.25/0.25 = 1; at week 20 it is 0.05/0.25 = 0.2.

3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort (|)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

No Data (–)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.

				🗖 prob	ability of	presence	e br	eeding s	eason	survey	effort –	no data
SPECIES	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Bald Eagle Non-BCC Vulnerable (This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.)			9a	+111			1111	1111	++1		*111	
Black Turnstone BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	+++#	++++
Great Blue Heron BCC - BCR (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA)						••••	1111	II+I	+₩₩₩			₩₩₩+

6/28/2019			REC 02/ CITY COMMUN	CEIVED 14/2020 DF LAKEWOOD ITY DEVELOPMENT	IPa	aC: Explore	e Location					
Lesser Yellowlegs BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++	+++#	++++	++++	++++	++++	++#+	++++	++++	++++
Marbled Godwit BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++ 	++++	++++	++++
Olive-sided Flycatcher BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++	+++#	+=11	1111	1111	1++1	++++	++++		++++
Red-throated Loon BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	# #+ #	+++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++ 3	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++++
Rufous Hummingbird BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	+++• < C	+•••• R	UU.	<u>ian</u>	1111	1111	1111	I +++	++++	++++	++++
Western Screech- owl BCC - BCR (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA)	++++	+++	* +++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++

Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

<u>Nationwide Conservation Measures</u> describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. <u>Additional measures</u> and/or <u>permits</u> may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

6/28/2019

RECEIVED
02/14/2020
CITY OF LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS <u>Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC)</u> and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the <u>Avian Knowledge Network</u> (<u>AKN</u>). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of <u>survey, banding, and citizen science datasets</u> and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle (<u>Eagle Act</u> requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the <u>AKN Phenology Tool</u>.

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the <u>Avian</u> <u>Knowledge Network (AKN</u>). This data is derived from a growing collection of <u>survey, banding, and citizen science</u> <u>datasets</u>.

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or yearround), you may refer to the following resources: <u>The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide</u>, or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the <u>Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds guide</u>. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

- 1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are <u>Birds of Conservation Concern</u> (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
- 2. "BCC BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
- 3. "Non-BCC Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the <u>Eagle Act</u> requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the <u>Northeast Ocean Data Portal</u>. The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review.



IPaC: Explore Location

Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the <u>NOAA NCCOS</u> <u>Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic</u> <u>Outer Continental Shelf</u> project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the <u>Diving Bird Study</u> and the <u>nanotag studies</u> or contact <u>Caleb Spiegel</u> or <u>Pam Loring</u>.

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to <u>obtain a permit</u> to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory birds resources page.

Facilities

National Wildlife Refuge lands

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the <u>National Wildlife Refuge</u> system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS AT THIS LOCATION.

Fish hatcheries

THERE ARE NO FISH HATCHERIES AT THIS LOCATION.



Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory

Impacts to <u>NWI wetlands</u> and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local <u>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</u> <u>District</u>.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

This location overlaps the following wetlands:

RIVERINE

<u>R4SBC</u>

A full description for each wetland code can be found at the National Wetlands Inventory website

Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

Data exclusions

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tuberficid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

Data precautions

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.