

# SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL 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 nonproject proposals:***

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT 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*** [\[HELP\]](#)

- 1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:** Land Use Code solid waste storage, staging, and collection amendments
- 2. Name of applicant:** Seattle Public Utilities (SPU)

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

Seattle Public Utilities  
700 Fifth Avenue  
P.O. Box 35177  
Seattle, WA 98124-5177

Contact: Hans VanDusen (206) 684-4657

**4. Date checklist prepared:** January 13, 2020

**5. Agency requesting checklist:** City of Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)

**6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):** 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2020

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

No.

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

None other than this checklist.

**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.**

The proposal addresses property citywide rather than a single development site. Applications are pending citywide for development permits; however, new amendments would apply only applications made after the bill becomes effective.

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

City Council approval

**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.)**

The proposal is a non-project action that would update the solid waste storage and access rules in the Land Use Code, Section 23.54.040, "Solid waste and recyclable materials storage and access," applicable to new development. SPU, SDCI, and Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) review development permit applications according to these rules, to ensure sufficient access and minimum space is provided for on-site solid waste storage, as well as staging and collection locations at or near where solid waste collection occurs on a regular basis. The rules

would apply citywide.

The changes to the code would:

- Newly add these requirements to certain additional kinds of development, including industrial development, and additions of commercial space greater than 5,000 square feet;
  - Add the dimensions of minimum required space for solid waste storage areas in buildings with non-residential uses – either 8 feet width and depth dimensions for non-residential use (less than 5,000 square feet floor area) storage spaces, or 12 feet width and depth dimensions for non-residential use (5,000 square feet or greater) storage spaces;
- Newly require solid waste collection capability – through either chutes or placing containers, or a combination – on each floor of multifamily buildings with 3 or more floors;
- Provide a floor area exemption for the new on-floor required space;
- Provide for added flexibility to define alternative workable measures that will meet the intent of the solid waste storage and access rules;
- Clarify slope maximums and overhead utility clearance dimensions in how solid waste is moved, placed, and accessed for collection;
- Clarify container sharing capabilities between development use types, and limits on how containers of different sizes should be placed for collection;
- Define that pre-collection locations for containers, known as “staging areas,” must be shown on building plans – something that SPU already asks for in their development reviews.

The general intent is to continue to foster and improve recycling rates in residential development, and ensure sufficient space and forethought is given to how garbage, food waste, and recycling will be stored and collected in dense neighborhoods as new development continues.

**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.**

Applicable to the entire city of Seattle.

## **B. Environmental Elements** [\[HELP\]](#)

### 1. **Earth** [\[help\]](#)

#### a. **General description of the site:**

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other \_\_\_\_\_

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

There is no site for this non-project action. Future development could occur on sites with varying degrees of flatness, rolling topography, slopes, and even properties with steep slopes.

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

There are a wide variety of soils throughout the city of Seattle, including types of glacial till, and other types, with varying levels of gravel and sand. There are also places where peat, clay, and muck soils may be present, of which some are in places containing more moisture, such as wetlands, bogs, and stream environments. Most future development would occur in soils that can offer adequate soil stability either in their natural condition or as accomplished by a variety of foundation and paving techniques.

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

No; there is no single site for this non-project action.

**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.**

None proposed for this non-project action. The proposal is not expected to adversely affect the amount of filling, excavation, or grading in future affected development.

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

No; the potential for significant adverse erosion impacts due to this non-project action is low, because it would not affect the degree of development in erosion-sensitive areas.

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

There is no single site for this non-project action. The proposal slightly increases spaces for, or clarifies how solid waste storage occurs, but this is largely within buildings or in places where impervious surfaces are not required. Therefore, the proposal is not likely to materially increase the percent of impervious surface coverage in future development.

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

None proposed.

## **2. Air** [\[help\]](#)

**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.**

None. Due to the nature of the non-project action and its minimal effects on the physical outcomes of future development, net differences in air pollutant emissions from that future development are unlikely. Thus, no adverse air emissions impacts are identified.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

### 3. **Water** [\[help\]](#)

#### a. **Surface Water:** [\[help\]](#)

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.

No; there is no single site for this non-project action.

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.

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.

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.

#### b. **Ground Water:** [\[help\]](#)

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

No.

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.

None. The proposal does not address waste materials of this sort.

**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.**

There is no single site for this non-project action. Properties in the city of Seattle are subject to a wide variety of runoff characteristics of all kinds, depending on the varying conditions of natural or manmade drainage pathways and facilities.

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

No. The non-project action would not materially affect future development in a way that would lead to new waste material deposits into waters.

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

No. There is no single site for this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

**4. Plants** [\[help\]](#)

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

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

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

None. There is no single site for this non-project action. Likely future development would include infill development on either vacant properties that remain, or redevelopment of lower-density structures into higher-density structures. As such, future development could lead to vegetative clearing on a cross-section of properties that host either vegetation and landscaping adapted to urban environments, or more natural, less developed settings that may be in or near greenbelts or drainage channels or existing parklands and shoreline vicinities. A relatively low level of disturbance in drainages and shorelines is expected in future development. In other already-urbanized vicinities, no significant adverse impacts of

the non-project proposal are anticipated on vegetation, due to lack of relevant differences in the nature and characteristics of future development with or without the regulatory changes included in the proposal.

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

Within the range of all vegetation present in the city of Seattle, there is a conceivable possibility that threatened and endangered plant species are present in or near future development sites. It is not necessary to catalog all such potential species in this response, but these could potentially include a number of rare natural or planted trees, or shrubs or other plants. If future development is proposed, city regulations require that tree and other species of note be disclosed as part of application and permitting documentation. The nature of this non-project action does not increase the potential for future development to result in increased impacts on threatened plant species in any known way, because it does not materially affect the nature of future development regarding total coverage or extent of development activity.

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

None proposed.

**e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.**

None known, due to lack of a particular site for this non-project action. Typical invasive species such as English ivy are known to be present intermittently in the city as well as typical weed species affecting urban environments.

**5. Animals** [\[help\]](#)

**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:** squirrels, coyote, rabbit

**fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, **other** \_\_\_\_\_

There are numerous varieties of urban environments and habitats or microhabitats across the city that support many different birds and other animal populations. There is no one site for this non-project action. Likely future development would include infill development on either vacant properties that remain, or redevelopment of lower-density structures into higher-density structures. As such, future development could occur on a cross-section of properties that host either wildlife adapted to urban environments, or more natural, less developed settings that may be in or near greenbelts or drainage channels or existing parklands and shoreline vicinities.

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

Based on the affected environment described above, it is conceivable that protected or threatened or endangered species could be present on or near future development sites. The most likely affected animals could be herons, and salmon, to the extent they could be present near future development or in downstream locations potentially affected by future development.

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

Given the description in responses to questions 5a and 5b above, it is conceivable that future development sites could be near wildlife migration routes. However, no material adverse effects of the non-project proposal are anticipated on wildlife migration due to lack of relevant differences in the nature and characteristics of future development.

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

None proposed.

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

None known.

**6. Energy and Natural Resources** [\[help\]](#)

**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.**

None, in relation to future development, as affected by this non-project proposal.

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

No.

**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:**

None proposed, in relation to future development, as affected by this non-project proposal.

The proposal relates to slightly increasing details and requirements about the manner of solid waste collecting and storage on given properties. There is no particular identified manner in which the proposal would lead to adverse energy impacts of any kind, much less significant adverse impacts.

**7. Environmental Health** [\[help\]](#)

**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.**

No. There is no single site for this non-project action, and no risks of these kinds due to the proposal. The proposal is likely to result in better, and well-tended solid waste and recycling systems in future development with no particular effects identified in relation to toxic chemicals exposure or any other risk described in this question.

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

See response to question 7a above.

**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.**

See response to question 7a above.

- 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.**

See response to question 7a above.

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

None.

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

None proposed.

**b. Noise**

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

None. There is no single site for this non-project action.

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

This non-project action would not generate any new types of noise-generation with future development. The action addresses facilities for solid waste storage and collection, which would be present in future development with or without the action. Different kinds of solid waste storage and collection options could be possible at future new buildings, and parties responsible for the building's operation would select manners of storage and collection, with or without this non-project action. The implementation of the action would not create new sources or patterns of noise generation from future development, including from its construction or operation.

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

None proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use** [\[help\]](#)

- 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.**

There is no single site for this non-project action. In relation to future development and solid waste collection and storage patterns, the non-project action would not likely substantially affect current or future land uses on nearby or adjacent properties. Our consideration of this question does not suggest any net differences in adverse land use impacts that might be caused by future development. This is due to a lack of physical differences in future development or solid waste servicing that might create significant spillover adverse land use impacts on or incompatibilities with adjacent or nearby properties. This includes for residential, commercial, and industrial development scenarios potentially affected by the proposal. For example, much of the detail of the non-project action would affect internal spaces of a building in ways that would not affect exterior locations. Also, future solid waste servicing would occur in the same manner or mostly in the same manner as existing servicing, with a minimal-to-low potential for minor differences in container placement to infringe upon the use patterns of neighboring properties. In other words, it is not probable that significant adverse land use impacts would occur due to this proposal.

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

No; none of the topics in this question pertain to this non-project proposal or future relevant development.

**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.

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

See the response to question 8.a above.

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

No.

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

Any and all zoning classifications within the City of Seattle, including residential, industrial, and commercial zones could be present.

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

All affected areas within the City of Seattle are designated Urban.

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

Any and all shoreline master program designations within the City of Seattle could be present in future development in places affected by the proposed non-project action. However, in a majority of future development, none would be present.

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

Any and all critical area designations within the City of Seattle could be present in future development sites affected by the proposed non-project action. However, in a majority of future development, none would be present. Any such areas would be subject to city critical area policies and regulations, regardless of the proposal.

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

See the response to question 8.a above.

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

None. See the response to question 8.a above.

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

None proposed.

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

None proposed.

**m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:**

None proposed.

**9. Housing** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed non-project action does not have a direct bearing on the number of dwelling units provided in future development. Indirectly, proposed regulations affecting future development space allocations could potentially affect the nature and sizing and potentially amounts of future housing development, except for details in the proposal that help avoid or mitigate this potential effect. For example, a proposed floor area exemption for certain facilities related to solid waste would have a mitigating effect by not consuming permissible floor area that otherwise would be used to provide housing units. By not counting such areas against maximum zoned development amounts, the potential for solid waste facilities to affect the exact quantities and types of future developed dwelling units is avoided or diminished.

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

None. Compared to existing regulations, the proposed non-project action does not have a bearing on or cause a net change in how much future development would occur or potentially how many existing housing units would be eliminated.

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

None proposed.

**10. Aesthetics** [\[help\]](#)

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

The proposed non-project action does not affect a particular single site, and does not have a direct bearing on the height or exterior building materials of future development, which is regulated by height limits and other policies and regulations in the Land Use Code.

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

See the response to question 10.a above.

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

None proposed.

**11. Light and Glare** [\[help\]](#)

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

See the response to question 10.a above.

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

No. See the response to question 10.a above.

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

None.

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

None proposed.

**12. Recreation** [\[help\]](#)

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

None. There is no single site for this non-project action.

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

No.

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

No.

**13. Historic and cultural preservation** [\[help\]](#)

**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.**

None. There is no single site for this non-project action. The proposal could include regulations applicable to historic buildings or sites, but other protective regulations addressing the treatment of such resources would also pertain to specific development proposals.

**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.**

No. There is no single site for this non-project action.

**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.**

None. There is no single site for this non-project action.

**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.**

None proposed.

#### **14. Transportation** [\[help\]](#)

**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.**

There is no single site for this non-project action. The citywide street network does not have a direct bearing on this non-project action. The proposal addresses aspects of access to the street system, in that the ability to place solid waste containers for collection may relate to physical slopes, and/or whether the adjoining street has transit service, and what the nature of curb use and other physical characteristics are. In relation to transit capabilities, existing and future practices would continue to ensure that through access can be safely accomplished.

**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?**

See the response to question 14.a.

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

See the response to question 14.a. The non-project action would have no direct bearing on parking spaces in future development.

**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).**

No. See the response to question 14.a.

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

No. See the response to question 14.a.

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

None for this non-project action. The non-project proposal would not generate any probable net differences in vehicle trips from future development, because solid waste vehicle trips would occur to and from future development regardless, and in the same probable volumes.

**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.

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

None proposed.



## **D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions** [\[HELP\]](#)

(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?**

The proposed non-project action and its relation to potential future development outcomes are not likely to result in direct or indirect significant adverse impacts related to water, air, toxic/hazardous substances, or noise. Similarly, no significant cumulative adverse impacts to these environmental elements are anticipated. The proposal addresses solid waste collection features and minimum performance requirements for future development, and aspects such as showing locations for staging and collection of solid waste containers, as part of the regular service of this utility. The proposal provides for larger solid waste storage facilities within future developed sites and structures, newly applicable requirements for commercial and residential additions, and industrial development, and a couple of items clarify access requirements (re: overhead clearance, and placement of certain containers) that ensure regular solid waste collection operations may occur. Also, new content would clarify opportunities for flexibility in how the solid waste storage and access is provided for, in case certain sites have impediments to service.

This checklist identifies no tangible potential for adverse environmental impacts with respect to air emissions, noise, or toxic/hazardous substances release, due to the code itself or its effect on future development. The non-project proposal would not substantially adversely affect how or where solid waste collection service would occur, and would not increase the total amount of solid waste service provided. This would be so because the proposal would not cause a larger amount of future development to occur, or changes in how much service is provided or necessarily where the solid waste collection service would be provided in exterior locations. Because there is little or no potential for adverse differences in how the services are accomplished in terms of these details, there is little or no potential for significant adverse environmental impacts regarding these elements of the environment.

Individual future development sites or developments that would be proposed after this non-project proposal, if they are subject to SEPA review, could evaluate and disclose the potential for environmental impacts based on the specific proposal and area affected. Such circumstances could be subject to other existing regulatory protections of natural environmental features such as drainage courses and environmentally critical areas. Also, stormwater and drainage regulatory codes would continue to apply and help avoid or mitigate the potential for environmental impacts.

#### **Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:**

None proposed.

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

The proposed non-project action would not likely result in direct adverse impacts to these environmental elements, in part due to a lack of potential to generate substantial differences in impacts on the physical environment around future development. See the response to question #1 above, including references to existing regulatory protections of natural features such as drainage courses and environmentally critical areas, which would minimize the potential for indirect and cumulative impacts upon plant, fish, or wildlife impacts. Therefore, this checklist identifies no potentially significant adverse plant, animal, fish, or marine life impacts.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed code amendments would result in no direct adverse impacts, and are unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative impacts related to energy or natural resources. The non-project proposal would not affect the amount or rate of future development of buildings in Seattle, and is not likely to adversely affect the manner of solid waste collection service in terms of how the collection vehicles operate.

One intent of the proposal is to accomplish higher rates of recyclable material collection through more convenient on-floor collection services (containers or chutes), which could relate to achieving greater recycling efficiencies overall, and thus more efficient avoidance of natural resources consumption. Further quantification of such a possible positive effect is beyond the scope of this environmental checklist.

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

None proposed.

**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?**

None of these kinds of environmentally sensitive areas or resources is likely to be substantially adversely affected by this non-project proposal (or related future development). Features such as historic buildings could be subject to the proposed regulations, but proposed language also accommodates the possibility of adaptive application of the requirements, which could aid in accomplishing outcomes that protect historic buildings or sites. The proposal would not affect an existing potential for unknown cultural resource sites to be discovered at future development sites. In other words, the proposed solid waste rules would not result in changes in potential development outcomes that would increase the potential for disturbance of cultural sites or resources. It would also not affect the strength of regulatory protection of those cultural sites or resources, if they are discovered, which is addressed by other State and local regulations, policies, and practices. See the response to question D.1 above, which addresses potential for drainage and wetland impacts.

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

None proposed.

**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?**

As noted in the response to question 8.a earlier in this checklist: in relation to future development and solid waste collection and storage patterns, the non-project action would not be likely to affect compatibility of current or future land uses on nearby or adjacent properties in an adverse or significant adverse manner. Our consideration of this question does not suggest adverse net differences in future development outcomes, with or without the non-project proposal. This is due to a lack of physical differences in future development in ways that might have an adverse effect on adjacent or nearby properties. For example, details of the non-project action could physically affect internal spaces of a building but not necessarily outdoor spaces. It is not probable that the physical implications of potential slight differences in manner of future development would create adverse or significant adverse incompatibilities with land uses on nearby properties.

Similarly, it is not likely that potential differences in outdoor operations, such as how solid waste containers are staged or moved or collected, would generate significant land use incompatibilities. In part, this relates to the City already requiring the demonstrating of staging and storage locations on development plans, and the City's review and approval of such operational aspects. To the extent there might be slight differences in how solid waste operations might occur, with or without the proposal, they are similar enough to not generate significant potential for differential land use compatibility impacts. This is due to a probable lack of circumstances that might cause significant new spillover land use impacts or actual conflicts among neighboring land uses. This kind of land use impact conclusion can be considered accurate on a property-by-property basis and also as a general conclusion about the overall low potential for adverse land use impacts at a neighborhood or citywide level.

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

None proposed.

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

As noted in the response to question 14.f earlier in this checklist, the non-project proposal would not generate any probable net differences in vehicle trips from future development, because solid waste vehicle trips would occur to future development regardless, and in the same probable volumes.

As noted in the responses to question 15.a and 16.b earlier in this checklist, the proposal would not affect future development in any manner that might cause an increase in demand for public services, and would not be likely to generate adverse built environment impact potential on the solid waste utility or any other kind of utility listed in this checklist.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposal is not known to conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.