

**SEATTLE CITY COUNCIL SEPA
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

This SEPA environmental review has been conducted in accord with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (RCW 43.21C), State SEPA regulations [Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Chapter 197-11], and the City of Seattle SEPA ordinance SMC Chapter 25.05. The proposed action is considered a non-project action under SEPA. Non-project actions are broader than a single site-specific project (WAC 197-11-774, SMC 25.05.774). This type of non-project action is not categorically exempt from a SEPA Threshold Determination (SMC 25.05.305 and SMC 25.05.800); therefore, it must be analyzed to determine if there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts. The probable significant adverse environmental impacts analyzed in a non-project SEPA environmental checklist are those impacts foreseeable at this stage, before specific project actions are planned. The Seattle City Council's Central Staff has prepared this SEPA Environmental Checklist under the non-project provisions of SEPA.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project:

Permanent Supportive Housing Land Use Code Regulations¹

2. Name of applicant:

Seattle City Council

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

Ketil Freeman, Legislative Analyst

Seattle City Council Central Staff

600 4th Avenue

Seattle, WA 98104

Ketil.freeman@seattle.gov

206.684.8178

4. Date checklist prepared:

November 12, 2020

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

The proposed council bill is expected to be considered by the Seattle City Council in the fourth quarter of 2020 and the first quarter of 2021. Council review will include a public hearing. If approved by Council, the proposed regulations would take effect before the end of the first quarter, 2021.

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

The proposal is a non-project action that is not dependent on any other current or future

¹ SDCl planner Gordon Clowers has annotated this checklist with underline and ~~strikeout~~ text to reflect his review, with recommended additions, clarifications and deletions to the checklist submitted by the applicant.

action.

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

No environmental information has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

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 is a non-project, non-site-specific action that would take effect within zones within the city that allow multifamily residential uses. There are no other applications pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting this proposal. Future public and private development projects may be subject to separate project-specific SEPA environmental review.

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

The legislation associated with this proposal will need to be approved by the City Council by ordinance following standard legislative rules and procedures.

11. Give a 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.

This proposal would (1) add a definition of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) to the Land Use Code, (2) establish new regulations and procedures for developing PSH, and (3) modify existing regulations to remove Land Use Code barriers to PSH. This is intended to facilitate permitting process time efficiencies, to allow such housing to be built and occupied sooner to serve existing and future needs. PSH is housing that is primarily intended for very low-income households that are exiting homelessness. PSH is typically developed with on-site supportive services for the formerly homeless. Specific elements of this proposal include:

- Defining PSH as a multifamily residential use (1) with at least 90% of units affordable to households with incomes that do not exceed 50% of Area Median Income, (2) that receives public funding, and (3) that has a contractual term of affordability of at least 40 years;
- Establishing that on-site supportive services, which can also be available to other clients, are an accessory use to PSH;
- Exempting floor area used for on-site supportive services from calculations for Floor Area Ratio limits, as applicable;
- Exempting PSH from Design Review;
- Exempting PSH from long and short term bicycle parking requirements;
- Authorizing the Director of the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections to waive or modify, as an administrative decision, specified development standards, if waivers would not affect the overall height, bulk, and scale of a PSH development, and would result in more units of PSH;
- The above waiving and modification capability would include requirements relating to indoor and outdoor amenity features, parking stall size and distribution, facade openings, articulation, modulation, art on the facades of buildings, transparency, blank facades, floor-to-floor height at street level, overhead weather protection, and other similar standards as would be determined by the Director to not affect the size of the building envelope.
- Requiring PSH applicants to submit a community relations plan;

- Allowing PSH as a permitted use in Commercial 2 zones; and
- Allowing PSH as a street-level use, in zones where those uses are required.

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.

The geographic area affected by this proposed non-project action is all areas of the City of Seattle, Washington, where multifamily residential uses are allowed. This includes commercial and multifamily zones but does not include industrial and single family zones.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a. General description of the site: *[Check the applicable boxes]*

- Flat
 Rolling
 Hilly
 Steep Slopes
 Mountainous
 Other: (identify)

The geographic area affected by this proposed non-project action is all areas of the City of Seattle, Washington, where multifamily residential uses are allowed. The topography includes all types of terrain, from flat land to steep slopes. Most of this area has been substantially graded, developed, or otherwise disturbed.

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

Slopes in Seattle range from 0% to greater than 40%. The steepest slopes occur primarily on the sides of the major hills in the city, including Queen Anne Hill, Capitol Hill, West Seattle, and Magnolia.

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.

Seattle has numerous soil types, including mineral soils dominated by clay, silt, or sand, as well as organic soils such as peats and mucks (see, for example, <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>). No agricultural soils or prime farmland are located within the Seattle corporate limits. As a densely urbanized area, much of Seattle’s native soils have been extensively altered by filling, grading, and other activity.

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

The Seattle area is known to be in an active seismic area, as is the entire Puget Sound region. The City’s geologically hazardous areas are defined by SDCI as environmentally critical areas (ECA) (http://gisrevprxy.seattle.gov/wab_ext/DSOResearch_Ext/). Unstable soils and surfaces occur primarily in two contexts within the affected geographic area. The first context includes steep slopes and landslide-prone areas, where a combination of shallow groundwater and glacial sediments deposited in layers with variable permeability increases the risk of landslides. The second context includes areas of fill or alluvial soils where loose,

less cohesive soil materials below the water table may lead to the potential for liquefaction during earthquakes.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would require filling or grading. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction, development, or use that would cause erosion. Future, specific development proposals subject to the provisions of this proposal may involve clearing, construction, or uses that cause erosion. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would convert pervious to impervious surfaces or create new impervious surfaces. The proposal covers areas within the Seattle corporate limits where multifamily residential uses are allowed. These are highly urbanized area with a comparatively high percentage of impervious surfaces. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

None proposed. The proposed non-project action does not involve construction activity, and contains no proposed measures related to reducing or controlling erosion or other impacts at any specific location.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal [e.g., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke, greenhouse gases (GHG)] during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would directly produce emissions. As such, the proposal would not directly affect odors, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or climate change. Potential emissions impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

No. The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would be affected by emissions or odors.

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

No measures are proposed.

3. Water

a. Surface:

- (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 so, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

The proposed non-project action would affect watersheds and surface water bodies in the Seattle area. Most of this area is located within the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (Watershed Resource Inventory Area [WRIA] 8). The Duwamish Waterway and Elliott Bay, located in southwestern Seattle, are part of the Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9). Seattle is characterized by a variety of surface water features, including marine areas, rivers, lakes, and creeks. Each type is briefly summarized below:

Marine: Seattle's west side is situated adjacent to Puget Sound, a major marine embayment.

Rivers: Portions of south Seattle drain to the lower reaches of the Duwamish River (also known as the Duwamish Waterway). The River receives flow from the South Park basin, Norfolk basin, Longfellow Creek, and other smaller urban creeks, and drains to Elliott Bay in south Puget Sound.

Lakes: Freshwater lakes and ponds, within or adjacent to the City, include the Lake Union/Ship Canal system, which links Lake Washington and Puget Sound through the Hiram Chittenden Locks. Other freshwater lakes include Green, Haller, and Bitter Lakes in the north portion of the City (also located in the Lake Union/Ship Canal drainage basin). Seattle also contains numerous small ponds and wetlands.

Creeks: Runoff from portions of Seattle's developed cityscape drains to creek systems of varying sizes. Major creeks in the western regions of the City drain directly to Puget Sound and include Pipers and Fauntleroy creeks. Longfellow Creek is a main creek in the southwest portion of the city that drains to the Duwamish River. Thornton Creek, Taylor Creek, and other smaller creeks drain runoff from the eastern portions of the City to Lake Washington.

- (2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If so, please describe, and attach available plans.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would require work over, in, or adjacent to the surface waters. Individual projects that may be subject to provisions of this proposal may be located over, in, or adjacent to these waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

- (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.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development or any fill and dredge in or near surface waters or wetlands. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

Because this is a non-project action, there would be no construction or development that would withdraw or divert surface waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through existing regulations and/or separate site specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would lie within a 100-year floodplain. Major streams and the Duwamish River have associated 100-year floodplains within the affected geographic area. Individual projects that may be subject to provisions of this proposal may be located over, in, or adjacent to these waters and their associated floodplains. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would discharge waste material to surface waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

b. Ground:

(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 proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would withdraw groundwater. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

(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.

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would discharge waste material to ground waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- (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.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would generate runoff. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

No. The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would generate waste materials that could enter ground or surface waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would have impacts to surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage. No measures are proposed at this time. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review.

4. Plants

a. Types of vegetation found on the site: [check the applicable boxes]

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Deciduous trees:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> alder;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> maple;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> aspen;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other: cottonwoods, willow, etc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evergreen trees:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> fir;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cedar;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> pine;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other: spruce, hemlock, cedar, etc.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shrubs				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grass				
<input type="checkbox"/> Pasture				
<input type="checkbox"/> Crop or grain				
<input type="checkbox"/> Orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wet soil plants:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> cattail;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> buttercup;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> bulrush;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> skunk cabbage; <input type="checkbox"/> other:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water plants:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> water lily	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> eelgrass	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> milfoil	<input type="checkbox"/> other: (identify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other types of vegetation:	Various other vascular, non-vascular, native, and non-native plant species.			

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. A wide variety of native and non-native plant species and associated vegetation are found in the Seattle area. Generally, the Puget Sound basin is home to a wide diversity of plant species that depend upon marine, estuarine, freshwater, and terrestrial environments. The Seattle area has a broad variety of vegetation, including upland forest (deciduous, coniferous, and mixed), shrublands, riparian forests, and wetlands. This flora includes

species native to the region, as well as many non-native species. Seattle is a densely developed urban area having few remaining areas of native vegetation and high-quality habitat. These remaining fragments of quality native vegetation are found in parklands and open spaces. The plants found in most urban and suburban areas are those native and non-native species that tolerate or benefit from habitat degradation and disturbance.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would remove or alter vegetation. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. No federally-listed endangered or threatened plant species or State-listed sensitive plant species are known to occur within the municipal limits of this area. Most of the Seattle area has been intensively disturbed by development and redevelopment over the last 100 years. Seattle's original vegetation has been extensively cleared, excavated, filled, paved, or occupied by streets and other built structures. There is no habitat for threatened or endangered plants.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. No landscaping or other measures are proposed at this time. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. Many species of noxious and invasive species are found within King County and the City of Seattle. See, for example, the noxious weed lists of the King County Noxious Weed Board (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/noxious-weeds/laws/list.aspx>).

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site: [check the applicable boxes]

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. Many species of birds, mammals, and fish are present. Generally, the Puget Sound basin is home to an extremely wide diversity of animal species that depend upon marine, estuarine, freshwater, and terrestrial environments. This fauna includes species native to the region, as well as many non-native species. The Seattle area is an intensely developed urban area having few remaining areas of native vegetation and high-quality habitat. These remaining fragments of quality wildlife habitat are found in parklands and open spaces throughout the planning area. The wildlife found in most urban areas are those native and

non-native species that tolerate or benefit from habitat degradation or close association with humans.

Birds: Hawk Heron Eagle Songbirds
 Other: osprey, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, purple martin, owl (various species), pileated woodpecker, belted kingfisher, waterfowl species, Canada goose. Also, typical urban species associated with urban development such as starling and pigeon.

Mammals: Deer Bear Elk Beaver
 Other: California sea lion, river otter, muskrat, raccoon. Also, a variety of urban-adapted species such as possum and rat.

Fish: Bass Salmon Trout Herring
 Shellfish Other: perch, rockfish, etc.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. In King County, five wildlife species are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but these species are not likely to be found in the Seattle Direct Water Service Area. These include Canada lynx (*Lynx Canadensis*; Threatened), gray wolf (*Canis lupus*; Endangered), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*; Endangered), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*; Threatened), and northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*; Threatened). King County contains federally designated critical habitat for marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl; no designated critical habitat is located in Seattle. Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) was removed from the federal list under ESA on August 8, 2007, but is federally protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Bald eagles are known to reside in Seattle.

Fish species listed as endangered or threatened under the ESA and found in freshwater tributaries of Puget Sound (PS) include Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, Threatened, PS), steelhead (*O. mykiss*, Threatened, PS), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*, Threatened, PS). Coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) is a Candidate species for listing as Threatened. All of these species reside in or near the planning area. Lake Washington contains federally designated critical habitat for bull trout and Chinook salmon. Because much of Seattle has been previously developed and the original habitats significantly altered or eliminated, the potential for threatened or endangered animal species to be present in Seattle is low.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. The Puget Sound region is known to be an important migratory route for many animal species. Portions of the planning area provide migratory corridors for bald eagles traveling to and from foraging areas in Puget Sound or Lake Washington. Marbled murrelets travel through the planning area between marine waters and their nests in late successional/old growth forests in the Cascade Mountains. Bull trout, steelhead, and Chinook, chum, pink, and coho salmon use the Puget Sound nearshore. Chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon use Lake Washington and Lake Union as migration corridors. Anadromous trout and salmon migrate through the area river and stream systems, including urban streams in Seattle. The Puget Sound region is also within the Pacific Flyway—a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl, migratory songbirds, and other birds. The Pacific Flyway extends from Alaska to Mexico and South America.

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

No measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are proposed.

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

Many species of invasive animal species are found within King County and the City of Seattle, including nutria (*Myocastor coypus*), rat (*Rattus* spp.), pigeon (*Columba livia*), New Zealand Mud Snail (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*), and Asian gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*).

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.

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would require energy to operate. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would affect potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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:

The proposed non-project action does not include any energy conservation features or other measures to reduce or control energy impacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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:

The proposed non-project action does not include any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review. See the response to Question #D.1 later in this checklist for more discussion.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or other activities that would encounter possible site contamination. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or other activity that would cause exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

- (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.**

The proposed non-project action does not involve the storage, use, or production of toxic or hazardous chemicals. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not require any special emergency services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action has no associated environmental health hazards. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

b. Noise

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

The proposed non-project action would not be affected by noise. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- (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.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would generate noise. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Because the proposed non-project action would not itself generate noise, no measures to reduce or control noise are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. Generally, this area is characterized by urban uses. Existing uses include multifamily residences, commercial, industrial, recreation, and open space. Most city properties have been developed at urban densities and existing uses are often mixed. Downtown areas often include many high-rise developments. Individual projects that may be subject to the provisions of this proposal may be located in any zone that allows multifamily residential uses. These include commercial, multifamily, and downtown zones and do not include single family and industrial zones. Project-specific impacts on land and shoreline use would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

- 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?**

The proposed non-project action would not convert agricultural or forest land to other uses. There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle.

- (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?**

The proposed non-project action would not affect or be affected by agricultural or forest land business operations. There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle.

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

Seattle's urban area is developed with a wide range of structures, ranging from single-family residences to high-rise office towers to large industrial structures. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include demolition of any structures. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Zoning in Seattle includes a range of residential, commercial, and industrial designations. Zoning designations are found in Seattle's Land Use Code, Title 23 of the SMC. Basic zone designations in which projects subject to this proposal may be located are listed below, followed by their abbreviations.

Designation (Abbreviation)

Residential, Multifamily, Lowrise 1 (L1)

Residential, Multifamily, Lowrise 2 (L2)
Residential, Multifamily, Lowrise 3 (L3)
Residential, Multifamily, Midrise (MR)
Residential, Multifamily, Highrise (HR)
Residential-Commercial (RC)
Neighborhood Commercial 1 (NC1)
Neighborhood Commercial 2 (NC2)
Neighborhood Commercial 3 (NC3)
Seattle Mixed (SM)
Commercial 1 (C1)
Commercial 2 (C2)
Downtown Office Core 1 (DOC1)
Downtown Office Core 2 (DOC2)
Downtown Retail Core (DRC)
Downtown Mixed Commercial (DMC)
Downtown Mixed Residential (DMR)
Pioneer Square Mixed (PSM)
International District Mixed (IDM)
International District Residential (IDR)
Downtown Harborfront 1 (DH1)
Downtown Harborfront 2 (DH2)
Pike Market Mixed (PMM)

Individual projects subject to the provisions of this proposed non-project action may be located in zones that allow multifamily residential uses. This includes multifamily, commercial and downtown zones and does not include single family and industrial zones. Project-specific information on zoning would be determined during the permitting of individual projects.

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

The geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed. Current comprehensive plan designations in the City of Seattle can be found in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, adopted on July 25, 1994, and last amended in September 2020. Individual projects that may be subject to the provisions of the proposed non-project action may be located in areas shown with a Comprehensive Plan Designation of Urban Center, Hub Urban Village, Residential Urban Village, Multi-family Residential Area, and Commercial/Mixed Use Area. Project-specific information on Comprehensive Plan designations would be determined during the permitting of individual projects.

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

The proposed non-project action would apply in all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed, this includes both freshwater and marine shorelines, resources that are regulated by the City's shoreline master program (SMP). Shoreline resources regulated under the SMP include all marine waters, larger streams and lakes, associated wetlands and floodplains, and upland areas called shorelands that extend 200 feet landward from the edges of these waters. Individual projects subject to the provisions of this proposal may be located in areas subject to the SMP. Project-specific information on land and shoreline use would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally critical” area? If so, specify.

The proposed non-project action would apply in all areas of Seattle where multifamily residential uses are allowed, including in environmentally critical areas. Individual projects subject to the provisions of the proposed non-project action may be located in environmentally critical areas. Project-specific information on site classification would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

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

The proposed non-project action would not create a completed project in which to reside or work. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No people would be displaced by the proposed non-project action. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would establish regulations for a new multifamily residential land use. Potential project-specific impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle.

9. Housing

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly provide housing. The proposal would, however, enable greater ease in developing future permanent supportive housing in zones where multifamily residential uses are possible. It would also likely lead to efficiencies in allocation and use of floor area in future permanent supportive housing, such that more dwelling units would be provided in most such housing than would occur with development under today’s codes. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would not eliminate housing, but instead would encourage more housing development serving low-income households. Uses demolished at future development sites could vary widely and include residential uses which might range from low- to higher-income housing, probably in low-density forms. Demolished uses might also include non-residential uses; it is not possible to accurately predict the range of type of uses demolished at a future date. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control housing impacts are proposed. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 proposed non-project action does not include construction or development. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would not alter or obstruct views. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts are proposed.

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 non-project action does not include construction or development that would produce light or glare. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include construction or development that would produce light or glare. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Light or glare would not affect the proposed non-project action. Potential impacts of light or glare on future, specific development proposals would be addressed through separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control light and glare are proposed.

12. Recreation

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

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where multifamily development is allowed. Seattle Parks and Recreation operates and maintains a large number of city parks, trails, gardens, playfields, swimming pools, and community centers. In addition to these public facilities, public and private schools, outdoor associations, and commercial businesses provide residents of and visitors to Seattle with a variety of organized recreational facilities and activities, such as school athletic programs, hiking and gardening groups, and private health clubs and golf courses. Seattle is particularly rich in recreational opportunities focused on the area's natural features. Seattle's many parks and shorelines offer abundant recreational opportunities, including water contact recreational activities (such as swimming, wading, snorkeling, and diving); water-related and non-water-related recreational activities (such as walking, hiking, playing, observing wildlife, and connecting with nature); and recreational activities that involve consumption of natural resources (such as fishing and noncommercial shellfish harvesting). Project-specific information on site-specific recreational opportunities would be determined during the design, environmental review, and future permitting of individual projects.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include construction or development that would displace any recreational activities. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed.

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 proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where multifamily development is allowed. There are a number of landmarks, properties, or districts in Seattle that are listed on, or proposed for, national, state, and local preservation registers. In addition, while Seattle today comprises a highly urbanized and developed area, it is also an area with potential for Native American cultural artifacts. Project-specific information on site-specific historic buildings, structures, and sites would be determined during permitting of individual projects. See the response to Question #D.4 for more discussion.

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

There are a number of landmarks, properties, or districts in Seattle that are listed on, or proposed for, national, state, and local preservation registers. In addition, while Seattle today comprises a highly urbanized and developed area, it is also an area with potential for Native American cultural artifacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be identified and addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review. See the response to Question #D.4 for more discussion.

- 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 Archaeology and Historic Preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

The proposed non-project action does not involve construction or disturbance of any site. No methods were used to assess potential impacts to cultural and historic resources. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- 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 proposed non-project action does not include construction or development, so there are no activities that would require the avoidance, minimization, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbance to historic and cultural resources. Individual projects developed pursuant to the provisions of this proposal would be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and to the State of Washington's and City's regulations related to the protection of historic and cultural resources.

14. Transportation

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

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where multifamily development is allowed. The area has dense grids of urban streets (residential and arterials) that provide connections to major routes, including Interstate 5 and State Route 99, which run north and south through the City, and Interstate 90 and State Route 520, which connect Seattle to points east across Lake Washington. More specific information on site-specific public streets and highways would be determined during future permitting of individual projects.

- 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?**

Seattle is served by bus, trolley, and light rail public transit. Site-specific information on the local public transit would be determined during future permitting of individual projects.

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

The proposed non-project action would not construct or eliminate parking spaces. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- 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 proposed non-project action does not require any improvements to roads or other transportation infrastructure. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would take effect throughout areas of Seattle where multifamily development is allowed. Seattle is served by railroads, sea ports, and airports. Project-specific information on proximity to and use of water, rail, and/or air transportation would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

- 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?**

The proposed non-project action would not generate vehicle trips. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would not affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural or forest products. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control transportation impacts are proposed.

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 non-project action would not result in an increased need for public services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services are proposed.

16. Utilities

a. Check utilities available at the site, if any: *[check the applicable boxes]*

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electricity | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural gas | <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Refuse service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone | <input type="checkbox"/> Sanitary sewer | <input type="checkbox"/> Septic system | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify) | | | |

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where multifamily development is allowed. All areas have electricity, telephone, water and refuse service. Most (but not all) areas have cable/fiber optics, sanitary sewers, and natural gas. Project-specific information on site-specific utilities would be determined during the design, environmental review, and permitting of individual projects.

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.

None

The proposed non-project action does not include construction or development of any utilities.

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: Ketil Freeman – Electronically Signed
Ketil Freeman, AICP
Legislative Analyst

Note: Section D. *Supplemental Sheet for Non-Project Actions* is required if the proposal applies to a program, planning document, or code change.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not 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 proposal would not result in direct impacts and is unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

Comparing future development scenarios for any given typical site with or without the proposal, while it is possible that total floor area could be larger with the proposal's code allowances, development sites would likely be fully or almost fully cleared during construction. This means that the construction-period worst-case potential for spillover impacts to the environment, such as stormwater runoff carrying sediments from graded soils off the site, or air emissions from construction dust, or the amount of construction noise would be approximately the same with or without the proposal. Therefore, this checklist identifies no net differences in typical construction-related adverse water, air or noise impacts with or without the proposal, either on a site-by-site basis or cumulative impact basis.

Similarly, post-construction, the potential for adverse water, air, and noise impacts would be approximately equivalent with or without the proposal. Future development meeting City requirements for drainage controls would likely avoid nearly all potential for runoff-related cumulative water quality and quantity impacts. And, there is no inherent reason why the proposed range of future housing uses with supportive services would operate differently with or without the proposal or generate different kinds of potential adverse air or noise impacts. This suggests a finding of no net difference in potential for these kinds of environmental impacts.

To the extent that future supportive services could include medical clinics or related services for on-site residents and possibly others, they might generate medical waste materials on a regular basis. Some waste such as used needles, for example, could be biohazards. These kinds of service providers would be required to follow normal precautionary safety protocols to collect and dispose of these kinds of materials. Therefore, the risk of improper disposal or release into the environment at any given future development site with these services would be minimal. And, there is no inherent reason why the proposed range of housing uses with supportive services would operate differently with or without the proposal, or generate different kinds of potential adverse hazardous substances exposure impacts. This suggests a finding of no net difference in potential for these kinds of environmental impacts.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

The proposal does not produce such increases. No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to plants, animals, fish or marine life.

The potential for adverse environmental impacts to plants, animals, fish and marine life during and after construction is based on the rationales discussed in the response to Question #D.1 above. There are not likely to be net differences in potential for these impacts, for scenarios with or without the proposal, either on a site-by-site basis or cumulative impact basis. During construction, the potential degree of site clearing would be approximately the same with or without the proposal, with similar potential for worst-case spillover impacts of sediments leaving sites and reaching streams and similar areas of potential fish and wildlife habitat nearby. After construction, there is no inherent reason why the proposed range of housing uses with supportive services would operate differently with or without the proposal, or generate different kinds of potential adverse plant, animal, fish, or marine life impacts.

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

None are proposed. The proposal does not produce such measures. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposal would not be likely to generate direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts of depleting energy or natural resources. Similar to the rationales discussed in the response to Questions #D.1 and D.2 above, future development would likely be approximately the same size with or without the proposal. (Although, the proposal would accommodate more flexibility in development sizing and layouts to accommodate the intended supportive service and housing uses.) Energy expended to build new buildings in future developments would be relatively similar on a site-by-site and cumulative basis with or without the proposal (although, under the proposal larger floor areas could mean slightly more energy expended to build the buildings). And, there would be little if any difference in potential for consumption of natural resources with this future development, given the typical qualities of Seattle's properties that might experience such development. Also, any such future development would be subject to meeting Seattle's energy codes, which are becoming progressively more energy-efficient and stringent in promoting energy conservation.

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

The proposal would not have a negative impact on energy or natural resources; therefore, no protective No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 proposal would not be likely to generate direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse impacts have a negative impact on these kinds of environmentally sensitive areas. Implementation of the proposal is not likely to cause future development in locations that might significantly affect wilderness or wild and scenic rivers, floodplains, or prime farmlands. And similarly, although parks, wetlands and limited threatened or endangered species habitat are present in portions of Seattle, future development with the proposal is not likely to generate any different potential for significant adverse impacts than if the proposal was not implemented. If present nearby to future development sites, wetlands would continue to receive the same

protections through current critical area regulations. Regarding historic and cultural sites, see the response to Questions #B.13a – 13d earlier in this checklist.

The proposal is not likely to affect whether historic sites or structures might be redeveloped. Existing historic sites or structures are effectively protected by current regulations and so they may only be demolished in rare circumstances that occur with consent of the City. The proposal analyzed in this environmental checklist does not contain provisions that would increase the possibility of future development of permanent supportive housing at historic sites or structures, meaning there is no net difference in the potential for adverse historic site impacts with or without the proposal.

The proposal is also not likely to result in development outcomes that would increase the potential for disturbance of cultural sites or resources. Most cultural sites and resources at risk from future development in Seattle are in unknown locations due to their being buried under soils, although certain vicinities such as near-shore areas are known to have greater potential for presence of such resources given past activities of indigenous peoples. The proposal does not include provisions that would alter the likelihood of future development occurring in any given location or type of vicinity such as near-shore areas. And, the proposal does not include provisions that would be likely to increase total site clearing and grading of future development, because it is likely that most future development sites would be fully or almost fully cleared during construction with or without the proposal.

Also, implementation of the proposal would not affect the strength of the City’s regulatory protection of cultural sites or resources if they are discovered during future development, which is addressed by other State and local regulations, policies, and practices. With or without the proposal, such processes are mandated to stop construction, assess the resources, and take appropriate next steps for the cultural resources’ protection or preservation.

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

The proposal would not have a negative impact on environmentally sensitive areas; therefore, no protective No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to land or shoreline use. The proposal defines PSH. However, the City currently allows uses meeting the proposed definition in most areas of the city where multifamily residential development is allowed. For example, in 2019 the Office of Housing funded twelve new affordable housing developments through the City’s Rental Housing Program. Two of those twelve, Hobson Place II and 12th and Spruce Supportive Housing, would meet the definition of PSH in the proposal. See [Seattle Office of Housing Annual Investments Report – 2019](#), March 2019, Table 7, p.8-10. Thus, while the proposal would facilitate permitting of PSH, it is unlikely to result in development and land uses that are would be incompatible or substantially and adversely different in locational pattern, scale, siting or total building bulk profile from multifamily housing for the formerly homeless that can be developed today. The City would retain SEPA authority to mitigate height, bulk, and scale impacts, if necessary to address substantial incompatibilities that might be possible to otherwise occur in future PSH development proposals.

Despite not leading to probable significant adverse impacts related to land use or height/bulk/scale, the proposal would alter the future methods of development review and give more regulatory flexibility in building design that could generate adverse height, bulk, scale, and land use-related aesthetic impacts,

compared to future development under current regulations.

- 1) The ability to exempt floor area for supportive accessory uses in PSH from counting against floor area limits would enable future development with more floor area than would occur under current regulations, thus adding to total building bulk.
- 2) The ability to avoid design review processes would forego the benefits that can accrue from design review processes' ability to recommend and require adjustments in building bulk, scale, materials, and other aesthetic-related features.
- 3) The ability for SDCI to waive compliance with development standards such as minimum building modulation, overhead weather protection, and minimum street-level glazing, blank façade limits and use-type requirements, could reduce or eliminate the benefits these requirements have in shaping and moderating the appearance of building bulk and scale; and could reduce the relative aesthetic visual quality and overall consistency and compatibility of future buildings with their immediate context and vicinity. This would be most potentially noticeable in vicinities that have pedestrian designations that have minimum design performance standards.

These factors would increase the probability of noticeable, adverse differences in the appearance of bulkier or less well-scaled buildings in future development, and could contribute to adverse aesthetic-related land use impacts in a vicinity to the extent that visual differences between the new building and existing buildings might be apparent and perceived as negatively contrasting with local building character or street level use character.

The proposal to allow PSH as a use permitted outright in Commercial 2 (C2) zones would generate a potential that future residential uses would locate in places where they might be adversely affected by neighboring uses which per the zoning category could include a variety of heavier commercial uses such as manufacturing and warehousing uses. Currently, housing is a conditionally permitted use within the C2 zone with conditions that relate to avoiding negative consequences such as proximity to polluting or noisy uses that might annoy nearby residents; and, conversely, regulatory conditions that seek to avoid having residential uses impair the ability to operate commercial uses that are appropriately located within the C2 zone. Providing for PSH to be a use permitted outright in C2 zones would create the potential for adverse land use impacts if these future residential uses were located in places that create potential compatibility issues between residential and non-residential uses. The probability of such impacts would depend on the specific characteristics of given sites and their patterns of surrounding uses, and the conditions that could be tied to future building permits for such development.

As a whole, the proposal may improve the efficiency of permitting PSH but would not likely result in future development that is incompatible with land uses or shoreline uses recommended in Seattle's land use plans. The future location of PSH would continue to be within zones where such forms of multi-family housing are authorized to locate according to the City's Comprehensive Plan, zoning, and Land Use Code. Because the magnitude of possible differences in building bulk under any given future development are limited in total size and would continue to be regulated by the City's Land Use Code, the proposal would not likely lead to situations with significantly incongruous height/bulk/scale outcomes between adjacent uses. Rather, it would likely continue to support development patterns with smooth transitions between areas of different zoned intensity, and thus would not impact neighborhood character in a significant adverse manner. Also, given the limited numbers of probable PSH developments occurring in any given year, the probable magnitude of cumulative adverse land use impacts on the city from more easily permitting this kind of housing is concluded to be minimal.

The proposal is consistent with housing goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The following is a selection of those relevant goals and policies.

GOALS

H G3 Achieve a mix of housing types that provide opportunity and choice throughout Seattle for people of various ages, races, ethnicities, and cultural backgrounds and for a variety of household sizes, types, and incomes.

H G4 Achieve healthy, safe, and environmentally sustainable housing that is adaptable to changing demographic conditions.

H G5 Make it possible for households of all income levels to live affordably in Seattle, and reduce over time the unmet housing needs of lower-income households in Seattle.

POLICIES

H 3.2 Allow and encourage housing for older adults and people with disabilities, including designs that allow for independent living, various degrees of assisted living, and/or skilled nursing care, in or near urban centers and urban villages where there is access to health care and other services and amenities.

H5.1 Pursue public and private funding sources for housing preservation and production to provide housing opportunities for lower-wage workers, people with special needs, and those who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.

H5.2 Expand programs that preserve or produce affordable housing, preferably long term, for lower-income households, and continue to prioritize efforts that address the needs of Seattle's extremely low-income households.

H5.5 Collaborate with King County and other jurisdictions in efforts to prevent and end homelessness and focus those efforts on providing permanent housing and supportive services and on securing the resources to do to.

H5.16 Consider implementing a broad array of affordable housing strategies in connection with new development, including but not limited to development regulations, inclusionary zoning, incentives, property tax exemptions, and permit fee reductions.

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

No avoidance or reduction measures are proposed because no shoreline or land use changes are expected. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposal would have no direct impact on the demands on transportation or the need for public services or utilities. The proposal would eliminate long and short-term bicycle parking requirements. Individual projects could choose to provide motor vehicle and bicycle parking. The Office of Housing prioritizes investments in areas with planned or existing transit access. In 2019 investments for all projects were for sites in frequent transit walksheds. See [Seattle Office of Housing Annual Investments Report – 2019](#), March 2019, Map E, p.21. Thus, residents of PSH developments may be more likely to choose transit as a mode over bicycling. However, any increase in transit ridership would be within the range of transit service alternatives contemplated by transit providers for higher ridership multifamily areas.

Because such policies regarding location of this kind of housing would continue to be applied by the Office of

Housing with or without the adoption of this proposal, no particular difference in geographic pattern or size of future development is likely to occur. Therefore, this checklist identifies no net differences that would lead to probable significant adverse differences of the proposal on transportation systems or public service or utility impacts due to differences in future development of permanent support housing.

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

No measures are proposed. ~~to reduce the demands on transportation, public services and utilities.~~ Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

There are no known conflicts or additional requirements.