

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

UPDATED 2014

(PREPARED SEPTEMBER 1, 2015)

A. background [\[help\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: [\[help\]](#)

Marijuana Zoning Restrictions Update

2. Name of applicant: [\[help\]](#)

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: [\[help\]](#)

Department of Planning and Development
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104
Contact: Faith Lumsden (206) 615-0097

4. Date checklist prepared: [\[help\]](#)

September 1, 2015

5. Agency requesting checklist: [\[help\]](#)

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): [\[help\]](#)

Approval by City Council and Mayor, fourth quarter 2015.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. [\[help\]](#)

The state legislature has enacted bills that affect how marijuana is regulated in Washington State. These bills also allow local governments to modify state rules by passing local ordinances. The City has recently passed associated legislation requiring regulatory licenses for marijuana businesses. It is possible that additional legislation might be prepared in reaction to specific legislation that is passed by the State.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal. [\[help\]](#)

None, except for the SEPA determination that will be prepared for 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. [\[help\]](#)

No.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. [\[help\]](#)

Approval of ordinance amendments by Seattle City Council.

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

- The proposal would update the definition of major marijuana activity to reduce the threshold above which marijuana activity must meet locational and licensing requirements, including of Section 23.42.058 of the Land Use Code. The proposal would change the threshold for major marijuana activity as follows:

	Old Threshold	New Threshold
Production	45 plants	Any production outside a dwelling unit or production inside a dwelling unit including more than 15 plants, except that 60 plants are allowed for registered cooperatives
Processing	72 ounces of useable marijuana or an amount of marijuana-infused product that could reasonably be produced with 72 ounces of useable marijuana on-site	Any processing outside of a dwelling unit or any processing within a dwelling unit other than the drying or incorporation into food of the product of 15 plants, except that the drying or incorporation into food of the product of 60 plants is allowed for registered cooperatives
Selling & Delivery	72 ounces of useable marijuana or an amount of marijuana-infused product that could reasonably be produced from 72 ounces of useable marijuana on-site	Any selling or delivery

- Section 23.42.058 of the Land Use Code would also be amended to clarify that this activity is prohibited in association with any residential dwelling (except caretaker's quarters).

Other elements of the proposal include:

- Redefining "restricted areas" in relation to major marijuana activity to be areas where such activity is prohibited, in zones that include:
 1. Single-family zones;
 2. Multi-family zones;

3. Neighborhood Commercial 1 (NC1) zone;
4. Pioneer Square Mixed (PSM);
5. International District Mixed (IDM);
6. International District Residential (IDR);
7. Downtown Harborfront 1 (DH1);
8. Downtown Harborfront 2 (DH2);
9. Pike Market Mixed (PMM);
10. Ballard Avenue Landmark District;
11. Columbia City Landmark District;
12. Fort Lawton Landmark District;
13. Harvard-Belmont Landmark District;
14. International Special Review District;
15. Pike Place Market Historical District;
16. Pioneer Square Preservation District;
17. Sand Point Overlay District; or
18. Stadium Transition Area Overlay District.

- Defining buffer distances from certain uses:
 - 1,000 feet from any lot line of property containing elementary schools, secondary schools, or playgrounds;
 - 250 feet from any lot line of property containing child care centers, game arcades, libraries, public parks, public transit centers, or recreation center or facility.
 - Major marijuana activity involving retail transactions may be located within 500 feet from no more than one other property containing state licensed major marijuana activity involving retail transactions.

The distance buffers are measured from all lot lines of each property on which certain state licensed major marijuana activity is occurring.

- Making certain major marijuana activity subject to major odor source rules, which calls for consultation with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) about odor control measures.

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. [\[help\]](#)

This proposal would impact major marijuana activities throughout Seattle including by prohibiting them within single-family, multifamily, Neighborhood Commercial 1, Pioneer Square Mixed, International District Mixed, International District Residential, Downtown Harborfront 1, Downtown Harborfront 2, and Pike Place Mixed zones as well as the following districts: Ballard Avenue Landmark District, Columbia City Landmark District, Fort Lawton Landmark District, Harvard-Belmont Landmark District, International Special Review District, Pike Place Market Historical District, Pioneer Square Preservation District, Sand Point Overlay District, or Stadium Transition Area Overlay District.

In other City zones, the proposal would affect where major marijuana activity is allowed to locate,

based on proximity to other such activity, such as elementary or secondary schools, playgrounds, parks, and locations including child care centers, game arcades, libraries, public transit centers, recreation centers or recreation facilities.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS [\[help\]](#)

** PER WASHINGTON STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, THIS SECTION IS LEFT BLANK. **

1. Earth

a. General description of the site [\[help\]](#)

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

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe. [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

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

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any: [\[help\]](#)

2. Air

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

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any: [\[help\]](#)

3. Water

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. [\[help\]](#)
- 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. [\[help\]](#)
- 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. [\[help\]](#)
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. [\[help\]](#)
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan. [\[help\]](#)
- 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. [\[help\]](#)

b. Ground Water:

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

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. [\[help\]](#)
- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)
- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

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

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

- a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site: [\[help\]](#)

- 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? [\[help\]](#)
- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: [\[help\]](#)
- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

5. Animals

- a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site. Examples include: [\[help\]](#)
 - birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
 - mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
 - fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____
- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site. [\[help\]](#)
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain. [\[help\]](#)
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any: [\[help\]](#)
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

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. [\[help\]](#)
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

- 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: [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)
- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
 - 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? [\[help\]](#)
- 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. [\[help\]](#)
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)
- 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? [\[help\]](#)
- 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:
- c. Describe any structures on the site. [\[help\]](#)

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? [\[help\]](#)
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? [\[help\]](#)
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? [\[help\]](#)
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? [\[help\]](#)
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify. [\[help\]](#)
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? [\[help\]](#)
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? [\[help\]](#)
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)
- L. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: [\[help\]](#)
- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [\[help\]](#)
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. [\[help\]](#)
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

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? [\[help\]](#)
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? [\[help\]](#)
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? [\[help\]](#)

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? [\[help\]](#)
- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? [\[help\]](#)
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity? [\[help\]](#)
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe. [\[help\]](#)
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: [\[help\]](#)

13. Historic and cultural preservation

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

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. [\[help\]](#)
- 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? [\[help\]](#)
- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate? [\[help\]](#)
- 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). [\[help\]](#)
- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe. [\[help\]](#)

- 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? [\[help\]](#)
- 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.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: [\[help\]](#)

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. [\[help\]](#)
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. [\[help\]](#)

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: [\[help\]](#)
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other _____
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed. [\[help\]](#)

C. Signature [\[HELP\]](#)

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: _____

Name of signee Faith Lumsden

Position and Agency/Organization Code Compliance Director, Seattle Dept. of Planning & Development

Date Submitted: _____

Reviewed by Gordon Clowers

D. supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [\[help\]](#)

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?

This ordinance would limit major marijuana activity that includes the production, processing, selling, and delivery of marijuana in the City at levels that require a state license. The amendments would be likely to prohibit and shift these activities away from residential zones and character areas to areas within certain zone classifications that, given their land use patterns and permissible use allowances, are better suited to accommodate these activities. Examples are those zones with land use patterns and buildings accommodating industrial facilities or commercial spaces. This would tend to limit the potential for adverse effects upon the most sensitive classes of neighboring users, such as residents, in relation to a worst-case potential for discharges of pollutants to air or water, and increases in incidents of unpleasant odors, and/or noise.

The likelihood of worst-case pollutant releases to air or water is judged to be low, but in the worst-case, it is possible that intentional or unintentional releases of substances (such as fertilizers, pesticides, planting soils, and volatile organic solvents like butane or similar liquids) to stormdrains could occur, as well as odors released through exhaust systems or open doors. This might occur at production or processing facilities. However, the proposed inclusion of major marijuana uses in "major odor source" rules in the Land Use Code would help ensure that ventilation systems are properly defined to avoid the worst-case potential for odor impact. At retail facilities, marijuana products are more likely to be already packaged or handled in ways that reduce or minimize the potential for releases to air and water.

The proposal would not likely cause significant or adverse increases in noise generation. However, the proposal does not entirely eliminate the potential for spillover odor or noise effects on residential uses, because due to Seattle's zoning patterns residential land uses could still be relatively nearby future locations where major marijuana activity could occur. If noise incidents would occur, they would be enforced through existing City codes for noise control, on a complaint basis. Odor complaints would be similarly enforced pursuant to relevant City enforcement codes such as SMC 23.90.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: None.

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

The probable outcomes associated with this ordinance are not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to plants, animals, fish, and marine life as there is only a low potential for worst-case increases in discharges to the urban built environment or disturbance to plant, animal or fish/marine habitats in Seattle. The proposal's effects are also not anticipated to result in substantial amounts of additional construction or demolition, as they primarily limit the scope of certain activities, and such uses are somewhat likely to typically occur within existing buildings rather than induce entirely new buildings.

Even if new construction does occur as a result of the proposal for production, processing or retail activities, the character and patterns of the eligible areas within commercial and industrial zoning tend to be already substantially developed with buildings, impervious surfaces or previously altered grounds that typically provide relatively low quality habitat for plants and animals. As well, there is not a substantial potential that future uses would be located in ways that substantially adversely

affect marine habitats, even indirectly (such uses are proposed to be prohibited in certain shoreline zones). To the extent this is possible, it might, in the worst-case, occur in places such as SODO industrial areas near the Duwamish Waterway, the Lake Washington Ship Canal, or near Lake Union. Current City regulations relating to land use controls, development standards, utility improvements, and shorelines, would tend to minimize the potential for substantial adverse impacts upon these elements of the environment.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:
None.

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

The relevant uses are ones that consume energy for the sake of goods production, processing, and to a lesser degree sales and transportation. This ordinance is not likely to deplete energy or natural resources in any significant adverse manner because it would primarily limit the scope of activities pertaining to marijuana-related activities. Rather than depleting energy and natural resources, it is conceivable that the proposal would lead to reduced energy consumption citywide, if the numbers of businesses conducting such activities is limited in total number or diminishes over time due to probable restrictions on licensing that limit the number of possible sites for such activities.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: None.

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?

Of the listed sensitive areas, urban parks, historic/cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, and habitats (such as those relating to salmon habitat) are the types known and potentially present in Seattle. This ordinance is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts to environmentally sensitive areas of these kinds, because it limits the scope of activities that may occur in certain areas (including use prohibitions in historic character areas and buffers from parks) and is not anticipated to result in significant development in or near environmentally sensitive areas. Rationales for low impact potential discussed in the responses to Questions D.1, D.2 and D.3 are also relevant.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:
None.

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?

This proposal would tend to limit and reduce the overall potential for worst-case land use incompatibility impacts on surrounding uses from major marijuana activity. This would be due in part to the probable discontinuation of a great number of marijuana-related uses that would not have proper State licensing. This would reduce the total number of instances where uses involving marijuana would be present and thus the potential for local incompatibilities or spillover impacts. It would also relate to the details of the proposal that would establish dispersal of a smaller number of licensed uses, buffers from certain kinds of potentially sensitive uses (schools, as one example), and the probable location of the relevant uses into commercial and industrial zoned areas that are interpreted as settings that are more compatible and less sensitive, in terms of land use mixes and adjacencies, to marijuana-related activities. The proposal would accomplish conditions that would

be consistent with City land use policies. Despite such findings, it is also accurate to conclude that in the worst-case there would remain potential for adverse spillover effects relating to use compatibility (such as related to noise, or odor or releases as described in the response to question D.1 above). This would include situations where, given new licensing of major marijuana activity, new instances of major marijuana activity could occur in a variety of locations around Seattle. If such effects occurred, they would be able to be adequately resolved through City enforcement actions that would pinpoint and address the particular issues that arise.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: None.

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

This ordinance is not likely to adversely increase demands on transportation as it would primarily limit the scope of certain activities. This effect of limiting presence of certain uses would tend to avoid causing systematically increased demands upon public utilities, road systems, and public services. It might even reduce the potential for demands upon police and fire protection, because the number of existing businesses engaged in such activities within the city will diminish if and when factors such as State licensing and local code enforcement leads to the closing of businesses with licenses for such activities.

However, to the extent that new locations engaged in production, processing or selling of marijuana would likely emerge over time through expansion of licenses available from the State, there could be increases in demand for public services and utilities at such locations over time. This is based on a reasonable assumption that more intensive activity levels at given properties may add to the possibility of additional police service or emergency/fire calls, and that more water, sewer, electricity services would be consumed. Indoor agricultural activities relevant to the proposal would involve use of lights that would consume energy to maintain good growing conditions. Given the low volume of such additional demands in comparison to citywide service demands, the proposal is not likely to noticeably impact the ability of police, fire or utility providers in their ability to provide effective services to future licensed locations.

Despite such findings, it can also be observed that if any transportation effects are experienced, they would be possible or likely to occur across several of the largest arterials in the city, including streets such as Aurora Avenue, Rainier Avenue S., streets in the SODO area, Lake City Way and others. This relative probability of dispersion, broadly speaking, would tend to minimize the potential for transportation impacts related to clustering. That said, a number of existing licensed businesses of this kind are already clustered in similar general proximities such as SODO, Aurora Avenue and Lake City Way. So, some degree of contribution toward total cumulative adverse traffic impacts in a given broad vicinity from the combination of multiple businesses engaged in major marijuana activity would be possible. Given the degree of existing traffic along potentially affected arterials, however, the contributions of cumulative marijuana-related traffic would not be anticipated to be significant and adverse. This is based on a qualitative comparison of impact potential of this proposal to impact potential of other past on-project proposals that affect land use types and locations, based on the experience of DPD analysts.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: None.

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

The proposed amendments are believed to avoid conflicts with local, state or federal laws and requirements for protection of the environment.