

## City of Seattle

### ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

#### *Purpose of Checklist:*

The State Environmental Policy Action (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

#### *Instructions for Applicants:*

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write “do not know” or “does not apply.” Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about permanent regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

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

#### *Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:*

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered “does not apply.” In addition, complete the Supplemental Sheet for Non-project Actions (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words “project”, “applicant,” and “property or site” should be read as “proposal,” “proposer,” and “affected geographic area,” respectively.

**A. BACKGROUND:**

**1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:**

2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

**2. Name of Applicant:**

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

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

700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
PO Box 34019  
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019  
Contact: Tom Hauger

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

November 5, 2012

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

**6. Proposed timing or schedule (include phasing if applicable):**

Public hearing: Fall 2012  
City Council Vote: Fall 2012

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

This proposal is for a non-project action with no directly related plans for future physical expansions or activities. In the future, the City will continue to engage in comprehensive and project-specific planning activities, many of which will address topics identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

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

None known.

**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 proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are relevant to the entire city, within which are numerous applications pending for governmental approvals. Policy changes in the Comprehensive Plan will affect some future possible permit applications and

City permit approvals. More specifically, there could be proposals related to container port improvement projects or related infrastructure, and there is an environmental impact study process commencing whereby potential impacts of a possible future arena development proposal on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue S. near S. Holgate Street (and other potential sites) are being analyzed, with relationship to the spectator sports and industrial zone topic proposed in these Comprehensive Plan amendments.

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

The proposed amendments will require approval by the City Council prior to their adoption. Some portions of the proposal may also lead to additional actions by the City Council that are unknown at this time.

**11. Give a brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site.**

The proposal consists of several annual amendment proposals to the Comprehensive Plan, as summarized below. There is no specific project size or site because this is a non-project action. DPD recommends approval of most of the items listed below, except for Items E, I, and K.

**A. Broadview-Bitter Lake-Haller Lake Neighborhood Plan policies adoption and Future Land Use Map changes:** This neighborhood plan update expands upon prior neighborhood plan concepts to stimulate the evolution of a denser urban village land use pattern including a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use spine along Linden Avenue N., and further consider land use/zoning changes in the future along with related street and open space/park improvements. The plan includes (but is not limited to) several instances of new and amended policies address neighborhood priorities on topics such as: improving drainage system infrastructure and performance; improving the aesthetics, completeness and functionality of the street system including Aurora Avenue N; improving the functionality of circulation systems for pedestrians and bicyclists; the goal of a vibrant mixed-use center focused along Linden Avenue N; strengthening Aurora Avenue N as a regional commercial center and source of jobs, while enhancing its fit with surrounding communities; enhancing economic and social vibrancy; improving Stone Avenue N as a green corridor connecting the Aurora Avenue vicinity with Haller Lake; seeking to improve compatibility between lower-density and higher-density areas; and other proposed amendments. Also, the plan update proposes future consideration of rezones and adjustments are proposed to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) regarding Urban Village boundaries and land use designations:

- i. Consider changing the FLUM designation of parcels fronting the east side of Linden Avenue N., between N. 135<sup>th</sup> St and N 145<sup>th</sup> St., from Commercial to Multifamily. Consider rezoning these properties to Midrise designation or similar designation that facilitates dense and affordable multifamily development.
- ii. Consider rezoning the parcels fronting the east side of Linden Avenue N., between N. 135<sup>th</sup> St and N 130<sup>th</sup> St., from

Commercial to a mixed-use designation such as Neighborhood Commercial (NC3) or Seattle Mixed (SM).

**B. Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan policies adoption and Future Land Use**

**Map changes:** This neighborhood plan update expands upon prior neighborhood plan concepts to further stimulate the evolution of a denser urban village land use pattern in the heart of the neighborhood as well as near the light rail station at MLK Way/S. Henderson Street, and select other locations. The neighborhood plan also expands upon efforts to create a safe, healthy, culturally responsive and educationally-supportive community that will best serve its residents. The plan includes (but is not limited to) several instances of new and amended policies addressing neighborhood priorities such as: better coordinated and more aesthetic transportation system improvements; increased opportunities for live-work units and home occupations; an urban farm and wetlands restoration project; better pedestrian/non-motorized connections among public spaces; improved public safety; using public art to express cultural diversity; and more capability to achieve affordable family-size residential units; and proposed adjustments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) regarding Urban Village boundaries and land use designations:

- i. Expand the Urban Village boundary between Martin Luther King Way S and 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue S, between Yukon Avenue S and Renton Avenue S (just south of S Henderson Street), and south of the Rainier beach light rail station along Martin Luther King Way S.
- ii. Allowing for the update of the FLUM by:
  1. Considering re-designating parcels to the east and west of Martin Luther King Way S, south of S Henderson Street, to Commercial /Mixed Use (parcels adjacent to existing Commercial / Mixed Use designation).
  2. Considering re-designating properties east of Renton Avenue S and south of S Henderson Street to Multifamily Residential.
  3. Considering re-designating parcels at the northwest corner of the intersection of S Henderson Street and Martin Luther King Way S to either Multifamily Residential or Commercial Mixed Use.
- iii. In the area within the residential urban village west of Martin Luther King Way S., permit consideration of rezones of Single-Family zoned land to Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Seattle Mixed (SM), Lowrise Duplex Triplex (LDT) [or similar zone type], Lowrise 1 (L1), or Lowrise 2 (L2) or Lowrise 3 (L3) designations.
- iv. Within ¼ mile of the rail station, and contiguous with Commercial / Mixed Use Future Land Use Map designations, and where there are changes in elevation, park land, rights-of-way, or similar buffers, permit consideration of rezones of Single-Family or multifamily designations to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) or Seattle Mixed (SM) designation.
- v. Support and expand the existing character and diverse mix of small-scale, minority and immigrant-owned businesses nodes

around Rainier Ave S and S Rose Street; Rainier Ave South and 56<sup>th</sup>/57<sup>th</sup> Ave. South; and the rail station vicinity.

- C. **Transit Communities:** Proposal Item C's content is defined according to DPD's recommended amendments. These narrow and revise the proposals made by the applicant – the Seattle Planning Commission. DPD's proposal for Item C includes a variety of new goal/policy statements in a new section of the Land Use Element that would include guidance about "transit communities" as a planning tool that can be considered and possibly implemented in future actions such as neighborhood plans, subarea plans or rezones. The proposal posits the benefits of urban planning that emphasizes "transit communities" in general, meaning areas near major transit stops or service intersections. The intent is that future planning choices and related future growth, to the extent it can be directed by the City, will occur in ways that increase the overall efficiency, accessibility, and vitality of districts near these areas. The proposal is also seen as contributing toward more efficient per-capita carbon emission levels and maintaining or improving social equity. The proposal also indicates desired values of "complete, compact and connected" for transit communities, and describes a range of aspirational "place types" that fall within the general category of transit communities.
- D. **Add Container Port Element narrative:** Add five paragraphs of narrative introductory text to this existing element in order to expand and clarify the description of the element's purposes and aims. The text describes the Port of Seattle's economic value, functional value, its vulnerability to adverse pressures of economy and accessibility, and a range of possible protective approaches the City may consider in its future work programs. It also mentions State legislation and past City land use code amendments.
- E. **Spectator sports facilities in Industrial Zones:** Amend the Land Use Element to prohibit the development of spectator sports facilities in Industrial zones if they would significantly restrict or disrupt existing industrial uses.
- F. **Climate Action amendments to Land Use, Transportation and Environment Elements:** Add and amend policies addressing future growth and transport in ways aimed at reducing the production of greenhouse gases, seeking "net zero emissions" of greenhouse gases by 2050.
- G. **Add an Urban Design Element with policies on public spaces and connections:** Add policies seeking improved design of public spaces and connections between them.
- H. **Recreational boating industry support in Economic Development Element:** This amendment would recognize the importance of the recreational boating industry that includes but is not limited to marinas, boat yards, boat sales and similar water-dependent and water-related business uses.
- I. **Discourage pedestrian grade separations in Urban Centers:** Amend the Transportation Element to discourage such separations that can have negative implications on urban design and function.

- J. **Healthy food:** Add or amend policies in several elements supporting the production and distribution of healthy food.
- K. **Funding neighborhood organizations for neighborhood planning:** Amend the Neighborhood Planning Element to state the City's receptivity to funding such organizations for such processes.

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 amendments would affect the City's Comprehensive Plan, which pertains to the entire City.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS:**

**1. Earth**

- a. **General description of the site: (circle one) Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:**

The earth characteristics vary throughout the City from flat to steeply sloping. The proposed amendments should not meaningfully increase the potential for earth impacts.

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

The steepest slopes in the City exceed 40% and include the nearly vertical cuts of I-5 retained by concrete walls.

- 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 prime farmland.**

Soils conditions vary considerably throughout the City of Seattle and typically include a mix of glacial till.

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

None; no project site is identified.

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

None; no project site is identified. Specific project actions requiring filling

or grading would require SEPA review at the time they are proposed.

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

None; no project site is identified. Specific project actions requiring clearing or construction would require SEPA review at the time they are proposed.

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

The City is already largely developed with buildings and roadway surfaces. No other information is known because no project site is identified. Future projects will undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

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

None required.

**2. Air**

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

Implementation of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments is not expected to result in significant adverse long-term air emissions impacts. Rather, a number of the proposed amendments could directly or indirectly support future growth that would control or limit per-capita air emissions. Included are amendments that would address long-term control of greenhouse gases. Future development, if indirectly encouraged by elements of the neighborhood plan updates, would generate additional emissions during and after construction.

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

None applicable to this non-project action.

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

Many surface water bodies are located within the City limits.

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

No. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments do not include specific construction projects. Any indirectly-encouraged actions that require work adjacent to any surface water body may be required to undergo project-specific SEPA review.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

None expected for this non-project action. Any indirectly-encouraged actions that require fill or dredge material may be required to undergo project-specific SEPA review.

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

No, for this non-project action.

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

Parts of the City are located within a 100-year floodplain, but the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not site-specific.

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

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

**b. Ground**

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate**

quantities if known.

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example, domestic sewage, industrial, containing the following chemicals... agricultural, etc). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

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.

Stormwater could occur, potentially in greater amounts in areas directly or indirectly affected by the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments. Any indirectly-encouraged future development projects in the city may undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

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

Not as a result of this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

**4. Plants**

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

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

Many of the types of plants listed above may be found in Seattle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not expected to result in increased impacts on plants.

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

None.

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

Threatened or endangered species do exist in Seattle, including Chinook salmon. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new direct or immediate impacts on threatened or endangered species. See Section D of this checklist for other commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal. Any indirectly-encouraged future development projects would undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

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

None proposed for this non-project action.

**5. Animals**

**a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

**birds:** hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

**mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

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

There are a number of types of animals in Seattle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new impacts on animals.

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

Threatened or endangered species do exist in Seattle, including Chinook salmon. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely create new direct or immediate impacts on threatened or endangered species. See Section D of this checklist for other commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal.

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

Seattle includes migratory bird species and is located within the Pacific Flyway, one of the four principal north-south migration routes for birds in North America. The Pacific Flyway encompasses the entire Puget Sound Basin. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments, as a non-project action, would not likely result in direct or immediate impacts on migratory birds. See Section D of this checklist for other commentary at a programmatic level on the indirect or long-

term potential for impacts as a result of the implementation of the proposal.

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

None proposed.

**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.**

None for this non-project action.

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

No.

**c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

None for this non-project action. One of the proposed elements would encourage strategies for reduction of greenhouse gases, and others would encourage future development in neighborhood areas that are transit-accessible, which would have positive energy conservation implications.

**7. Environmental Health**

**a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

No.

**1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

None required for this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

**b. Noise**

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

None identified for this non-project action because there is not one site or

development project.

- 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.**

None identified for this non-project action because there is not a project site or development project.

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

None proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

There are various residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and recreational uses located throughout Seattle. See Section D of this checklist for more discussion of potential land use impacts for this non-project action.

- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.**

No; this non-project action does not include a single project site.

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

Not applicable to this non-project action because there is not one project site.

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

Not as a result of this non-project action.

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

Zoning designations vary widely from site to site within the City limits. The proposal includes elements that encompass designations ranging from Single Family to all or most of the other zoning designations in the city.

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

Citywide Comprehensive Plan designations are shown on the Future Land Use Map within the Land Use Element of Seattle's Comprehensive Plan (available online here: [www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Seattle\\_s\\_Comprehensive\\_Plan/ComprehensivePlan](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Seattle_s_Comprehensive_Plan/ComprehensivePlan)).

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

The City has established a Shoreline District with the following twelve shoreline

environment designations: Conservancy Navigation (CN), Conservancy Preservation (CP), Conservancy Recreation (CR), Conservancy Management (CM), Conservancy Waterway (CW), Urban Residential (UR), Urban Stable (US), Urban Harborfront (UH), Urban Maritime (UM), Urban General (UG), Urban Industrial (UI). Except for the proposal related to support for the recreational boating industry in the Economic Development Element, the proposed amendments don't particularly address shoreline designated areas in ways with potential for adverse impacts. Future potential development projects that might be indirectly encouraged by the proposed amendments would undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis if they exceed categorical exemptions.

**h. Has any part of the site been classified as an environmentally sensitive area? If so, specify.**

The City includes environmentally sensitive areas, including wetlands, shorelines, riparian corridors, landslide-prone areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, among others. The proposed amendments are not reasonably likely to affect environmentally sensitive areas in an adverse manner because changes do not pertain to these areas in particular, nor are indirect effects expected. Future projects would undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis if they exceed categorical exemptions.

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

None estimated for this non-project action because there is not one project or one project site.

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

None.

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

None proposed.

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

None proposed.

**9. Housing**

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

No added housing units provided directly related to this non-project action, because there is no development project proposed nor a single project site. Among the non-project components, adoption of updated neighborhood-plan-

related policies for Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake and Rainier and Future Land Use Map changes could be interpreted as encouraging more future development of housing. Such housing would likely fall in the middle-income range or more affordable.

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

None known.

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

None proposed.

**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?**

No structure proposed that is related to this non-project action.

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

No effects identified for this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

**11. Light and Glare**

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

None identified for this non-project action.

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

No.

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

None identified.

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

None proposed.

**12. Recreation**

- a. **What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the**

**immediate vicinity?**

None identified for this non-project action because there is no single site.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

**13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.**

Numerous across the city.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

This site-specific question has minimal relationship to this non-project action because there is no single site.

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

None proposed.

**14. Transportation**

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

Numerous citywide. This site-specific question is not answered for this non-project action because there is no single site; given the subject matter of the various amendments different portions of the network would be affected indirectly, including south of Downtown, along various transit routes, and in neighborhoods including Rainier Beach and Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Yes. See the response to Question 14.a above.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

See the response to Question 14.a above.

- d. **Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe. (indicate whether public or private).**

See the response to Question 14.a above, and Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

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

See the response to Question 14.a above, and Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

- f. **How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

See the response to Question 14.a above, and Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

## 15. Public Services

- a. **Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

Minor to moderate indirect implications on public service demands could occur in relation to area-specific amendment proposals. See Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

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

None proposed.

## 16. Utilities

- a. **Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

Minor to moderate indirect implications on public utility demands could occur in relation to area-specific amendment proposals. See Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

- 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.**

See Section D for further discussion of potential impacts from this non-project action.

**C. SIGNATURE:**

I, the undersigned, state that to the best of my knowledge the above information is true and complete. It is understood that the lead agency may withdraw any declaration of non-significance that it might issue in reliance upon this checklist should there be any willful misrepresentation or willful lack of full disclosure on my part.

Signature:

---

Tom Hauger

Date Submitted: November 5, 2012

**D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT 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 the questions, be aware of the extent of 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.

---

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments (summarized at section A.11 of this checklist) generally have minimal potential to generate direct or immediate significant adverse environmental impacts. The potential indirect or extended impacts related to changed future conditions associated with the proposals are discussed in response to the questions below, to the extent that impacts can be identified and are relevant to SEPA impact review requirements.

A majority of the proposed amendments are policy changes that could support improved conditions in the environment, or have minimal potential for adverse impacts, because they are advisory in nature, or lend support to a particular type of land use implementation such as precluding a particular land use in a given location. Items D through K fall into this category. These sorts of proposed changes are either predominantly neutral or positive in their implications for environmental impacts. The following discussion suggests aspects of the proposal items that might conceivably lead to adverse environmental impacts.

**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?**

**Water Resources**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes would result in no direct adverse impacts related to water resources, but certain changes might indirectly generate impacts in relation to the effects of future related development.

- Proposal Items A and B, the adoption of neighborhood plan policies related to Rainier Beach and Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake neighborhood plans, could result in localized increases in water-related effects if proposed or future accommodated land use/zoning changes lead to increased levels of future development. This would most directly relate to potential for future increased surface runoff to storm sewers or combined sewers or drainage channels that might affect local water bodies, and increased sanitary sewer volumes that could potentially affect releases from downstream sewage systems (treated or untreated). Similar sorts of impacts may also occur in relation to identified possible infrastructure improvements such as pedestrian- or vehicle-oriented improvements to Aurora Avenue N or S. Henderson Street, for example.
  - It should also be noted that current rules for stormwater controls and utility permitting requirements would tend to reduce or eliminate a large fraction of the potential for adverse impact, and may even improve conditions substantially on redeveloped properties that may be currently

impervious surfaces and have uncontrolled or minimally controlled conditions for stormwater runoff.

- Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse impacts on water resources. Indirectly, if this concept influences future development to be denser in transit communities areas, this differential in land use patterns that could occur (compared to the current zoning patterns) could lead to greater stormwater volumes generated through addition of more impervious surfaces such as roofs and driveways. At the same time, the greatest fraction of these volumes would be directed toward City utility systems and/or to on-site detention systems that would tend to lead to better overall control of surface runoff patterns. However, the total volumes of treated runoff ultimately released to natural waters such as Puget Sound and Lake Washington could increase.
- Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts upon water resources, given their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance.

### **Air Quality**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes would result in no direct adverse impacts related to air quality, but certain changes might indirectly generate impacts in relation to the effects of future development.

- Proposal Items A and B, the adoption of neighborhood plan policies related to Rainier Beach and Broadview neighborhood plans, could result in localized increases in air quality effects if proposed or future land use changes lead to increased future development. This would most directly relate to potential for short-term, construction-related site disturbance and dust generation. Similar sorts of impacts may also occur in relation to identified possible infrastructure improvements such as pedestrian- or vehicle-oriented improvements to Aurora Avenue N or S. Henderson Street. Conceivably, also, future possible rezones such as along the west side of Aurora Avenue N. in Bitter Lake could lead to increased residential density in greater proximity to pollutant generators along Aurora Avenue N.
- Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning concept or tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse impacts on air quality. Rather, indirectly, if this concept influences future development to be denser in transit communities areas, this differential in land use patterns (compared to the current zoning) could lead to probable positive long-term effects upon air quality. This would be due in part to the increased access to transit systems allowing modes of travel that would generate fewer per-capita pollutant emissions from vehicles.
- Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts upon water resources, given their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. Item F notably includes proposals meant to control or reduce the production of greenhouse gases (GHG) to “net zero emissions,” which would have positive air quality impact potential in relation to long-term emissions generated by urban area activity.

## **Noise**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes in Items A and B are not likely to result in direct impacts related to noise. The potential for indirect adverse impacts is comparable in degree and type to those described in the disclosures for air quality above. This means: potential for added noise due to future possible new construction on private property or for infrastructure improvements, and potential for increased proximity of low-density residential uses with moderate-density residential and/or commercial land uses, which could increase the potential for adverse noise impacts between uses.

Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse noise impacts. Indirectly, if this concept influences future development to be denser in transit communities areas, this differential in land use patterns (compared to the current zoning) could lead to increased noise levels, which would be a potential adverse noise impact upon properties within and bordering the transit community areas.

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts in relation to noise, given their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance.

## **Production, Storage or Release of Toxic or Hazardous Substances**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes in Items A and B are not likely to result in direct impacts related to production, storage or release of toxic or hazardous substances. The potential for indirect adverse impacts is comparable in degree and type to those described in the disclosures for noise above. This means: a conceptual potential for added presence of toxic or hazardous substances due to future possible new construction and demolition activities on private property or due to infrastructure improvement projects, and a conceptual potential for increased proximity of low-density residential uses with other non-residential land uses that might conceivably use such substances, which could increase the potential for adverse impacts of toxic/hazardous exposures between uses.

Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning concept or tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse impacts related to toxic or hazardous substances. Indirectly, if this concept influences future development to be denser in transit communities areas, this differential in land use patterns (compared to the current zoning pattern) could increase the proximity of residents to locations producing/storing toxic or hazardous substances. This would be a potential adverse toxic/hazardous substance impact upon properties within and bordering the transit community areas.

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts in relation to noise, given their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. To the extent that some topics refer to industries such as the boating industry or farming that may have local adverse effects

on their surrounding environment, the proposed amendments would not specifically affect those activities in ways that would be likely to increase the expected adverse effects. Thus, there is no net change in environmental impact potential identified.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes in Items A and B are not likely to result in direct impacts upon plants, animals, fish or marine life. The potential for indirect adverse impacts is comparable in degree and type to those described in the disclosures in response to Question D.1 above. This means: a conceptual potential for added disturbance of plant and animal habitats due to future possible new construction and demolition activities on private property or due to infrastructure improvement projects, and a conceptual potential for increased proximity of new development to plant/animal habitat edges such as nearby greenbelts, which could increase the potential for adverse impacts upon plants and animals.

Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for adverse impacts on plants, animals, fish or marine life. Indirectly, if this concept influences future development to be denser in transit communities areas, this differential in land use patterns (compared to the current zoning) could increase future adverse impacts upon urban wildlife habitats. Such habitat might be present either on low-density residential properties or in remaining vegetated areas in and around the transit communities.

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate adverse impacts on plants and animals, given their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. To the extent that some topics refer to industries such as the boating industry or farming that may have local adverse effects on their surrounding habitats, the proposed amendments would not specifically affect those activities in ways that would be likely to increase the expected adverse effects. Thus, there is no net change in plant/animal environmental impact potential identified.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes in Items A and B are not likely to result in direct impacts in terms of energy or natural resource depletion. Comparable to responses to questions above in this section D, the potentially added adverse impacts generated indirectly by Items A and B would relate to the extent that increased amounts of future development might occur in certain parts of Rainier Beach and Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake. Such increases in development would likely consume more natural resources and energy to build and operate new residential and

non-residential facilities. At the same time, encouraging more such development in transit-accessible areas within the City of Seattle would enable greater degrees of energy and resource savings than would development located in more distant portions of the urban region. This would occur in relation to savings of energy expended for transportation as well as due to more efficiently dense building construction and urban use patterns. An analysis of whether these factors offset each other is beyond the scope of this analysis, but in any case significant adverse impacts on this element of the environment are not anticipated.

Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for adverse impacts on energy or natural resources. Indirectly, to the extent these concepts are implemented, the potential for improved efficiency of future development patterns would encourage more efficient energy use and reduce the potential for significant effects upon related natural resources. Thus, no potential for indirect significant adverse impact upon energy or natural resources is identified.

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts in terms of energy or natural resource depletion, due to their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. No potential meaningful adverse implications are identified for these items.

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

None proposed.

**4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened, or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes in Item A and B would result in no direct impacts on environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection. Indirect impacts of this kind are also relatively unlikely due to the lack of presence of these kinds of sensitive features, and because wetlands and floodplains in the city would continue to be protected comparably to today. Neighborhood plan updates in Items A and B contain a couple of references to wetland restoration and encouragement of farming for healthy food production, but such elements would be expected to accomplish wetland restorations carefully and to use farming practices that would not be significantly adversely harmful to the environment.

Proposal Item C, regarding the addition of “transit communities” as a planning tool that could be used to influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct or known indirect potential for significant adverse impacts on these kinds of sensitive areas. This is due to the general lack of presence these sensitive areas in potentially affected areas. In addition, future planning activities and existing/future code regulations would help to ensure appropriate protection of any such resources (such as wetlands or historic sites) if any are present.

See the responses to Questions D.1, D.2 and D.3 for other relevant interpretations of the low potential to substantially affect natural environmental features and habitat.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes would result in no direct, immediate impacts on land use because they are part of a non-project action. By their nature, the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan would represent shifts in policy that could influence long-term differences in patterns of land use, activities, and externalities such as pollution upon different elements of the environment. Changes to the Comprehensive Plan supersede many other “existing plans” such that differences in policy among plans would not represent adverse incompatibilities but rather properly-decided shifts in overall policy direction.

Items A and B, updates to neighborhood plans for Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake and Rainier Beach, respectively, would generate a limited potential for added indirect adverse land use impacts, due largely to their proposals to consider Future Land Use Map designation changes and zoning changes in ways that would newly create the possibility of future increases in development capacity and intensity. While these recommended land use possibilities can be viewed as potentially positive in terms of helping to support these communities’ visions for an improved future neighborhood, in environmental impact terms they would represent an extension of capability for intensified land use and activity that could generate net increases in adverse impacts related to land use compatibility. Potential compatibility impacts could relate to different or increased activity levels, differences in types of uses nearer to other uses that may have adverse consequences, or potential impacts of relationships of buildings’ height, bulk and scale.

***Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake Neighborhood Plan’s recommended possible future land use changes:***

While seeking to maintain the land use/zoning intent for the properties abutting the Aurora Avenue N corridor, the western portion of the blocks west of Aurora Avenue N between N 130<sup>th</sup> and N 145<sup>th</sup> Streets are recommended for designation/zoning changes that would encourage multifamily and/or mixed-use development rather than general single-use commercial uses. The northern portion is recommended for Midrise rezoning, while the southern portion is recommended for NC3 or SM zoning. Some of the affected properties span all the way between Aurora Avenue N and Linden Avenue N. These recommendations, if achieved, would underscore the neighborhood plan’s intent to foster a denser residential population oriented to Linden Avenue N as the neighborhood’s core. Such uses are partially present today, along with other uses that remain general-commercial in nature. The changes would create the potential for a more direct interface between predominantly residential uses to the west and general commercial uses to the east, e.g. more residents might live close to the rear of Aurora-oriented commercial uses. This arrangement of uses is actually possible under today’s zoning and so would not be a new phenomenon. Also, design review processes, if

applicable, would aid in achieving edge conditions that would likely provide for an adequately compatible interface between commercial and residential uses. Thus, no significant adverse land use impacts are identified as likely from the future possible land use designation/zoning changes.

***Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan's recommended possible future land use changes:***

The variety of recommended land use designation and zoning changes in this plan seek to augment the zoned density and intensity of land in the general vicinity of the light rail station at MLK Way/S. Henderson Street, for residential and non-residential purposes. This includes some areas currently designated for Single Family uses. The purpose is to increasingly focus land use development potential in the light rail station vicinity to encourage future realization of transit-oriented development and improved activation of areas near Henderson Street and MLK Way that would help accomplish land use objectives and area character improvements desired by this neighborhood plan. This includes economic development objectives for the improved economic health of the neighborhood and its residents' livelihoods. The combination of topography, street patterns, zoning patterns and the presence of power lines passing diagonally through this vicinity has likely discouraged growth in this area to date. In contrast, the City's preferred land use and transportation planning principles seek to achieve greater residency, activity, and efficient land use patterns around the transit station areas to achieve neighborhood and citywide planning objectives.

To the extent that the existing use pattern includes single-family properties and other low-density uses or vacant tracts, the recommended changes could lead to future development that would increase the intensity of the land use pattern. This could generate increased proximity of denser uses near other adjoining lower-density properties, which would generate a degree of potentially adverse land use compatibility impact upon those adjoining properties. However, those are relatively minor in extent and magnitude; the area is confined by its physical characteristics such that surrounding residential densities and potential for actual edge-located incompatibilities is relatively low, and there is little or no potential for substantial conflict with non-residential uses. .

***Transit Communities recommendations***

The City's recommended Item C, which consists of the addition of "transit communities" as a planning tool that might influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse land use impacts. Indirectly, the transit communities concepts could contribute support to future land use actions that could increase future development intensity in areas near frequent transit corridors. Properties near the edges of such areas could potentially become closer to greater bulk/density, increased activity levels or other such spillover impacts. These would represent potential indirect adverse land use impacts. Other comprehensive plan goals and policies addressing the protection of low-density zoned areas would remain unchanged in this proposal. Therefore, the actual potential for substantial influence on future development intensity is most likely to occur only within non-Single-Family zones. These potential effects of the proposal are not likely to generate probable inconsistencies with existing plans, or significant potential for land use incompatibilities. At this general level of description, the proposal largely corresponds with existing zoning patterns and the primary directions of the comprehensive plan.

It is also worth noting that Proposal Item C does not commit the City to take any specific future action that would definitely lead to future adverse land use environmental impacts. Rather, the proposal suggests the inclusion of tools and planning concepts that could be considered for future use and could potentially influence future planning actions that are unknown at this time. Such future possible land use actions would be subject to SEPA review at the time they are proposed; however, such actions are not ripe for review in this checklist at this time.

***Other Items***

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts on the land use environment, due to their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. A few observations can be made in terms of the probable effects, regarding positive effects as well as a few aspects that might represent adverse impact potential:

- Item D: Five paragraphs added to the “discussion” portion of the Container Port Element would help provide more context to explain the orientation of the policies in this element. As such, they could be helpful for future plan users to interpret how the Container Port Element’s policies should be applied. This is practically speaking an improvement to the clarity of the Comprehensive Plan, even though the discussion text has no substantive policy weight in the application of the Comprehensive Plan to the existing and future land use environment.
- Item E: Due to its prohibiting nature, this proposal would preclude a certain land use from occurring in a certain location. This does not generate meaningful adverse land use environmental impact potential; nor does it have positive impact potential on the land use environment. Rather, it would maintain a status quo in a neutral fashion, meaning that almost any other land uses permitted today on this property could still be proposed at a later date, with varying ramifications for potential future land use impacts.
- Item F: Climate action policies appear to have predominantly positive land use impact potential, in encouraging more functional transport systems and built environments, and in encouraging land use patterns that would be more efficient in their location of all uses including places of residence and employment. This would encourage the accomplishment of the City’s and the region’s growth management and environmental protection objectives.
- Items G and I: Regarding urban design guidance, including on pedestrian grade-separations, the probable outcomes of such policy guidance would be to influence higher quality built environments in the future, which would be a positive form of land use impact. No meaningful adverse land use impacts are identified.
- Item H: Recognition or support of the economic importance of the recreational boating industry could be a goal/policy that helps maintain the status quo and/or adds weight in local land use policy to that industry’s importance to the economy. It is not likely to generate significant implications for change in most portions of the shoreline, but could forestall or prevent certain changes that would be seen as harmful to the economy, e.g., trends or individual regulatory decisions that would passively or actively push out existing boating-related industries from in-city shoreline areas. This proposal would generally not have adverse land use impact implications but would be relatively neutral in nature;

however, it would also tend to retain use patterns that can have negative externalities upon the natural and built environment, such as residual oil pollution and noise generation.

- Item J: Regarding policy changes for healthy food production, no meaningful adverse land use impact potential is identified. Rather, such policy changes could create a number of beneficial impacts for the community as a whole.
- Item K: A funding mechanism for neighborhood participation in planning is neutral with respect to the natural and built environment, but could help improve the quality of future neighborhood plans.

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

None proposed.

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

**Transportation**

The proposed non-project Comprehensive Plan changes are not likely to result in direct impacts related to transportation due to their programmatic nature. Indirectly, certain land use changes recommended in the amendments could generate increased levels of future development that would generate increased overall demands for street networks, transit and other non-motorized transportation facilities. More commentary is provided as follows.

***Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake Neighborhood Plan***

Over the long-term, the implementation of the neighborhood plan and the associated land use/zoning recommendations would contribute to an encouraged intensification of the neighborhood core near Bitter Lake, along Linden Avenue N and Aurora Avenue N, as well as general improvement of existing character in other areas. Future street improvements, including of certain street segments with more complete sets of facilities for vehicles and other modes, would help provide for continued circulation capabilities in the neighborhood. This would help avoid or moderate the potential for increased traffic congestion with future redevelopment that would lead to more residential and mixed-use density. The probable conversion of some existing commercially used properties to residential properties could lead to some net offsetting of traffic generation by the subtraction of traffic due to business cessation, over the long term. (This is not the neighborhood plan's intent, but could happen regardless.) It is also possible that improved Aurora Avenue street conditions in the area, with improved transit service, would assist in overall walkability and improve the ease of using transit modes, thereby altering vehicle trip generation rates.

Despite the moderating factors identified above, given the recommended future land use/zoning changes, there likely would be an increase in total vehicle trip volumes over the long term on the main arterial street network, and other side streets as well, in the core vicinity between approximately N. 125<sup>th</sup> and 145<sup>th</sup> Streets. This would be expected to add proportionately to overall traffic congestion, probable reduced level-of-service performance, and a possible need to adjust signalization. Given current and projected street capacity levels for the main arterials in this part of North Seattle, the

recommended land use changes in themselves would not be expected to cause an over-capacity condition if related future development would occur (see screenline results for 2020 in the Comprehensive Plan transportation appendix).

***Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan***

The analysis of potential transportation impacts is relatively similar to that expressed for the Broadview/Bitter Lake neighborhood above, except the existing condition in the Rainier Beach light rail station area is less developed today, and the street network is more limited and less congested today than in Broadview/Bitter Lake. The neighborhood plan encourages the intensification of the station area through future transit-oriented development. The immediate proximity of the light rail service would provide a high degree of mitigation value for potential development-related traffic volume increases. Even so, with implementation of the recommended future land use/zoning changes, there likely would be a future development-related increase in total vehicle trip volumes over the long term on the main arterial street network and other side streets as well. This could add proportionately to overall traffic congestion on the available street network. This could also add to reduced level-of-service performance and a possible need to adjust signalization in the future in intersections such as S. Henderson Street/MLK Way or S. Henderson Street/Renton Avenue S. Given current and projected street capacity levels, light rail service, and existing development levels, it is likely that the recommended land use changes' trip generation and traffic adverse effects can be absorbed adequately without causing an over-capacity condition, even if all the future development encouraged by the neighborhood plan occurs (see screenline results for 2020 in the Comprehensive Plan transportation appendix).

***Transit Communities recommendations***

The City's proposed Item C, which consists of the addition of "transit communities" as a planning tool that might influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse impacts related to transportation, due to its non-project nature.

Indirectly, the transit communities concepts could contribute support to future land use actions that would increase future development intensity in areas near frequent transit corridors. In such a scenario, the differential in land use patterns (compared to the current zoning pattern) would be likely to increase the long-term capability of more residents to rely on transit systems rather than personal vehicle use for more trips including commuting and non-commuting trips. This type of effect would represent a net positive sort of transportation impact, although such development patterns could also exacerbate congestion and delay at localized intersections. Given the lack of knowledge about the extent of the "transit communities" and the tools that will implement them, it is not possible to provide additional interpretive analysis of potential adverse transportation impacts for specific locations around the city. Rather, such future possible land use actions would be subject to SEPA review if or when such proposals are made.

***Other Items***

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts on transportation, due to their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. A few observations can be made in

terms of the probable effects, regarding positive effects as well as a few aspects that might represent adverse impact potential:

- Item D that is protective of port activity and adds discussion text, includes maintaining transport accessibility as a key topic. As such, the potential for impact on transportation would be positive if anything. However, given that the text to be added is “discussion” in the Plan, it would not have any probable direct effect on the Port-protective policies’ actual strength in any way that would lead to differential environmental impacts
- Item E that seeks prohibition of a sports stadium in Industrial zones, naturally suggests a rationale that it could protect against stadium-related traffic impacts that might occur near industrial and port facilities. Due to the narrow use-prohibiting nature of this proposal, it does not generate adverse environmental impact potential.
- Item F on climate action broadly speaking could lead to positive transportation impact outcomes to the extent that single-occupant vehicle travel and other vehicle travels are curtailed in favor of other non-motorized or more efficient travel modes. No significant adverse impact potential on the transportation environment is identified.
- Items G and I, in their potential to influence future urban design and avoid grade separations, could lead to a variety of urban design improvements in future projects that would aid non-motorized travel’s ease, safety and functionality. These would be positive impacts overall on the transportation environment. At the same time, such policies could conceivably influence choices that would reduce road widths or similar actions that would limit street capacities. Also, limiting grade separations could encourage retention or new provision of sidewalks that could impair operational efficiency for vehicle travel. These aspects could conceivably cause localized degradation in vehicle travel efficiency, while at the same time a net overall improvement in street uses for all travel modes would be realized.
- No substantive adverse transportation impact implications are identified for Items H, J, and K.

### **Public Services and Utilities**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan changes are not likely to result in direct impacts related to public services and utilities, due to their non-project nature. Indirectly, certain land use changes recommended in the amendments could generate increased levels of future development that would generate increased overall demands for public services and utilities. More commentary is provided as follows.

### ***Broadview/Bitter Lake/Haller Lake Neighborhood Plan***

Over the long-term, the implementation of the neighborhood plan and the associated land use/zoning recommendations would contribute to an encouraged intensification of the neighborhood core near Bitter Lake, along Linden Avenue N and Aurora Avenue N, as well as general improvement of existing character in other areas. Other neighborhood plan recommendations include requested improvements to drainage infrastructure and related green features. While there is presently an apparent deficit in overall capabilities related to surface drainage, planned and underway improvements are expected to effectively improve drainage utility capabilities along Linden Avenue N. This would help accommodate surface drainage needs generated by future development, although other on-site drainage needs would likely need to be

addressed through compliance with drainage and sewer improvement requirements. Analyses for future development projects' permitting would be expected to identify on-site and potential off-site improvements for which a future developer would be at least partly responsible for providing connection and service improvements, to ensure sufficient quality of utility systems. This includes sanitary sewer service, and potential electrical service needs as well. Therefore, while it is possible there are localized shortcomings in area drainage systems or other utility infrastructure, there is a capability to improve that over the long term with an expected combination of public funded projects and private-funded required improvements as well, that would serve future development. This sort of conclusion would also pertain in relation to potential major street improvements such as along Aurora Avenue N, if any such improvement projects emerge in the next decade or so. It is beyond the scope of this analysis to analyze project-specific impacts of such future development or infrastructure improvements in greater detail because specifics are either not available, not confirmed, or it is premature to conduct such analysis.

With added degrees of possible future development in this neighborhood, there would be an incremental additional need for fire, police, parks, schools and similar public services. While past analyses for comprehensive planning have already identified most such needs and concluded sufficient service is possible, the degree of possible added development capacity with future possible land use designation/zoning changes would add incrementally to those future service demands. If such future levels of increased development came to pass, the planned or possible future public service improvements would likely be affected in a manner ranging from minor-to-moderately adverse, depending on the concentration of added residents. For example, such added concentrations would generate more fire/emergency and police service calls, more students, and more use of park facilities over the long term.

#### ***Rainier Beach Neighborhood Plan***

The nature of the analysis and the programmatic potential for public service/utility impacts is nearly the same as expressed above for Broadview/Bitter Lake, except the potential magnitude and intensity of the adverse impact potential is less in Rainier Beach. This is due to the comparatively less intensive nature of the existing land use pattern and the suggested future land use designation/zoning changes. As such, the incremental added potential for adverse impacts is likely only to represent a potentially minor degree of adverse impact upon public services and utilities. Relationships to specific utilities impact potential would depend upon the specific characteristics of the storm and sanitary sewer systems there today, but there is a probable degree of need for system improvement over time as the area would grow, which would be addressable through a combination of public- and private-funded/required improvements over time.

#### ***Transit Communities recommendations***

The City's proposed Item C, which consists of the addition of "transit communities" as a tool that might influence future possible land use actions, would not generate direct potential for significant adverse impacts related to public services and utilities. Indirectly, Item C could contribute support to future land use actions that would increase future development intensity in areas near frequent transit corridors. This could allow for an increase in development intensity near frequent transit-served stops and corridors. In such a scenario, the differential in land use patterns (compared to the

current zoning) would be likely to alter future demands for increased public services and utilities.

Past analyses have indicated that the comprehensive plan's future growth scenario (assuming current growth targets) can be served by planned or existing public services and utilities, albeit with the probable need for localized system improvements, many of which would require some participation by future developers to contribute funds for improvements. Given that frequent transit corridors are generally some of the main street arteries throughout the city and that the plan's growth scenario locates growth centers along arterials, there is a relatively high probability that utility systems are larger-scaled and thus generally capable of serving somewhat more intensive future development patterns. This sort of determination would depend on the magnitudes of change represented in future land use actions, and their geographic coverage. Areas farther away from major arterials could be more susceptible to having size constraints that might generate a greater need for utility improvements to serve future development if it were assumed to be larger than possible today. See also the response to Question D.1 in this non-project section of the checklist, regarding potential effects on water resources.

Future public service provision (fire, police, schools, parks et al) could be modestly affected by potential future changes in development patterns, in that somewhat more demand could be generated by given areas. However, to the extent that future growth patterns become more concentrated in certain areas, there could be a degree of efficiency achieved, in that more demands might be served in locations with established fire department and police presence, as well as schools and parks to serve higher populations nearby.

Given the lack of knowledge about the extent of the "transit communities", it is not possible to provide additional interpretive analysis of potential adverse public service/utility impacts for any specific locations around the city. Rather, such future possible land use actions would be subject to SEPA review if or when such proposals are made.

***Other Items***

Proposal Items D through K have minimal potential to generate significant adverse impacts in terms of public services and utilities, due to their lack of substantial reference to future potential development and environmental disturbance. No potential meaningful adverse implications are identified for these items.

**Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demands are:**

None proposed.

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

None of the proposals are known to result in conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.