

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 Nonproject 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:

Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) and Floodplain Development
Regulations Cleanup Ordinance

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

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

City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development (DPD)
700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
PO Box 34019
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019
Contact: Bill Mills, 684-8738

4. Date checklist prepared:

January 2, 2013

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Department of Planning and Development

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

City Council consideration is expected to begin in the first quarter of
2013.

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

DPD is responsible for maintaining the Land Use Code, Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Title 23, and related land use development regulations in SMC Title 25 on an ongoing basis to ensure the proper maintenance of the provisions. Omnibus or maintenance ordinances will be prepared on an ongoing basis.

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

The information provided in this checklist.

- 9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.**

The legislation would apply citywide where development permit applications are ongoing within designated environmentally critical areas and floodplains as identified through mapping by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Since the most recent comprehensive amendments in 2006, a number of inconsistencies and minor errors in the regulations have been identified by City staff and external customers such as citizens and the development community. These issues can be addressed by proposing a collection of amendments that are small scale, with a limited scope of impact. The amendments include correcting typographical errors and incorrect section references, updating external documents referenced in the regulations, and adding clarifications or corrections to existing code language. Comprehensive amendments to the City's Shoreline Master Program have also been proposed that would affect properties in the Shoreline District also covered by this proposal.

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

Approval by Seattle City Council and Mayor as amendments to SMC Chapter 25.06, Floodplain Development, and SMC Chapter 25.09, Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas.

- 11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the site of the project. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)**

This proposal involves a number of small amendments to SMC Chapters 25.06 and 25.09 that are intended to clarify current provisions, resolve inconsistencies, or to correct minor oversights and clerical or typographical errors. The ordinance includes changes to the following sections:

Chapter 25.06 Floodplain Development (amending 25.060.20, 25.06.030, 25.06.040, 25.06.100, and 25.06.110) and Chapter 25.09, Sections 25.09.020.B, 25.09.045.G, and 25.09.120

Seattle Municipal Code Chapter 25.06 specifically regulates development in floodplains as identified through mapping by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Chapter 25.06 is a separate body of regulations from the ECA standards but closely related to them as part of SMC Title 25, which contains most of the city's regulations for environmental protection. The current regulations for ECA and floodplains both contain standards for development in areas prone to flooding. In addition to the federally mapped floodplains, the ECA regulations include standards for flood-prone hazard areas, which include certain mapped areas managed by Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) outside the floodplains mapped by FEMA. The proposed changes would make the standards in Chapter 25.06 applicable to flood-prone areas as defined in Chapter 25.09 that are not located in areas of special flood hazards referenced in Chapter 25.06 but have been mapped by SPU. Portions of Chapter 25.09 regulating flood-prone areas would be revised to be consistent with the standards in Chapter 25.06. The clarification of these regulations is consistent with FEMA standards for flood-prone areas and therefore incorporates BAS by relying on the Federal standards.

25.09.015 Application of ECA Chapter

The existing language states, in part, that the ECA chapter applies to “publicly or privately owned parcels containing an environmentally critical area or buffer.” The proposed change to this section would substitute the term “property” for the term “parcels” to clarify that the ECA regulations apply to city owned right-of-way as well as any other types of property that may not be identified as a “parcel” for property tax assessment purposes.

25.09.017 Administration of ECA Chapter

A new sentence is proposed to be added as subsection 25.09.017.C.2 to clarify that City departments that have management authority over specific property, such as Seattle Department of Transportation or Department of Parks and Recreation, are responsible for administering the ECA regulations on the property they manage, rather than DPD.

25.09.020 ECA Definitions

The definition of “flood-prone areas” would be changed to clarify that these areas include the areas mapped by FEMA or identified on the Seattle Floodplain Development Ordinance maps, as well as areas mapped by SPU. A reference in the definition of “wetlands” would be changed to delete a reference to an out of date Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual and instead reference “the approved federal wetland delineation manual and applicable regional supplements,” to avoid the need for future amendments to reference a specific manual.

25.09.045 ECA Exemptions

This section includes activities and development that are determined to be exempt from the provisions of the ECA chapter. Several clarifying changes are proposed as follows:

- 1) An exemption in subsection 25.09.045.G allows rebuilding or replacing of structures destroyed by act of nature provided, in part, that new construction or related activity shall comply with restrictions on flood hazard area reconstruction. The language would be clarified to include applicable requirements of Chapter 25.06, regulating floodplain development.
- 2) Certain public projects and utility relocation or development are exempt under subsection 25.09.045.H. The proposed changes would add a clarification, for purposes of allowing tree and vegetation removal, that the activity must not pose an unreasonable threat to the environment, and DPD would be given authority to conduct special inspections or require conditioning of any approved vegetation removal and replanting.
- 3) A new subsection would be added to exempt minor site investigative work necessary for land use permit submittals, such as surveys or soil logs. Just as with beneficial vegetation removal and replanting, the existing regulations, in prohibiting any site disturbance in certain critical areas, have either prevented or complicated this type of reasonable activity within a critical area site.

25.09.055 Small Project Waiver

The clarifications would remove any waiver analysis for small projects from liquefaction-prone, flood-prone, and abandoned landfill ECAs. In liquefaction-prone areas and abandoned landfill areas, there are no development standards limiting development or the size of structures. In flood-prone areas, the waiver should not be applicable, as no new development is allowed. The changes would also clarify that retaining walls and drainage features in steep slope and steep slope buffer areas are not eligible for the waiver as accessory structures or additions to existing structures. This potentially substantive clarification is consistent with BAS as it already reflects current DPD practice in administering the Code and reflects the general City of Seattle policy to limit or restrict development within ECA's. Based on BAS and experience, the impacts from retaining wall and drainage features in steep slope areas require full analysis under the usual standards for steep slope areas.

25.09.060 General development standards

The change corrects a minor misspelling.

25.09.160 Development standards for wetlands

In 25.09.160.B.3, a sentence requiring runoff to be routed away from the wetland and wetland buffer would be deleted and replaced by a cross reference to the Stormwater Code Section 25.805.020.G, which has more specific language that requires the same practices. Further, BAS supports the deletion of the requirement to route runoff away from wetlands because runoff is necessary to maintain the normal functioning of wetlands. For both wetlands and wetland buffers, the language in subsections

25.09.160.B.4 and 25.09.160.C.4 would be clarified to more specifically prohibit any action detrimental to habitat, trees or vegetation. The current language emphasizes removal or clearing only. In subsection 25.09.160.E, the language would be clarified to state that wetland avoidance and mitigation standards are applied only in conjunction with review and approval of a critical areas exception decision under Section 25.09.300, and subsection E.6 is added to specifically state that the wetland avoidance and mitigation standards themselves are only subject to waiver or modification through the exception process, by showing that their strict application would deprive an applicant of reasonable use of the applicant's property. Subsection E.2 would be clarified to reference the correct Washington Department of Ecology (DOE) publication for wetland mitigation plans and includes language that would prevent the need for continuous updating of the subsection every time the DOE publication changes or is updated.

25.09.180 Development standards for steep slope areas

A new subsection 25.09.180.B.3 would be added to clarify that clearing vegetation and replacing with new vegetation, or any type of vegetation and site restoration management, is not considered "development" within steep slopes or steep slope buffers. While the language would promote vegetation restoration, it would also prevent future argument that a site where vegetation removal and restoration has occurred should qualify as a previously "developed" site no longer subject, pursuant to subsection 25.09.180.B.2, to the general prohibitions on disturbance of steep slope areas or buffers.

25.09.200 Development standards for fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas

For both the riparian watercourse and riparian management area, the language in subsections 25.09.200.A.2.c and 25.09.200.A.3.b.2) would be clarified to more specifically prohibit any action detrimental to habitat, trees or vegetation. The current language emphasizes removal or clearing only.

25.09.260 Environmentally critical areas administrative conditional use

Subsection 25.09.260.A, which is currently a single very long sentence, would be changed to clarify that the Code allows a two-part application of the ECA conditional use. First, the ECA conditional use would be applicable to allow counting of critical areas toward the maximum number of lots allowed on a parcel, in cases where the application of the subdivision standards in Section 25.09.240 would otherwise exclude ECA areas from the calculation of land to be subdivided. Second, the ECA conditional use would be applicable to allow approval of smaller than required lot sizes and yards and/or more than one dwelling unit per lot. Further, variance analyses are not required for yard reductions or disturbance in a steep slope critical area or buffer if approval of the yard reductions or steep slope and steep slope buffer disturbance is authorized through the environmentally critical areas conditional use.

In subsection 25.09.260.C.2.b, amendments are proposed to delete language requiring application of unit lot subdivision procedures to creation of new lots through the conditional use process. Instead, new criteria are added that are now independent of unit

lot regulations but still require the development as a whole to meet all applicable development standards of both the Land Use Code and ECA regulations, specifically allows development on some lots to be nonconforming to standards on those lots if the development as a whole is conforming to standards, prohibits any future actions from creating or increasing nonconformity to standards, imposes specific requirements for creation of access easements and joint use and maintenance agreements for common features such as common garages, parking, or open space, and requires approved plats to include language, similar to unit lot subdivisions, that lots approved by the environmentally critical areas conditional use process are not separate buildable lots and that additional development on these lots may be limited as a result of the application of development standards to the original lot.

25.09.300 Environmentally critical areas exception

Language is proposed that would create a separate ECA exception process for development in an ECA or buffer that is necessary to accommodate a public facility or public utility. The new criteria would substitute for the existing “reasonable use” criteria in subsection 25.09.300.C and 25.09.300.D, and would require: 1) that there be no reasonable alternative location; 2) that the facility be designed, located and constructed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts and mitigate impacts to the extent feasible; 3) that all regulations in subsection 25.09.300 apply except subsections C and D; and 4) that the avoidance and mitigation standards for wetlands be applied when imposing any conditions.

25.09.320 Trees and vegetation

The language in subsection 25.09.320.A.1 would be clarified to more specifically prohibit any action detrimental to habitat, trees or vegetation. The current language emphasizes removal or clearing only.

25.09.520 Definitions

Adds a definition of the term “reasonable alternative location” similar to the definition in the new Shoreline Master Program proposed in Council Bill 117585, to clarify how to apply the criteria proposed in the new ECA exception process for a public facility or public utility, and to emphasize that the location with the lowest level of impact to ecological function must be considered.

- 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 proposed amendments apply to areas throughout the city of Seattle that are within environmentally critical areas or floodplains as identified through mapping by FEMA.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT: EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

This is not a project; therefore no direct impacts from this proposal are anticipated.

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one):

**Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,
other: _____**

The earth characteristics for the location of development vary significantly throughout the City of Seattle. The proposed amendments would not increase the potential for earth impacts.

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

See a. above.

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 and typically include a mix of glacial till found in the urban Seattle area. No agricultural soil or prime/unique farmland is present in the City.

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

Some areas within the City of Seattle feature unstable soils. Soil conditions vary from site to site, and would be evaluated accordingly.

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

Many developable sites within Seattle are composed of unstable soils. However, the proposed amendments are programmatic, not site-specific.

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

The potential for erosion is site-specific and would need to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. The proposed amendments would not result in increased development.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction activity. Individual projects may undergo SEPA review on a site-specific basis.

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

This is a non-project action. Development consistent with this proposal may occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of erosion at this stage. Such projects will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as subsequent environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

2. Air

a. What type 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.

This is a non-project action and no changes to odor standards are proposed. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have also been considered, and no changes to GHG emissions are expected as a result of this non-project action. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and existing odor and emissions requirements currently contained in the Land Use Code and promulgated by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency as they move forward. A SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet is required for all individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal.

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

None that are known.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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.

The City of Seattle features freshwater lakes, streams, and saltwater bodies. Major bodies of water include Lake Washington, Lake Union, the Duwamish River, and Puget Sound. The proposed amendments are not expected to result in increased impacts on water quality.

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.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this

proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental 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. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

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

No. The proposed amendments are not site-specific.

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

No. The proposal is not site-specific. However, parts of Seattle are located within 100-year floodplains.

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

No. This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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.

The entire city of Seattle is served by a sewage system, generally sewer mains. The proposed legislation will not change existing regulations on septic tanks or waste material discharge.

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.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

4. Plants

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

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

Citywide application within environmentally critical areas and floodplains: each of these features exists within the city limits to a limited extent.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

5. Animals

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

The area is developed and urban in character. Future proposals may be evaluated for their impact on animals.

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

The proposal is not expected to impact threatened or endangered species. Chinook salmon in Puget Sound are listed as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Bald Eagles are known to exist within the city limits. No impacts to any species are expected as a result of implementing this proposal.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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.

Areas within the City of Seattle are served by electric and natural gas utilities. Future development is likely to use these sources of energy.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as

environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

7. Environmental Health

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Future development projects may be subject to environmental review, the City's Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance, and other requirements. Future development projects will need to comply with project-specific environmental regulations. Zoning or development regulation changes in the proposed legislation are unlikely to result in environmental health hazards as part of the site development for an individual project.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

As a non-project action, no emergency services are required by this amendment. In general, emergency service providers including the Fire and Police Departments will review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs.

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

This is a non-project action. Future development cannot be evaluated in terms of measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards at this stage.

b. Noise

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

This proposal is a non-project action. As such, noise levels would not be directly affected.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

This proposal is not site-specific. The proposed regulations will apply in environmentally critical areas and floodplains, including areas within the Shoreline District.

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

The implementation of this proposal is not expected to impact land previously used for agricultural purposes as the proposal is not site-specific. Future projects may be evaluated for such impacts in the future.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

This proposal is not site-specific.

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

No.

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

This proposal applies to zones throughout the city of Seattle.

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

The proposal applies to all comprehensive plan designations throughout the city.

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

The proposal applies to all shoreline areas throughout the city. Where there are differences or inconsistencies between environmentally critical areas regulations or floodplain regulations and the shoreline master program, the shoreline regulations prevail.

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

Parts of the city are classified as environmentally sensitive. The proposed changes are for environmentally critical areas and floodplain development regulations. This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

The proposal is a non-project action.

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

The proposal is not site-specific and therefore is not expected to result in displacement of people from existing housing.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as

environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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

The proposed amendments have been reviewed for consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Policies and adopted neighborhood plans. The primary purpose of the proposed amendments is ongoing maintenance of the Regulations for Environmentally Critical Areas and Floodplain Development regulations, and to propose minor amendments.

9. Housing

No additional units are expected as a result of implementing the proposed amendments.

10. Aesthetics

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

The proposal is not site-specific and does not apply to any particular structure.

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

The proposal is not site-specific.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

11. Light and Glare

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

12. Recreation

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal will be subject to the city's codes and ordinances as well as environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review).

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.**

This proposal is not site-specific. Historic places and objects eligible for national, state, or local registers are located throughout Seattle.

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

This proposal is not site-specific. Landmarks and cultural facilities are located throughout Seattle.

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

None of the proposed amendments is expected to impact historic/landmark structures. Individual projects will undergo SEPA review, as required. All future development is required to comply with local, state, and national regulations that require mitigation of impacts on historic and cultural resources.

14. Transportation

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

The city is well-served by an urban street system and street classification system.

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

The proposal is not site-specific. The City is currently well-served by King County Metro and Sound Transit bus service and by Sound Transit regional commuter rail facilities.

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

This is not a site-specific proposal. However, future development proposals throughout the city will meet the applicable parking requirements under the existing code. Projects and development consistent with this proposal will occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of parking impacts at this stage.

- 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).**

The proposal is not site-specific. No new roads or streets or street improvements will be required as a result of implementing the proposed amendments.

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

This proposal is not site-specific.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not involve construction or development activity. Future development projects will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review for traffic and transportation impacts), and will need to meet transportation concurrency requirements.

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

See 14 c. above.

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.**

No new public services would be required.

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

Please see (B) (15) (a) above.

16. Utilities

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

The proposed amendments are a non-project action. Individual projects developed pursuant to this proposal would be served by utilities including electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, and sanitary sewer.

- 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 immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

In general, utility providers, including Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Washington Natural Gas, U.S. West, and other utilities regularly review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs. This proposal will not create the need for additional utility services.

C. Signature

Signature provided following section D below.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

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

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

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

The proposed amendments would not affect discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions have also been considered, and no changes to GHG emissions are expected as a result of this non-project action. Individual projects that may use the land use and zoning provisions of the proposal will occur over time and cannot be evaluated in terms of discharge to water, emissions to air, production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, or noise, at this stage. Such projects will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) as they move forward.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

No proposed measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. A SEPA GHG Emissions Worksheet is required for all individual projects that may use the provisions of this proposal. Any potential impacts from GHG emissions will be addressed during review of development proposals on a project-specific basis.

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

Enactment of the proposed amendments is unlikely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The area is developed and urban in character. The proposal does not alter existing protections to plants, animals, fish or marine life.

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

No measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. The City and other regulatory agencies have existing regulations to protect these resources.

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

The proposed amendments would not affect energy or natural resources.

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

No measures to protect or conserve energy are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity.

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 ordinance makes minor changes and clarification to existing regulations for environmentally critical areas and floodplains but the changes are small in scale and with limited scope of impacts and would not make substantive changes that would affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection. Best available science has been included in developing the proposed minor changes.

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

No resource protection measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity.

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?

No incompatible uses would be allowed or encouraged by these amendments. No site-specific proposals are proposed at this time.

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

No resource protection measures are proposed beyond existing regulations at this time because the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity. Future development projects will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed

thresholds for environmental review), which will help mitigate the impacts of height, bulk, and scale for new developments on existing buildings.

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

The proposed ordinance would not affect transportation or public services.

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

In general, providers of utilities and public services, including fire protection, police protection, health care, schools regularly review the effects of increased development and propose enhanced services as necessary as part of their planning for future service needs. Future site-specific development projects will need to meet the City's concurrency requirements for transportation, utilities, and public services infrastructure. As the proposal does not involve any construction or development activity, no specific measures are practicable at this stage.

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

No conflicts are anticipated.

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.

_____, 2013
Date
William K. Mills
Senior Land Use Planner
Department of Planning and Development

This checklist was reviewed by:

_____, 2013
Date
Seth Amrhein, Senior Environmental Analyst, City of Seattle
Department of Planning and Development