

## **WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

#### *Purpose of checklist.*

The State Environmental Policy Act (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 governmental 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.*

For nonproject proposals complete this checklist and the supplemental sheet for nonproject actions (Part D). The lead agency may exclude any question for the environmental elements (Part B) which they determine do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

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:**

Seattle Comprehensive Plan Annual Amendments 2014-2015

**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

700 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000

P.O. Box 34019

Seattle, Washington 98124-4019

Contact: Kristian Kofoed, 206-233-7191

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

January 29, 2015

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

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

The proposed amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan will be reviewed by City Council, and public comment taken, at public hearings in the first or second quarter of 2015.

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

No. The proposal is a non-project action that is not dependent upon any further action.

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

None beyond this SEPA environmental checklist and related information, which includes the Director's Report and attachments addressing several topics.

**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.**

Yes. For Item C (relating to a Morgan Junction property) below, a proposal for rezone and a residential development has been applied for (MUP #3016200) re: 5911 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. SW.

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

The proposal requires approval by the City Council and Mayor.

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

The proposal consists of several possible amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, as summarized below. The proposed amendments will be considered by the City Council likely in mid-2015.

**A. Adoption of a package of Comprehensive Plan Amendments addressing compliance with GMA.**

The recommended amendments address updates and revisions that are oriented to fulfilling required GMA information, including the following:

1. Updating the Comprehensive Plan to accept new growth estimates of 70,000 additional housing units and 115,000 additional jobs. This is the City's share of the region's projected housing and employment growth between 2015 and 2035, assigned through the countywide process conducted by the Growth Management Planning Council.

- a. Growth amounts proposed to be assigned for Seattle at the citywide level represent the city's share of King County's projected 20-year population and employment growth. The City plans its zoning and infrastructure to accommodate these targets.
  - b. Revisions to "Urban Village Figure 8" and removal of Urban Village Appendix A, are recommended to reflect the new population and employment projections; and
  - c. Other text edits to policies that are needed in policies that currently refer to growth targets, Urban Village Figure 8, or Urban Village Appendix A.
2. A recommendation to update growth assumptions for the City's urban centers and manufacturing/industrial centers. Urban centers are the largest type of places designated for growth, including Downtown, Capitol Hill/First Hill, South Lake Union, Uptown Queen Anne, University District and Northgate, and they are recognized in the regional growth management strategy.
  3. Updated Comprehensive Plan elements and appendices for transportation, capital facilities, economic development, housing, utilities and land use to reflect the new population and employment projections and any changes in inventory or capacity, as needed.

The recommendations maintain the City's approach of accommodating citywide growth by continuing to use the urban village strategy, which has been the City's prevailing growth management strategy and primary urban planning principle for the past twenty years. As this does not represent a change in policy direction, it is not included as part of the actions evaluated in this proposal. But it is worth noting as supporting information that reflects on the nature of the individual actions being considered and their overall intent.

**B. Amendment to neighborhood-specific policies in the Neighborhood Planning Element and amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) in the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village:**

This set of proposed amendments arises from neighborhood planning efforts conducted by DPD with community stakeholders, meant to shape future development patterns and characteristics. The City Council is anticipated to review a legislative rezone action for affected areas in 2015. The FLUM changes would affect limited portions of the

neighborhood, including two places just west of 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, along E. Cherry Street and along E. Union Street. The proposal includes the following:

1. Add policy language to the Central Area portion of the Neighborhood Planning Element to accommodate the possibility of redesignating certain land from 'single-family' to 'commercial/mixed-use.'
2. Recommended FLUM amendments will:
  - a. Re-designate a small area on the north edge of E. Cherry Street from Single Family to Commercial/ Mixed Use.
  - b. Re-designate another area from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial/ Mixed Use, located on the south side of E. Cherry Street, just west of properties along 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue.
  - c. Expand the Urban Village boundary for the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson residential urban village to include an area west of 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue near E. Union Street. No land use designation change to these Commercial/Mixed Use parcels is proposed.

**C. Amendment to neighborhood-specific policies in the Neighborhood Planning Element and amendments to the Future Land Use Map in the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village:**

This would affect property owned by the West Seattle Church of the Nazarene, in the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village, located at 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW and SW Juneau Street. The proposal addresses the following:

1. Modifications to language in Policies MJ-P6 and MJ-P13 would allow for very limited circumstances in which Single Family designated and zoned area could be reclassified away from Single Family.
2. Update the FLUM by:
  - a. Re-designating less than one acre of land, currently occupied by a church and an associated residence, from Single Family to Multi-Family

Residential on the west side of 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SW, in the northern portion of the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village.

- D. **Amendment to neighborhood-specific policies in the Neighborhood Planning Element and amendments to the Future Land Use Map in the Lake City Hub Urban Village:** This set of recommended map changes arises from neighborhood planning efforts by DPD with community stakeholders, meant to encourage more pedestrian-friendly development, with the potential for future improvements in urban design. This would affect an area near NE 125<sup>th</sup> Street and 26<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> Avenues NE, the Lake City Library and Virgil Flaim Park. The recommendation would:
1. Revise policy language in the Lake City portion of the Neighborhood Planning Element to allow increased height, bulk or density in and around the neighborhood's Civic Core in limited circumstances.
  2. Update the FLUM by:
    - a. Re-designating approximately 5 acres from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial/Mixed Use in the vicinity of NE 125<sup>th</sup> Street near 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.
- E. **Amendments to Policies Addressing Environmentally Critical Areas:** In 2014, the City updated its report on the best available science related to ECAs. Recommended amendments to these policies reflect new information in that report, as well as language changes to improve the clarity of existing policies. The amendments include recognition of peat settlements as a classification of ECA.
- F. **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces:** Proposed revisions to the wording of Policies EP8.1 and EP10 would include more specific descriptions of intended purposes and targeted design components for EP8.1, including reference to low-impact development techniques, and broaden the language of EP10 and include a focus on removing unnecessary impervious surfaces.

**G. Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments.** These amendments clarify goals and policies related to mitigating housing and childcare impacts associated with new commercial and residential development. Specifically, the amendments remove language that sets out a policy whereby impacts associated with development below a base density or height are not mitigated.

**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.

Portions of these non-project proposals apply to the entire city of Seattle, and other parts refer to certain locations in neighborhoods, including but not limited to:

- Portions of the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village
- Portions of the Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village
- Portions of the Lake City Hub Urban Village

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

### **1. Earth**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

## **2. Air**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None 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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

#### b. Ground:

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

#### **4. Plants**

**a. Check the 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
- Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.
- Wet soil plants: Cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- Water plants: Water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- Other types of vegetation

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**5. Animals**

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

**Birds:** Hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

**Mammals:** Deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

**Fish:** Bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is 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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed. Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

#### **b. Noise**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:**

No. Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

None proposed.

**m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

## **9. Housing**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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?**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**c. Proposed measures to reduce or control 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?**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**c. What existing offsite sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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?**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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 buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation.**

**This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or**

**areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

None proposed.

#### **14. Transportation**

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed. Not possible to identify.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

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

No. Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**h. 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, public transit health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**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.**

Not applicable. This is a non-project action. No construction is proposed.

**C. SIGNATURE**

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

Signature: .....

Date Submitted: .....

## 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?

### Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance

Future development during the 20-year planning period throughout Seattle could lead directly or indirectly to added discharges to water, toxic/hazardous substance releases, added emissions to air, and additional increments of noise. This could occur on a place-by-place basis and cumulatively within neighborhoods and sectors of the city. However, this proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline “no action” scenario (meaning what would occur if the proposal was not adopted), and therefore no unique new increment of potential adverse impacts is identified.

### 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

In the 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry vicinity, there would be a slightly increased likelihood and potential magnitude of site disturbance from future development that could increase construction-related emissions to air and water and cause generation of noise. After construction, such potential for increased adverse impacts to air and water would be avoided due to the requirements to serve future development. The new potential for increased development size and possible mix of uses would add a degree of potential additional adverse noise impacts upon nearby single-family residential uses compared to development under the Single Family designation, but such difference would likely be minor and less than significant adverse in degree. Other spillover noise from nearby non-residential activities might also be relevant in limiting the degree to which future ambient noise levels might be perceived as changed. However, proposed future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as

provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

### **Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The potential for adverse impacts at this location in Morgan Junction would be approximately the same as described above for the 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry vicinity. However, proposed future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

### **Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The potential for adverse impacts at this location in Lake City would be similar to the description given for the 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry vicinity. However, given that the largest potentially redevelopable property is 2-3 acres in size, and given its proximate location and general topographic relationship to a stream/drainage toward the south and west, there is a somewhat greater potential for drainage-related impacts than the other locations than in Morgan Junction or 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry vicinity. This might depend in the worst-case on the nature of future uses on the largest property and the amount of redevelopment that might occur there. If they occurred, circumstances such as outdoor storage of trucks might generate an increased potential for drainage or water quality impacts, in the worst case. However, current drainage and water quality code requirements that would be applied in review of future development proposals would tend to be strong enough to address and reasonably prevent or minimize the potential for significant adverse impacts from future development in the affected area. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified. The recommended provisions should improve the application of the City's environmentally critical area protections. This could improve the effectiveness of future uses of the policies and regulations, which should aid

in avoiding or reducing discharges to water from erosion, landslides, etc., from environmentally critical areas.

**Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces**

The policy revisions, to the extent that they might influence future outcomes, would likely help support long-term, incrementally improved conditions with respect to stormwater management through low-impact development best management practices and to avoid or reduce placement of impervious surfaces in future actions. This would aid in improving future water quality and air quality.

**Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

These amendments clarify goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan related to mitigating housing and childcare impacts associated with new commercial and residential development. Specifically, the amendments remove language that sets out a policy whereby impacts associated with development below a base density or height are not mitigated.

No direct, indirect or cumulative significant adverse impacts relating to air, water, noise or toxic/hazardous substance release are identified. The changes are not expected to significantly alter the scale or quantity of new development that would otherwise be allowed in the absence of the proposal. Commercial and residential development in a variety of formats would continue to be allowed. And, the proposal does not change the overall planned and zoned development capacity of the city.

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

None are proposed.

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

**Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance**

Similar to the response to question #1 in this section, future development within the planning period throughout Seattle could lead directly or indirectly to effects on plant and animal habitat and fish/marine habitat. However, this proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline “no action” scenario, and therefore no unique new increment of potential for adverse impacts is identified.

**23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Given the locations of the proposed changes and the relatively limited degree of differing potential for drainage-related impacts with adoption of the proposal, there is a minimal potential for adverse indirect impacts upon plant, animal, fish or marine habitat. The existing potentially affected lots have some vegetation (grass and trees) which provide for a minor degree of plant and animal habitat. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

**Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Conclusions for this location are the same as reached for the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson area above. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

**Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The largest 2-3 acre property that is potentially affected by this proposal is a former school and is located adjacent to a playground-oriented park. Given this site’s existing character that includes vegetated grounds, and the other characteristics in the general vicinity of a stream drainage toward the south and west, there is a slightly elevated potential (more than minimal) for impacts upon plant, animal, and stream habitat. However, current drainage and water quality code requirements tend to be strong enough to address and reasonably prevent or minimize the potential for significant

adverse impacts from future development in the affected area. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified. The recommended provisions should improve the application of the City's environmentally critical area protections. This could improve the effectiveness of future uses of the policies and regulations, which should aid in avoiding or reducing damage to environmentally critical areas, which would help avoid direct or indirect effects upon plant, animal and fish/marine life habitat.

### **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces**

See the response to question #1 in this section of the Checklist. The potential impact implications in relation to plants, animals, fish and marine life are likely to be positive in nature, leading to future enhanced or preserved conditions that are likely to support improved natural environment quality. Thus, no adverse impacts upon plants, animal, fish or marine life are expected, even if it is possible that individual trees or plants could be removed and/or replaced.

### **Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

No direct, indirect or cumulative significant adverse impacts relating to plants, animals, fish or marine life are identified. The potential locations and sizes of current and anticipated development would not be significantly altered by the proposal, and the proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections. Therefore, the proposal is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on elements of the natural environment.

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

None are proposed.

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

#### **Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance**

Similar to the responses above in this section, future growth would generate additional energy use and in a related fashion generate some effect on natural resources. However, this proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline “no action” scenario (meaning what would occur if the proposal was not adopted), and therefore no unique new increment of potential for adverse impacts is identified.

#### **23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Future development would expend additional energy for construction and consume energy over the long-term. This is judged to be slight in magnitude in comparison to the regional nature of potential energy and natural resource-related concerns. There is no identified natural resource concern at the affected sites. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review, if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

#### **Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Conclusions for this location are the same as reached for the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson area above.

#### **Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Future development would expend additional energy for construction and consume energy over the long-term. The total potential for possible future development activities would be somewhat greater than identified for the other two locations above, given the size of the most likely redevelopment site. The largest site’s adjacency to a playground park is acknowledged, but this would not generate adverse natural-resource-impact potential because future development would be unlikely to substantively affect the operation or environmental quality of the park. As noted earlier for other questions in this section, drainage and water quality code requirements would also tend to prevent or minimize the potential for significant adverse impacts from future development on the

identified stream/drainage area located nearby to the south and west. Future projects that comport with the amendments will require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and will be subject to environmental review, if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

#### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified. The recommended provisions should improve the application of the City's environmentally critical area protections. This could improve the effectiveness of future uses of the policies and regulations, which should aid in avoiding or reducing potential for energy consumption and/or natural resource depletion.

#### **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces**

See the responses to questions #1 and 2 in this section of the Checklist. No significant adverse effects upon energy depletion or natural resource depletion are identified.

#### **Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

No direct, indirect or cumulative significant adverse impacts relating to energy or natural resource depletion are identified. The potential locations and sizes of current and anticipated development would not be significantly altered by the proposal, and the proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections. Therefore, the proposal is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on elements of the natural environment.

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

None are 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, flood plains, or prime farmlands?

#### **Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance**

No specific potential impacts to such resources are identified in relation to this proposal. Within Seattle, the most likely such resources to be affected by future growth could be parks, wetlands, and salmon habitat areas. However, this proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline “no action” scenario (meaning what would occur if the proposal was not adopted), and therefore no unique new increment of potential for adverse impacts is identified.

#### **23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified for the affected properties in this area. The City’s codes and policies addressing protections of environmentally critical areas, parks, and historic and cultural resource sites would continue to provide protection against impacts.

#### **Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified for the affected properties in this area. The City’s codes and policies addressing protections of environmentally critical areas, parks, and historic and cultural resource sites would continue to provide protection against impacts.

#### **Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The largest site’s adjacency to a playground park is acknowledged, but this would not generate adverse natural-resource-impact potential because future development would be unlikely to substantively affect the operation or environmental quality of the park. As noted earlier for other questions in this section, drainage and water quality code requirements would also tend to prevent or minimize the potential for significant adverse impacts from future development on the identified stream/drainage area located nearby to the south and west. The City’s codes and policies addressing protections of

environmentally critical areas, parks, and historic and cultural resource sites would continue to provide protection against impacts.

### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified. See the responses to questions #1, 2 and 3 in this section of the Checklist.

### **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage**

#### **Management and Permeable Surfaces**

See the responses to questions #1, 2 and 3 in this section of the Checklist. While presence of such areas in affected places could be conceivable (such as wetlands, flood plains, historic/cultural sites and parks), the effect of the policy changes is likely to lead to positive improvements and net positive impacts upon environments in such areas. If historic/cultural resources are found to be present, existing codes, policies and protections would also apply, leading to a likely protection and/or suitable response to addressing such resources.

### **Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

No direct, indirect or cumulative significant adverse impacts relating to the described sensitive or protected areas are identified. The recommended action would not lead to differences in locations or sizes of ongoing or future development. The potential locations and sizes of current and anticipated development would not be significantly altered by the proposal, and the proposal does not alter any procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections. Therefore, the proposal is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on elements of the natural environment.

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

None are proposed.

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

#### Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance

The contents of the proposal would update Plan contents in ways that define a citywide growth estimate for the coming 20-year period, and accompanying estimates for Urban Centers, which are recognized elements of the regional growth management strategy and its centers concept. The citywide growth estimate reflects an acceptance of the growth objectives defined through the City's participation in the Growth Management Planning Council.

The proposal will allow the City to remain in timely compliance with GMA requirements. The proposal also provides for revised Comprehensive Plan text that will be internally consistent. The proposal reflects a continuation of planning that follows the Urban Village Strategy as a primary organizing principle; the proposed growth estimates are made within the context of anticipated continuation of Urban Centers and Manufacturing & Industrial Centers as area-based growth planning units, with future growth estimates that are similar to growth trends from the last twenty years.

The elements of the proposal and the outcomes of its adoption would not lead to substantive adverse differences in future growth outcomes or built-environment impacts (land and shoreline use). This is in comparison to a "no action" baseline scenario of the environmental impact implications if the proposal was not adopted. The adoption of citywide and Urban Center growth estimates provide a broad guiding role in planning efforts but do not in this case cause any substantive adverse difference in the course of future development or in its effects upon land use and shoreline use patterns. Adoption of the proposal does not require accompanying changes in land use designations, zoning or regulations, nor any redirection of the City's overall planning direction. On the contrary, the proposal reflects an anticipated continuation of overall planning direction in terms of retaining the Urban Village Strategy as a primary organizing principle. This supports a finding of a lack of substantive adverse environmental-impact differences in relation to future growth outcomes, compared to a baseline "no action" scenario.

### **23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The proposal would allow a change away from Single Family to a Commercial/Mixed Use designation and from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial/Mixed Use, both near 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry Street, and a probable long-term development outcome that would include added or expanded presence of buildings. This would likely bring denser use patterns on the affected properties over time, which would increase the proximity of such uses to neighboring properties that would remain in Single Family designation. The affected areas are along or near arterials and adjacent uses that mean they are already transitional in nature. For example, just east of the properties along E. Cherry Street, a gas station and another non-residential building already define activity levels and use patterns that influence the actual and perceived character of the properties, as does an existing church use on the property on the north side of E. Cherry Street.

### **Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The proposal would allow a change away from a Single Family designation, and a probable short-term development outcome that would include added residential building density (if the already-proposed rezone and development occur). Such building would likely occur on the southerly portion of the affected property, with the church likely to remain present for the long term. This would increase the proximity of denser uses to neighboring properties that would remain in Single Family designation. The area just west of the site is in the California Avenue corridor that has mixed uses and denser qualities already, so the site is evaluated as being within a transitional area where such proposed change may occur without incurring significant adverse land use impact potential.

### **Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The affected area lies within the Lake City Residential Urban Village nearby and to the west of Lake City Way, and is designated for various multifamily densities of use. Nearby uses include multifamily uses, lower-density residential uses, and other non-residentially zoned properties nearby to the north and east. The largest affected property, a former school and current office use, lies within one of these residential designated areas. If this property was redesignated for non-residential use (and potentially another property north of NE 125<sup>th</sup> Street), future rezones would be possible and future increases in levels of

non-residential development could occur. This affected area is generally considered transitional in nature due to the nearby use patterns, and thus somewhat less sensitive to potential adverse land use-related impacts. Virgil Flaim Park would continue to provide a degree of buffering of lower-density residential uses from such impacts.

### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

See the responses to questions #1, 2 and 3 in this section of the Checklist.

### **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces**

See the responses to questions #1, 2, 3 and 4 in this section of the Checklist. Any likely actions relevant to this policy change that might occur within shoreline areas would continue to be subject to shoreline policies and codes that would help determine improvements that are best suited to the particular shoreline environment. Thus, no adverse impact potential is identified.

### **Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

The changes are not expected to significantly alter the scale or quantity of new development that would otherwise be allowed in the absence of the proposal. Commercial and residential development in a variety of formats would continue to be allowed. Existing fees and performance requirements to mitigate impacts to affordable housing and childcare would not be changed. And, the proposal does not change the overall planned and zoned development capacity of the city. Thus, the proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative adverse impacts related to land and shoreline use, housing, or height, bulk and scale.

Future projects built under yet-to-be developed potential regulations, based on the proposal, would require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and would be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

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

None are proposed.

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

**Comprehensive Plan amendments for GMA compliance**

Similar to the response to question #1 in this section, future development within the planning period throughout Seattle would lead to increased demands placed on transportation systems, public services and utilities. However, this proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline “no action” scenario, and therefore no unique new increment of potential for adverse impacts is identified.

**23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

The proposed designation changes would generate a minor increase in future development potential at the 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and E. Cherry vicinity properties. This would generate a slightly increased potential for adverse impacts upon local transportation and public service and utility systems. However, when considered in light of neighborhood-wide or larger-area needs, this additional level of potential impact would be considered minor-to-minimal. Future development could be subject to local improvements to streets or utility systems as well, if project-specific review determines they are needed to provide service.

**Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Conclusions for this location are the same as reached for the 23<sup>rd</sup>-Union/Jackson area above.

**Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes**

Increased traffic volumes could occur over the long-term if any of the affected properties redeveloped, such as the largest 2-3 acre property. If so, there would be potential for incremental additions of minor adverse traffic effects on local streets to the north and south, and nearby existing residents in single family homes and multifamily homes (also in Lowrise zones). However, traffic impact potential would be limited somewhat by the adjacency to NE 125<sup>th</sup> Street, which would be able to handle much of the inbound and outbound traffic additions if future denser development occurred. Given its somewhat

large size where potential redevelopment could occur, there could be an additional degree of adverse impact upon local public service and utility system functions. This would ultimately depend on the nature of future development that would be subject to project-specific review and application of code requirements that would be likely to resolve and avoid the potential for significant adverse impacts upon local utilities.

### **Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments**

No impact concerns of this kind are identified. See the responses to questions #1, 2 and 3 in this section of the Checklist.

### **Amendments to Environment Element Policies Addressing Stormwater Drainage Management and Permeable Surfaces**

See the responses to the other questions on this topic in this section of the Checklist. No particular adverse impact potential is identified with respect to transportation, public services or utilities. The recommended changes would contribute slightly to enabling city utility planning and project designs that are attuned to addressed stormwater drainage and discouraging impermeable surfaces, which should contribute to net positive environmental impact potential for utilities.

### **Housing and Childcare Mitigation Amendments**

The changes are not expected to significantly alter the scale or quantity of new development that would otherwise be allowed in the absence of the proposal. Commercial and residential development in a variety of formats would continue to be allowed. Existing fees and performance requirements to mitigate impacts to affordable housing and childcare would not be changed. And, the proposal does not change the overall planned and zoned development capacity of the city. Thus, the proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in significant indirect or cumulative adverse impacts related to transportation, public services and utilities.

Future projects built under yet-to-be developed potential regulations, based on the proposal, would require permits, review and project approvals as provided for in the Seattle Municipal Code and would be subject to environmental review if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review.

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

None are proposed.

- 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 known.