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 Periodic Update and 2014-2015 Annual Amendments

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:

June 4, 2015

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle, Department of Planning and Development

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

The proposal will be reviewed by City Council, and public comment taken, at public hearings in the third 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.

City staff is working on two separate legislative proposals that contain other comprehensive plan amendments. One separate but concurrent legislative proposal contains other comprehensive plan amendments generally related to affordable housing. An additional separate proposal may also be considered in 2015 that contains other Comprehensive Plan

amendments -- generally related to neighborhood-specific policies in the University District -- which have been evaluated in the University District Urban Design EIS. These other separate comprehensive plan amendments are not necessary as part of the periodic update under the Growth Management Act but may be adopted in 2015 concurrently with th amendments recommend in this Director's Report.

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, the September 2014 Development Capacity Report, the Director's Report.

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.

No applications are pending.

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 third quarter of 2015.

A. **Adoption of Comprehensive Plan Amendments as part of the Periodic Update**

The recommended amendments address updates and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan , and technical amendments to an associated chapter of the Land Use Code, SMC 23.52 The Comp Plan amendments include 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" are recommended to be consistent with the City's Urban Village strategy; and

c. Other text edits as needed to policies to reflect the new growth estimates or new planning horizon.

2. Updating 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. The economic development policy EDG1 is updated to reflect the new population projection and planning horizon.

4. Updated Comprehensive Plan appendices for transportation, capital facilities, housing, utilities, economic development and land use.

    a. The Housing Appendix is amended to include updated analysis and inventory beyond the current plan including updated characteristics of housing stock, populations and housing need, as required by the KC CPPs.

    b. The Transportation Appendix is amended to remove outdated references. The existing volume and capacity data and the transportation expenditure and revenue figures are updated.

c. The Urban Village Appendix A and the Economic Development Appendices are removed because the information contained therein is outdated.

d. The Utilities, Capital Facilities, and Land Use Appendices are updated to reflect the new population and employment projections and relevant changes to inventory or capacity.

5. The recommended amendments 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 considered as part of the action evaluated in this proposal.

B. **Amendment to neighborhood-specific policies in the Neighborhood Planning Element and amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) in the 23rd-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 may subsequently review a legislative rezone action for affected areas. The FLUM changes would affect limited portions of the neighborhood, including two places just west of 23rd 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, just west of properties along 23rd Avenue.

   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 23rd Avenue.

c. Expand the Urban Village boundary for the 23rd-Union/Jackson residential urban village to include an area west of 23rd Avenue near E. Union Street. No FLUM designation change to the Commercial/Mixed Use parcels in this area 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 42nd 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 an area designated Single Family could change its designation.

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 42nd 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 125th Street and 26th, 27th and 28th 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 125th Street near 27th Avenue NE.

E. **Amendments to Land Use Element 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 clarify the intent of those policies and include a focus on removing unnecessary impervious surfaces.

G. The applicant is also proposing technical amendments to Chapter SMC 23.52. These amendments are purely technical in nature and include updating the maps associated with the Level of Service screenline locations, striking out-of-date volume-to-capacity measurements and amending the Code to recognize that the LOS volume to capacity methodology is already detailed in an associated Director's Rule. None of these Code amendments is anticipated to have any impact on the Elements of the environment further analyzed in this checklist. In addition, these amendments if proposed separately would be categorically exempt from the requirement of a threshold decision under RCW 43.21C.450 (1), since they are made to ensure consistency with the currently adopted Comprehensive Plan, which has already been subjected to environmental review. Therefore, the description of these amendments is presented here for informational purposes only.

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

As provided in WAC 197-11-315, the agency applicant has determined that the questions in Part B (Environmental Elements) do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

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

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

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.

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

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.

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

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

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

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.

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

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

3. W ater

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Animals

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

Birds: Hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
Mammals: Deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
Fish: Bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

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

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

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

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

6. Energy and natural resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

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

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:

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.

b. Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

1) 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.

2) 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.

3) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

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

c. Noise

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

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.

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

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.

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?

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

c. Describe any structures on the site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. Housing

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

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

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

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?

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

11. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: Light and glare

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

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

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

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

12. Recreation

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

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

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation

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.

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.

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.

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

14. Transportation

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

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?

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

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).

.

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

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?

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

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

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.

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

16. Utilities

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

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

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: . . . . . .June 4, 2015

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.

The amendments to the Chapter 23.52 are purely technical in nature and are not anticipated to have impacts to any Element of the environment analyzed below.

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 as part of the periodic update

   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) because as noted in the September 2014 Development Capacity Report the existing zoning would already allow for the growth allocation the City of Seattle must accept for the 2015-2035 planning horizon. Therefore no unique new increment of potential adverse impacts is identified.

   23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

   Three parcels are affected by the proposed FLUM change. The same type and intensity of development that currently exists on those parcels is what is likely to occur if the rezones allowed by these FLUM changes are sought and approved.

Each of the three parcels is already within an urban village boundary or would be brought into the urban village, so any development that takes place would be commensurate with the type of development within urban villages contemplated by the existing Comprehensive Plan, FLUM and existing zoning. Thus, new development would be similar to the type and intensity of development already reviewed for environmental impacts. Minimal and temporary impacts because of construction-related site disturbance, construction-related emissions to air and water and increased noise could occur. After construction, the impacts of new uses and structures would be addressed by required permits, and environmental review if such development meets the threshold for SEPA review. Specific impacts on nearby parcels still zoned single family, such as increased noise, would likely be minimal.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

Two parcels are affected by the proposed FLUM change. Both parcels are already within an urban village, and the proposed development of six townhouses on those two parcels is known in concept. This type and intensity of development is similar to existing development on the same block and has minimal potential for adverse impacts, other than temporary construction-related impacts described for 23rd and Cherry. After construction, the impacts of new uses and structures would be addressed by required permits, and environmental review, if such development meets the threshold for SEPA review.

Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

Seven parcels are affected by the proposed FLUM change. All seven are already within an urban village and the type and intensity of new development (that would be allowed by rezones, if sought and approved, as allowed by the FLUM changes) is similar to existing uses and structures. The FLUM amendment would change the designation of a small area within the civic core from Multifamily to Commercial/Mixed-Use.

The intent of the FLUM amendment, also carried forward in a change to a neighborhood plan policy, is to allow a modest expansion of the business district by encouraging office uses in existing, repurposed structures, or in new structures. The

largest parcel of the seven (two to three acres in size) currently has an office use, and that is the type of new development contemplated by the code amendments. Although office development may have somewhat more impacts than multi-family development, office impacts would be equal or less than the impacts of nearby and well-established retail uses (although a somewhat different pattern of traffic based on how office hours differ compared to that of retail, with greater intensity at weekday peak hours but much less intensity at other times during weekdays and significantly less intensity on weekends).

That parcel drains toward a stream toward the south and west, creating somewhat greater potential for drainage and water-quality impacts, but as part of the environmental and regulatory review of projects, drainage and water quality requirements would be applied.

Overall, the type and intensity of new development that could be permitted if the FLUM changes are approved is similar to existing development on the same block and has minimal potential for adverse impacts, other than temporary construction-related impacts similar to those described for 23rd and Union/Jackson. After construction, the impacts of new uses and structures would be addressed by required permits, and environmental review if such development meets the threshold for SEPA review.

Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments

No potential impacts are likely. The proposed amendments will improve application of the City's environmentally critical area protections.

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

The proposed amendments will improve stormwater management through low-impact development best management practices and avoid or reduce impervious, thus improving future water quality and air quality.

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 as part of the periodic update

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, the proposal will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline "no action" scenario. Compared to this baseline, no new impacts are likely.

23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The three parcels affected by the FLUM change have existing vegetation, such as grass and trees, on these parcels providing some degree of plant and animal habitat. The new development contemplated is similar to existing development within an urban village. There is a minimal potential for adverse indirect impacts upon plant, animal, fish or marine habitat. After construction, the impacts of new uses and structures would be addressed by required permits, and environmental review if such development meets the threshold for SEPA review.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The two parcels affected by the FLUM change have existing vegetation, such as grass and trees, on these parcels providing some degree of plant and animal habitat. An existing privately-owned open space is contemplated to be preserved as part of the known concept for the new development. There is a minimal potential for adverse indirect impacts upon plant, animal, fish or marine habitat. After construction, the impacts of new uses and structures would be addressed by required permits, environmental review and approvals as required.

Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The seven parcels affected by this FLUM change are largely developed. The largest 2-3 acre parcel on which development could occur, if rezones are sought and approved, is an office use within a former school and located next to a playground and park. The parcel has some vegetation on it and is near a stream draining toward the south and west. These characteristics slightly increase the potential impacts upon plant, animal,

and stream habitat. That parcel drains toward a stream toward the south and west, creating somewhat greater potential for drainage and water-quality impacts, but as part of the environmental and regulatory review of projects, drainage and water quality requirements would be applied.

Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments

No potential impacts are likely. The recommended provisions will improve application of the City's environmentally critical area protections, helping to 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

. The proposed amendments will improve stormwater management and enhance the natural environment. No adverse impacts upon plants, animal, fish or marine life are anticipated.

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 as part of the periodic update

Similar to the responses above in this section, future growth would generate additional energy use. This increased use of energy will have some effect on natural resources, but the proposed amendments will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline "no action" scenario. Compared to this baseline, no new impacts are likely.

23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The new development contemplated is similar to existing development within an urban village. Future development would expend additional energy for construction and consume energy over the long-term, but any increase is likely to be slight in magnitude. The proposed amendments will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline "no action" scenario. Compared to this baseline, no new impacts are likely.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The applicant's conclusions for Morgan Junction are the same as those identified above for the 23rd Avenue area.

Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The applicant's conclusions are similar to those for 23rd Avenue and Morgan Junction. Although there may be slightly greater potential for energy consumption given the great number of parcels within the Lake City area under consideration and the size of the largest parcel, any such impacts would be minimal.

Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments

No impacts are likely. The recommended provisions will improve application of the City's environmentally critical area protections, and help avoid or reduce energy consumption and depletion of natural resources.

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

No significant adverse effects upon energy or natural resources are likely.

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 as part of the periodic update

No impacts are likely from adoption of the proposal. Within Seattle, the resources that would be most likely to be affected by future growth are parks, wetlands, and salmon habitat areas. The proposed amendments will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline "no action" scenario. Compared to this baseline, no new impacts are likely.

23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

No impacts are likely. The application to projects of City codes and policies relating to

environmentally critical areas, parks, and historic and cultural resources would continue to provide protection against impacts if this proposal were adopted.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

No impacts are likely. The application to projects of City codes and policies relating to environmentally critical areas, parks, and historic and cultural resources would continue to provide protection against impacts if this proposal were adopted.

Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

Part of the area under consideration is adjacent to a playground park but this adjacency does not make impacts on natural resources more likely. Future development under a commercial/mixed use FLUM designation would not be more likely than under the current designations to have adverse impacts on the park. As noted above, drainage and water quality code requirements would prevent or minimize the potential for significant adverse impacts on natural resources, including the stream/drainage area located nearby to the south and west.

Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments

No impacts are likely.

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

The proposed amendments will improve stormwater management through low-impact development best management practices and avoid or reduce impervious surfaces citywide, thus generally improving future water quality and air quality.

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 as part of the Periodic Update

The proposal updates growth estimates in the Plan on a city-wide basis and also for urban centers and manufacturing industrial centers. These Center designations are recognized elements of the regional growth management strategy which includes tactics relying on urban center growth. The citywide growth estimate reflects the growth objectives defined through the City's participation in the Growth Management Planning Council.

Adoption of the proposal allows the City to remain in compliance with GMA requirements. The proposal reflects a continuation of the City's Urban Village Strategy as a primary organizing principle. Allocation of the growth estimates to Urban Centers and Manufacturing & Industrial is based on analysis of growth trends from the last twenty years.

Adopting the proposal would not make impacts on land and shoreline use more likely, compared to a "no action" baseline scenario – that is, if the proposal was not adopted because the existing zoning already allows for the growth allocated to Seattle for the 2015-2035 planning horizon. Adopting the growth estimates shapes broad planning efforts but does not cause any substantive adverse differential impacts, compared to "no action", on land use and shoreline use. The proposal anticipates continuing the existing planning direction based on the Urban Village Strategy.

23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

If adopted, the proposal would re-designate a small area from Single Family to Commercial/Mixed Use and another small area from Multi-Family Residential to Commercial/Mixed Use, moving the latter area within the urban village boundary. Both areas are near 23rd Avenue and E. Cherry Street. A possible development outcome would include additions to existing buildings or new buildings. A new, denser pattern of land use has the potential of impacts because of the proximity of the parcels under consideration to other properties that remain designated Single-Family. However, the areas under consideration are on or near arterials, proximate to commercial uses and generally already in transition. For example, a mini-mart / gas station are just south of the properties across 23rd Avenue. These, and another non-residential use, already define a level of activity and pattern of usage similar to that which could occur under the new FLUM designation. These uses also influence the actual and perceived character of the properties in this area.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

If adopted, the proposal would designate a small area to Multi-Family from Single Family. A probable short-term outcome of a proposal consistent with the new designation would be new residential buildings. These uses would occur on the southerly portion of the area. The church is likely to remain present. Although this new adjacent density has potential for land use impacts on adjacent parcels that continue to be single-family, the nearby character just west of the site along California Avenue is already mixed-use and has a density reasonably similar to what could be developed should these amendments be adopted. The transitional character of the area reduces the potential for significant adverse land use impacts.

Lake City Hub Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The affected area lies within the Lake City Residential Urban Village just to the west of Lake City Way. It is currently designated as multi-family on the FLUM. Existing uses in the area are mid-rise and low-rise residential uses. Nearby parcels to the north and east contain non-residential uses. The largest affected property, a former school and current office use, lies within one of these residential designated areas but is used

commercially. Changing the FLUM designation would allow development similar to that already on the ground. In general, the area under consideration is transitional and similar to the nearby properties along Lake City Way, reducing the potential for 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

No impacts are likely.

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

No impacts are likely. 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.

Future projects under zoning consistent with these FLUM amendments will require permits and environmental review as required.

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 as part of the periodic review

No impacts are likely. Future development within the 20 year planning period throughout Seattle will generally lead to increased demands placed on transportation systems, public services and utilities. The proposed amendments will not generate different types or levels of impacts than a baseline "no action" scenario and, in comparison to this baseline, no new impacts are likely.

23rd-Union/Jackson Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

The proposed designation changes would generate a minor increase in future development potential at the 23rd 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. This additional level of potential impact would not be considered significant. Future development would be subject to requirements for local improvements to streets or utility systems.

Morgan Junction Residential Urban Village Policy and FLUM Changes

Conclusions for this location are the same as those described immediately above for the 23rd-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 125th Street, which would be able to handle much of the inbound and outbound traffic additions if future denser development occurred. Given the 2-3 acre size of the largest parcel being considered, development on that could have a somewhat greater impact on local public service and utility system functions, compared to the

smaller parcels within the area under consideration. However, this potential for impact ultimately depends on the density and intensity of future development. Any such development would be reviewed on a project basis. Code requirements would be applied and would reduce any significant adverse impacts upon local utilities.

Environmentally Critical Area Policy Amendments

No impacts are likely.

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

No particular adverse impact potential is identified with respect to transportation, public services or utilities. The recommended changes can improve utility planning and project designs that improve stormwater drainage management, including by discouraging impermeable surfaces. Thus, the proposal will have a net positive effect on the environment served by City utilities.

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.