

# Addendum

To the Final Environmental Impact Statement  
For the Seattle Industrial and Maritime Strategy for  
the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing and  
Industrial Center (BINMIC) Subarea Plan

05-2026

SEATTLE  
CITY HALL

## Fact Sheet

**Project Title:** Addendum to Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Seattle Industrial and Maritime Strategy for the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing and Industrial Center (BINMIC) Subarea Plan

**Proponent & Lead Agency** City of Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD)

**Location:** The proposal addresses all lands in Seattle within the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing Industrial Center (BINMIC)

**Proposed Action:** The City of Seattle is proposing to adopt a BINMIC Subarea Plan into the City's One Seattle Comprehensive Plan

**Tentative Date of Implementation:** Fall 2026

**Responsible SEPA Official:** Rico Quirindongo, Director, OPCD

**Contact Person:** Jim Holmes, Senior Planner, OPCD  
P.O. Box 94788, Seattle, WA, 98124-7088  
206-684-8372  
[jim.holmes@seattle.gov](mailto:jim.holmes@seattle.gov)

**Date of Final EIS Issuance:** September 29, 2022

**Date of EIS Addendum Issuance:** May 7, 2026

**Review and Comment Period:** Comments on this addendum may be submitted to [Jim.Holmes@Seattle.gov](mailto:Jim.Holmes@Seattle.gov) by 5PM on May 22, 2026.

**Location of Documents and Background Information:** Please see the project website for the Final EIS and other related studies and documents at <https://www.seattle.gov/opcd/ongoing-initiatives/industrial-and-maritime-strategy>.

**Required Approvals** The proposed BINMIC subarea plan will be reviewed and considered as part of the 2026 Comprehensive Plan annual amendments for approval by the City Council Land Use Committee and the full City Council.

## Background

In 2019, the City began a planning process that led to the creation of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy. The Industrial and Maritime Strategy was a re-evaluation and recommitment to the long-term health and vitality of industrial land with a primary focus on the two regionally designated Manufacturing / Industrial Centers (Greater Duwamish and the Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing/Industrial Centers). The strategy recognized that the MICs function as part of a holistic industrial and maritime economy and cultural ecosystem, and that they share many issues and challenges.

On September 29, 2022, the Office of Planning and Community Development (OPCD) issued the Industrial and Maritime Strategy Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that anticipated a new industrial zoning framework, citywide Comprehensive Plan policies, and Manufacturing Industrial Center (MIC) Subarea Plans. In July of 2023 the City Council adopted a set of new and amended policies to implement the Industrial and Maritime Strategy in the Comprehensive Plan. These policies included adjustments to the boundaries of the two designated Manufacturing and Industrial Centers in the city. The City Council also adopted a new set of industrial zones in its Land Use Code to implement a future vision for growth and development within each MIC.

The Office of Planning and Development is now proposing to update the BINMIC Subarea Plan. The subarea plan is a requirement of the Puget Sound Regional Council for redesignation of the center. The plan aligns with PSRC's VISION 2050 and is an implementation action of the City's Industrial and Maritime Strategy. The plan makes no changes to existing development regulations, existing policies, and makes no changes to policies that would result in development capacity beyond that studied in the preferred alternative of the 2022 Industrial and Maritime Final Environmental Impact Statement.

## Description of the Proposed Action

The proposed subarea plan memorializes the extensive 2023 Comprehensive Plan policy changes and provides for some additional MIC-specific recommendations. The Ballard Interbay Northend Manufacturing and Industrial Center (BINMIC) Subarea Plan is divided into 6 chapters consistent with PSRC's framework for recertification. Within each chapter is a summary of background data, a description of key opportunities and challenges, a set of goal statements and policies to advance each goal statement. The subarea plan summarizes how goals are primarily supported by existing citywide policies, programs and regulations. Where appropriate, the proposed subarea plan propose specific policies to address unique conditions in the BINMIC.

For each subarea plan goal, existing citywide policies, regulations and programs that advance the goal are summarized. Following citywide policies, regulations, and programs, the plan proposes BINMIC-specific policies.

The BINMIC Subarea Plan sets the following goals for each subject area:

### Land Use

- Water-dependent maritime uses and associated infrastructure which are of exceptional value to the city and the region, remain viable and protected for the very long term.

- Predictable land use policies result in continued industrial activity in the BINMIC
- High-capacity transit lines support employment density that is compatible with industrial activity
- Healthy transitions exist between core industrial areas and nonindustrial areas.

#### Transportation

- By 2044, existing constraints and weak points in the transportation network identified in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS the BINMIC are addressed and improved during the time horizon of the subarea plan.
- High efficiency use of limited rights of way achieves a well-functioning transportation network for freight and all other modes to and through the BINMIC.
- BINMIC shoreline and maritime uses have strong intermodal connections to freight and rail for movements to local, regional, and national distribution networks.
- The BINMIC has a network of pleasant and safe multi-modal trails and pedestrian pathways that harmoniously co-exist with vehicle and freight circulation.

#### Economy

- Strong presence of firms and sectors that are drivers of maritime and industrial jobs.
- Equitable access to the living wage jobs provided in the industrial and maritime sectors.
- The BINMIC is home to new and emerging subsectors of the industrial and maritime economy.
- The BINMIC is home to a blend of Information Computer Technology (ICT) and traditional industrial and maritime employers located near high-capacity transit.

#### Environment and Open Space

- Promote the rehabilitation of critical/environmentally sensitive areas.
- Stormwater management in the MICs uses innovative and effective stormwater management measures.
- A high-quality network of open spaces and trails interspersed throughout the BINMIC that coexist harmoniously with industrial and maritime activities.
- Reduce the amount of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions that are generated from the BINMIC.
- Promote innovative green building practices in design, materials selection, construction, and maintenance.

#### Public Services

- A network of waterborne emergency and police services keeps all the commercial, recreational and transportation activities on Seattle's waterways safe.
- Crime protection for community members and for properties in industrial areas is provided at a level that is consistent with other mixed-use and residential areas of the city.

Policies that advance these goals are based on much of the subarea work done as part of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy planning process. None of the policies anticipate a greater amount of future development, employment growth, or vehicle miles traveled than was studied in the Industrial and

Maritime Final EIS and, in total, are not anticipated to result in additional adverse impacts beyond those analyzed in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS.

## **Analysis**

An Addendum to the Industrial and Maritime FEIS is used for this SEPA review for the Manufacturing/Industrial Center Subarea Plans. An addendum adds analyses or information about a proposal but does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document, in this case the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The information provided in this addendum is based on an analysis of the proposed subarea plans for their potential to result in new or different adverse impacts not identified in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS (FEIS) issued in September of 2022. The potential impacts of the proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan are compared to the thresholds of significance established in the FEIS.

This addendum is organized according to the elements of the environment studied in the FEIS, sections 3.1 – 3.14. For each element of the environment this addendum contains additional information related to the proposed plan and a discussion of whether there would be an adverse impact stemming from the plan. The discussion focuses on instances where there is a possibility for a new proposed policy to create any additional adverse impact. This analysis does not reconsider the potential for adverse impacts for existing policies that are discussed in each plan which have had their own prior environmental review.

Other nonproject planning projects have occurred since the Industrial Maritime Strategy Final EIS. In 2025 the City released a Final EIS for the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in November of 2025. The City adopted the Seattle Transportation Plan in April 2024. In December 2025 the City released a draft regional center subarea plan for the Downtown Regional Center, and in the spring of 2026 released a draft subarea plan for the Northgate Regional Center. The City released a draft MIC plan for the Duwamish Manufacturing and Industrial Center in March of 2026. For each element of the environment in this addendum OPCD staff reviewed and considered these other nonproject actions and their associated environmental review documents and contemplated the possibility for cumulative impacts from policy and planning changes in the other areas in combination with the content of the proposed BINMIC plan. It is notable that the 2025 One Seattle Comprehensive Plan did not make any substantive policy changes pertaining directly to the BINMIC and the plan. Rather, the One Seattle Plan FEIS assumed the same level of employment growth and redevelopment that was considered in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS, and the adopted Comprehensive Plan did not alter the policies pertaining to the BINMIC and industrial land that were contemplated in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS.

### **3.1 SOILS/GEOLOGY**

The FEIS evaluated the impacts of 5 alternatives on soils and geology by evaluating existing conditions in the study area and the potential for construction activities associated with implementation of the industrial and maritime strategy to indirectly affect the land within the boundaries of the BINMIC. Impacts on soil/geology conditions are considered significant if they result in:

- Erosion that could not be contained on future development sites.
- Exposure of people to risk of injury or substantial damage to structures and infrastructure due to the creation or acceleration of a geologic hazard, such as slope failure, liquefaction, settlement.

The proposed subarea plans contain no new policy proposals that would change future land use or zoning from current conditions and the subarea plans are unlikely to result in new adverse impacts related to soils/geology beyond those analyzed in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. The Industrial and Maritime FEIS recommends that all structures, water, wastewater, transportation and other infrastructure associated with new development and redevelopment be carefully designed with input from site-specific geotechnical investigations to lessen and withstand the effects of earthquakes and liquefaction.

The proposed plan contains policy guidance on future adjustments to boundaries of the BINMIC to accommodate future transit-oriented development occurring as part of development of a Sound Transit light rail station. The precise location of future redevelopment resulting in a boundary adjustment is speculative until Sound Transit issues a Record of Decision regarding the precise location of stations to guide potential boundary changes. Such an action in the future might result in new development types not anticipated in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. Any future boundary adjustment consistent with this policy would occur as part of a future Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle and will require its own SEPA review prior to Council consideration.

The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease development activity in the BINMIC compared to the amount contemplated in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including but not limited to the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan, it is determined that no new impacts on soils/geology are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.2 AIR QUALITY AND GREEN HOUSE GAS (GHG) EMISSIONS**

The FEIS included a review of regulatory standards for air quality, air emission sources and individual criteria pollutants of concern with a focus on carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM) emissions, ozone precursors, and Toxic Air Pollutants (TAPS). For air quality impacts, the analysis measures whether:

- Future conditions under the alternative would prevent or deter achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants.

Under existing conditions and under all alternatives, the FEIS found that all portions of the study area (which are encompassed by the City of Seattle boundaries) met NAAQS for criteria pollutants and would not prevent or deter efforts to reduce emissions in comparison to local or regional goals. Due to improvements in technology and overall transition towards fuel economy and cleaner or renewable fuels, air quality would improve over the study time horizon. The proposed plan does not alter this conclusion. Nor are the goals or policies in the subarea plan expected to create new air quality impacts beyond those analyzed in the EIS.

The GHG section of the FEIS describes community goals for GHG emissions and climate change, transportation, and land use emission sources in the industrial and maritime areas of Seattle, the methods used to measure GHG emissions, and how implementation of the alternatives considered in the

EIS may contribute to global climate change. For purposes of the EIS, GHG impacts are analyzed to determine whether:

- The alternative would prevent or deter efforts to reduce emissions in comparison to local or regional goals or targets for GHG reductions.
- The alternative would cause the cumulative difference in GHG emissions between an alternative and Alternative 1 No Action to exceed Washington Department of Ecology's GHG reporting.

Air quality impacts from vehicle emissions and GHG emissions related to each alternative in the FEIS were evaluated by reviewing proposed land use changes and anticipated changes in employment, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and commercial, industrial, and housing construction and post-construction activities. The FEIS concluded that all action alternatives would create a net increase in VMTs and resulting GHG emissions from growth and development in the study area compared to no action alternative but that the region-wide benefit of capturing development that might otherwise occur in peripheral areas of the city or region would offset these impacts. The proposed plan establishes a mode split goal for trips to work within the MIC. The mode split together with policies to improve last mile connections and to improve the active transportation network will not result in new adverse air quality impacts and may result in fewer VMTs than were studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS and in any case will not result in new adverse impacts.

Air Quality and GHG emission impacts were studied in the One Seattle FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions and growth estimates studied in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new impacts on air quality and ghg are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.3 WATER RESOURCES**

Analysis of impacts of the action alternatives studied in the Industrial and Maritime EIS used the following thresholds of significance:

- Development that results in discharges to surface waters that do not meet water quality or flow control standards.
- Development that eliminates groundwater recharge or results in groundwater that does not meet water quality standards.
- Development that increases vulnerability to sea level rise.

The FEIS found that under all proposed alternatives, any redevelopment or new development will require compliance with all applicable regulations to avoid, minimize, or mitigate any impacts to water

resources. Development will need to meet stormwater requirements to protect surface and groundwater from increased flow or water quality impacts. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated on water resources under any of the proposed alternatives.

The proposed subarea plan does not increase development capacity or change the type of development that will occur beyond the amount that what was studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS. Some policies in the proposed subarea plan specifically address mitigation for sea level rise and encourage effective and innovative stormwater management. Approval of the BINMIC Subarea Plan will not result in any adverse impacts to water quality in addition to those identified and described in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS.

Impacts to water resources were studied in the One Seattle FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. The One Seattle Comprehensive Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new impacts on water resources are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.4 PLANTS AND ANIMALS**

The Maritime and Industrial Strategy EIS acknowledges that the study area which includes the BINMIC is highly urbanized but still provides habitat for numerous plant and animal species. Many of these are nonnative introduced species, and most of them are well-adapted to the urban environment and high levels of human disturbance.

Thresholds of significance used for this impact analysis include:

- The potential to reduce or damage rare, uncommon, unique, or exceptional benthic, marine, wetland, riparian, or fish and wildlife habitat.
- The potential to harass, harm, wound or kill any species listed as federally threatened or endangered.
- The potential to adversely affect critical habitat for any federally threatened or endangered species.
- The potential to block migration corridors for special status species.
- Terrestrial noise levels generated exceed any established injury thresholds for any special status species.

The analysis considered potential impacts on plants and wildlife in the four subareas of the FEIS study area (Ballard, Interbay/Dravus, Interbay/Smith Cove, Sodo/Stadium, Georgetown/South Park), reviewed the current policy and regulatory frameworks, and reviewed the types of plants and wildlife found in the study area. Finally, the analysis identifies regulations that provide mitigation to potential impacts. These regulations include the Federal Clean Water Act, Washington State laws and review, when required by

the Washington Departments of ecology and Fish and Wildlife, City of Seattle Critical Areas Regulations, Stormwater Regulations, Environmental Health Regulations.

The analysis in the FEIS found that if all minimization and mitigation measures are implemented, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to plants and animals are anticipated. The study area is already highly urbanized. Most plant species are nonnative introduced species common in urban environments. Development on industrial lands would not significantly reduce available habitat, particularly rare or unique habitat. The FEIS identifies a range of existing regulations and commitments as mitigation for adverse impacts related to plants and animals. These include the Federal Clean Water Act, state laws requiring review by the Washington Department of Ecology and/or the Washington Department of Natural Resources, City of Seattle Environmentally Critical Areas Ordinance, stormwater regulations, and The Model Toxics Control Act of the State of Washington. Other mitigation measures are site specific.

Terrestrial animal species are adapted to urban conditions and have a high tolerance for human disturbance. Additional noise and disturbance that would be generated under the different alternatives would not be likely to adversely affect species in the study area. The Industrial and Maritime Strategy does not involve changes to shoreline or critical area policies or regulations regarding in-water work and is not expected to result in direct noise and disturbance to aquatic species.

Redevelopment of previously developed areas provides opportunities to reduce urban runoff and pollutant loading to aquatic habitat, potentially contributing to improved water quality in the study area. Improved water quality would benefit special status aquatic species and critical habitat, as well as other animals that prey on aquatic species.

The proposed subarea plan contains no policies that would increase redevelopment activities at levels greater than were studied in the FEIS and does not change regulatory framework governing potential impacts to plants and animals. The proposed subarea plan provides additional specificity beyond the Comprehensive Plan policies but these subarea plan goals and policies are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the City's development standards. The BINMIC Subarea Plan includes policies to mitigate sea-level rise.

The proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan does not result in any new or different significant adverse impacts related to plants and animals beyond those studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS.

Impacts to plants and animals were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS and adoption of the One Seattle Plan does not alter any policies or regulations that protect plants and animals. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse impacts on plants and animals are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### 3.5 CONTAMINATION

The Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS considered potential impacts related to contamination for each alternative. Contamination refers to potential for disturbance of existing contamination during redevelopment or operations, and the potential for new environmental contamination. The thresholds of significance used for this analysis include:

- Release or contamination of soils, groundwater, or surface water that requires removal and disposal.
- Hazardous chemicals or conditions that might result in health or safety impacts or impede future development.

The analysis studied potential impacts in the study area and a secondary study area extending .25 miles from the full study area. The analysis presents an overview of existing conditions including Confirmed or Suspected Contaminated Sites (Exhibit 3.5-2/3.5-4) and Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Sites (Exhibit 3.5-3/3.5-5). This analysis also includes an overview of the regulatory framework and lead agency with potential jurisdiction over clean-up activities.

The analysis found key impacts common to all alternatives:

- Development under any of the alternatives may encounter hazardous materials such as contaminated soil, soil vapor, groundwater, surface water, or sediments. The greatest potential for impacts associated with contamination would occur during construction when sites are disturbed.
- A soil and groundwater management plan could be necessary for construction activities in areas with known or suspected contamination. Contaminated soils excavated during construction activities would require special handling, transport, storage, and off-site disposal.
- Depending on groundwater depth and the type of hazardous materials, it is possible that contaminants from historic spills or releases may have infiltrated and migrated, requiring additional cleanup. Cleanup efforts implemented before or during construction would reduce potential short-term and long-term impacts
- For contaminated soil, the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) generally requires residential land uses to use the most protective cleanup levels established under MTCA Method A or B cleanup levels (WAC 173-340-740). These requirements apply to most land uses except those that meet the definition of “industrial property” as defined in WAC 173-340-200 and 173-340-745. For industrial properties, MTCA allows less restrictive soil cleanup levels established under MTCA Method A or C (WAC 173-340- 745) based on adult worker exposure scenarios only and including the use of institutional controls.

The FEIS identifies regulations and commitments that will mitigate the potential for adverse impacts and concludes: No significant unavoidable adverse impacts would occur with the implementation of mitigation measures.

The proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan will not result in the potential for new adverse impacts related to contamination. The goals and policies contained in the plans build on existing policies, regulations and programs and do not encourage or promote development activity at levels that exceed what was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS.

Impacts pertaining to contamination were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS and adoption of the One Seattle Plan did not alter any protections or mitigations against contamination impacts. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse contamination impacts are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.6 NOISE**

The Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS evaluates potential noise impacts associated with implementing the alternatives. The analysis includes a description of noise and noise levels in general, regulatory standards for noise (see Exhibits 3.6-1 WSDOT Noise Abatement Criteria by Land Use Category and Exhibit 3.6-2 Maximum Permissible Noise Levels: Seattle Noise Control Ordinance), noise sources and potential sensitive noise receptors in the maritime and industrial areas of Seattle, the methods used to assess noise and impacts from noise, and an assessment of noise impacts associated with each alternative, as well as potentially feasible noise mitigation measures where appropriate. The FEIS included original noise measurements in eight locations under existing conditions. This analysis evaluates noise conditions and potential impacts for each MIC on an area-wide cumulative basis and in specific areas where the alternatives consider greater degrees of change.

Regulatory thresholds are used to judge significance. If actions meet regulatory thresholds, then the determination is typically that the level of impact is unlikely to be significant. For the purposes of the programmatic impact analysis, noise impacts are analyzed by examining whether:

- The alternative would cause future traffic noise levels of 10 dBA or more above existing noise levels.
- After application of mitigation, the alternative fails to comply with SMC Maximum Allowable Sound Level for receivers.

The FEIS outlines federal, state, and local noise regulations and presents an analysis of noise sensitive receptors the potential for noise impacts by source in each of the subareas. The analysis also describes how land use conflicts can emerge when sensitive receptors are located near industrial areas or heavily traveled roadways that generate high levels of noise. The analysis identifies a range of mitigation measures including development standards for new residential buildings adjacent to industrial areas which were adopted in 2023

The FEIS concluded that under the studied alternatives, increased employment growth could result in increased traffic volumes that generate noise, though the resulting noise increases are not anticipated to exceed 3dBA, the threshold of change that is perceptible. With respect to noise generation from traffic, the proposed BINMIC plan will not generate employment growth beyond that studied in the preferred alternative in the FEIS and similarly, with mitigation is unlikely to result in significant adverse impacts.

The location of noise sensitive receivers like residential uses near industrial or traffic noise sources could occur under all alternatives. The proposed subarea plan will not result in new adverse impacts related to

noise. The plan does not contain policies that alter the number of sensitive receivers near industrial or traffic noise than was studied in the FEIS.

The proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan will not result in the potential for new adverse impacts related to noise. The goals and policies contained in the subarea plan builds on existing policies, regulations and programs and does not encourage or promote development activity at levels that exceed what was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS.

Impacts related to noise were studied in the One Seattle FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. Increases in residential density provided for in the One Seattle Plan could result in greater exposure of noise sensitive receivers throughout the city if additional opportunities for new housing are located in proximity to the BINMIC. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond the amount studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new direct noise impacts would result. However a minor cumulative impact could result in instances where new housing is enabled by the One Seattle Plan. Those minor impacts are assessed in the One Seattle Plan FEIS and they are not significant adverse impacts.

### **3.7 LIGHT AND GLARE**

The Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS discusses light and glare conditions in the study area and considers the impact of development under each of the alternatives on future conditions. Impacts of the alternatives on light and glare are considered significant if:

- Light and glare from new development has the potential to affect substantial numbers of residents, shoreline views, or protected scenic views (e.g., scenic routes, designated parks).

The FEIS impact analysis provides a description of potential light and glare impacts by zone.

- The MML zone is most like existing IG zones and would have the greatest light impacts. Lighting for cargo and storage areas and manufacturing facilities is generally less screened in these zones and results in the greatest light and glare emission.
- Light and glare impacts associated with the II zone are anticipated to be more like a commercial or mixed-use district than existing industrial areas. Without extensive outdoor areas requiring night-time lighting, exterior building illumination would be less intense, though taller allowable building heights could make buildings visible from farther away, depending on location and relative elevation.
- Development in UI areas is anticipated to generate relatively lower light emissions compared to existing industrial typologies and the proposed MML and II land use concepts, due to the smaller scale of development and a greater emphasis on vegetation and green space, which can screen exterior illumination from surrounding areas.

The FEIS considers the relative concentration of each zone in each alternative. Following a discussion of mitigation measures including proposed and existing regulations and commitments, the FEIS finds that there would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

No goal or policy in the proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan changes the location and type of development studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final FEIS and will not result in new adverse impacts related to light and glare compared to those already identified and discussed in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS.

Impacts related to light and glare were studied in the One Seattle FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime EIS. Increases in residential density provided for in the One Seattle Plan could result in greater exposure to light and glare impacts from industrial land in the BINMIC where there are opportunities for new housing located in proximity to the BINMIC. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond the amount studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new direct light and glare impacts would result. However a minor cumulative impact could result in instances where new housing is enabled by the One Seattle Plan in areas at the periphery of the BINMIC. Those minor impacts are assessed in the One Seattle Plan FEIS and they are not significant adverse impacts.

### **3.8 LAND AND SHORELINE USE**

The Industrial and Maritime FEIS evaluates the potential for the proposal to result in land and shoreline use impacts. The alternatives are expected to result in a land use impact if:

- Consistency with plans and policies. The action would result in an inconsistency between the predominant land use pattern and the stated land use goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan and/or the VISION 2050 regional growth plan, Countywide Planning Policies, or Shoreline Master Program. The action would introduce a land use pattern that would foreclose future opportunities to reach goals and policies.
- Land use compatibility. The action would cause an increase in the prevalence of disparate activity levels and use patterns that would result in incompatibilities within industrial zones. Incompatibility could undermine industrial and maritime operations, or the comfort and safety of employees or residents. Incompatibility could be related to time of day/night activity, noise levels, odors, and conflicting movements by vehicles and other modes.
- Employment mix. The action would lead to changes to employment mix that would decrease the percentage and total quantity of jobs related to or supportive of industrial and maritime sectors in Manufacturing Industrial Centers (MICs). The action would cause a high likelihood of voluntary or involuntary economic displacements of businesses in industrial maritime sectors widely throughout a subarea. It would preclude new opportunities for expansion of industrial and maritime employment through business formation and retention.

- Land use transitions. The action would create a land use pattern where high intensity / high impact uses would be likely to abut or encroach on adjacent non-industrial uses and concentrations of residential populations. These impacts can result from noise, light and glare, odor, or height, bulk, and scale of taller buildings adjacent to nonindustrial areas.

Land use impacts of the alternatives are considered significant if:

- There is an acute/severe adverse impact within one of the impact categories defined above.
- There are cumulative land use impacts in multiple categories within one of the defined study area subareas.

The FEIS found minor and moderate impacts related to land and shoreline use for all alternatives.

- Inconsistency with Plans and Policies: Some degree of inconsistency between the expected land use pattern and plans and policies was found for all the alternatives. Since consistency of land use patterns with plans and policies requires interpretation and balancing with many policies, it is common for some inconsistency to exist, while maintaining an overall predominant level of consistency. The FEIS found that moderate inconsistencies would be present under alternatives 3 and 4 and the Preferred Alternative due to the introduction of increased amount of industry-supportive housing, which can be viewed as inconsistent with some regional and local policies limiting residential uses in MICs. The FEIS also found that application of the MML zone would reduce the prevalence of non-industrial uses in industrial areas through new standards in the proposed MML zone that close loopholes in existing Industrial General zones that allowed non-industrial development.

The proposed subarea plan does not include changes to the expected land use pattern or the density and intensity of uses that were studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final FEIS and the plan's adoption will not result in new adverse impacts related to consistency with plans and policies.

- Incompatible Land Uses: The FEIS found that Alternatives 3 and 4 and the Preferred Alternative would see moderate incompatible use impacts in some subareas—most notably Ballard, Stadium/SODO, and Georgetown/South Park—where introduction of new buildings with dense employment in the II zone and industry-supportive housing in the UI zone could create incompatibilities between new activity patterns and adjacent areas of continued industrial uses.

The proposed subarea plan does not include changes to the expected land use pattern or the density and intensity of uses that were studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS and the plan's adoption will not result in new adverse impacts related to incompatible land uses.

- Inadequate Transitions: The FEIS found that potential for inadequate transitions from industrial to nonindustrial areas is highest for the Ballard and Interbay Dravus subareas. Moderate impacts at transitions would be expected in the Ballard and Interbay Dravus subareas under all the alternatives. In general, portions of the study area that abut residential and urban village locations without strong physical edge features such as greenbelts, major roadways or topographical changes have greater potential for inadequate transition. Future land use under

the UI zone is expected to assuage potentially inadequate transitions to residential and urban village areas. Minor transition impacts are identified for the Georgetown/South Park Subarea under all the alternatives, and for the SODO/Stadium/SODO Subarea under the Preferred Alternative.

The proposed subarea plan does not include changes to the expected land use pattern that was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS and the plan's adoption will not result in new adverse impacts related to inadequate transitions.

- Employment Mix Impacts: In all subareas combined under all alternatives, the projected employment mix would remain 50% or more industrial—one of the threshold criteria for regional designation as a MIC. A minor employment mix impact was identified in Alternative 4 and the Preferred Alternative for the Ballard subarea, where the percentage of industrial employment is projected to fall to a level approaching the 50% threshold.

The proposed subarea plan does not contain goals or policies that would change the employment mix studied in Industrial and Maritime FEIS and is not expected to result in new adverse impacts beyond the impact already identified and discussed in the FEIS.

Under all the alternatives, any inconsistencies with plans and policies, incompatible land uses, undesired employment mixes, or inadequate land use transitions described above would be minimized and reduced to less than significant levels via incorporated features of the Industrial and Maritime Strategy and other existing regulations and commitments of the City.

The proposed BINMIC subarea plan includes no goals or policies that will result in inconsistencies with existing plans and policies, nor would it encourage incompatible land uses or land use transitions or affect the employment mix. No significant unavoidable adverse impacts to land or shoreline use were anticipated under the alternatives studied in the FEIS and approval of the proposed subarea plan does not alter that conclusion.

Land use impacts were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS and adoption of the One Seattle Plan does not alter any policies or regulations that protect against land use impacts. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse impacts on land use are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.9 HOUSING**

Three impact thresholds were used to identify potential adverse housing impacts in the study area in the FEIS. Impacts of the alternatives on housing are considered significant if they:

- Result in loss of housing due to redevelopment and insufficient development capacity, tools, or programs to address displacement of dwellings and population.

- Potential to increase households' exposure to air pollution, noise pollution, or environmental hazards in census tracts identified as having high environmental health disparities and with sensitive populations.
- Creation of demand for housing that cannot be accommodated within the city in adjacent districts or areas where housing is planned.

Under all alternatives in the FEIS additional growth and development will occur in the study area, with small changes in the mix of housing. This change is unavoidable but is not considered significant or adverse within an urban area designated as an employment center in the Comprehensive Plan. No significant loss of existing housing due to redevelopment is anticipated under any of the alternatives studied in the FEIS, and the proposed subarea plan would not contribute to a loss of housing.

The FEIS finds that increases in housing in certain areas could increase households' exposure to air pollution, noise pollution, or environmental hazards in census tracts identified as having high environmental health disparities and with sensitive populations. The proposed subarea plan does not contain goals and policies that would increase housing areas that would increase household exposure to environmental hazards in these census tracts.

Increases in employment growth in the study area may shift some demand for housing. The level of growth within the MICs with adoption of the proposed subarea plan is the same as the amount of growth studied in the FEIS. Therefore any change to the amount of housing due to changes in employment pattern would be the same as what was studied for impact in the FEIS.

The proposed BINMIC Subarea Plan will not result in the potential for new adverse impacts related to housing. The goals and policies contained in the subarea plan build on existing policies, regulations and programs and do not encourage or promote development activity at levels that differ from what was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS including related to housing.

Population, Housing and Employment impacts were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or housing or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse impacts on housing are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.10 TRANSPORTATION**

The Industrial and Maritime FEIS presents a multimodal transportation evaluation of the potential impacts of implementing the range of land use alternatives under consideration. Significant transportation impacts and potential mitigation strategies are identified for the Action Alternatives based on the policies and recommendations established in local plans. Thresholds of significance utilized in this impact analysis include:

- Lengthy travel times on key corridors designated as major truck streets.
- Peak hour volumes on key corridors that cannot be accommodated by roadway capacity.
- Mode shares in conflict with City goals.

- Transit demand on key corridors that cannot be accommodated by planned service.
- Increases in pedestrian and bicycle demand in locations with network gaps or preclusion of planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements.
- Substantive increases in parking demand in excess of parking supply.
- Increases in serious and fatal crash rates in the study area.

FEIS analysis included travel times on the designated major truck street network, mode share of journey to work, LOS at select screen lines (both mode share and screen line approach was set out in Seattle 2035 and is included in the Transportation Appendix to the One Seattle Plan adopted in 2025). The analysis then outlines the current policy framework including an overview of Move Seattle, the Freight Master Plan, the Transit Master Plan, the Pedestrian Master Plan, Complete Streets, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan.

The FEIS found impacts common to all alternatives in the following categories:

- **Freight and Mobility Access;** Corridor-specific travel time findings for roadway users—including freight—are presented by alternative in the FEIS. Although freight uses the same facilities, traffic congestion is more difficult for large trucks to navigate, and trucks typically travel at slower speeds than general auto traffic. For those freight corridors that are projected to experience increased congestion compared to Alternative 1 No Action, it is also expected that travel time reliability may be affected.
- **Active Transportation:** It is expected that pedestrian and bicycle activity will continue to increase compared to existing conditions, both due to overall growth in the study area as well as an increasing share of people walking and biking. All alternatives would create more demand in areas that lack sidewalks, curb ramps, pedestrian crossings, and dedicated bicycle facilities.
- **Parking:** While parking demand varies throughout the study area, there are some localized areas where on-street parking demand exceeds parking supply, particularly demand for truck parking given the industrial nature of the MICs. Given projected growth throughout the city and that on-street parking is unlikely to increase in the future, a parking impact is expected under Alternative 1 No Action. With the increase in development expected under the Action Alternatives, parking demand would be higher than Alternative 1 No Action.
- **Safety:** The contribution of future growth to an increase in VMTs. In terms of relative exposure among the alternatives, alternatives 3 and 4 are expected to have more substantive VMT increases in the Duwamish compared to Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative. Likewise, VMT increases are greater in the BINMIC under alternatives 3 and 4, compared to more limited increases under Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative.
- **Pavement Condition:** As noted above, the Action Alternatives are expected to result in an increased number of vehicle miles traveled in the Greater Duwamish MIC and BINMIC, areas of which already have worn pavement conditions due to regular heavy vehicle use. While increased use of these roadways may incrementally degrade pavement conditions further, vehicles are subject to gas taxes and weight-based license fees that can be directed toward more frequent

maintenance of facilities. Therefore, while the Action Alternatives may cause some impact to roadway pavement conditions, it is not expected to rise to a level of significance.

The analysis further provides an overview of potential mitigation strategies including existing regulations and policy commitments, construction of transportation projects identified in the modal plans to facilitate freight movement, active transportation, and safety. The Seattle Transportation Plan (STP) updated modal plans analyzed in the One Seattle EIS and there are no new cumulative impacts

The transportation analysis found that significant adverse impacts to transportation would occur as a result of the Action Alternatives. With respect to active transportation, corridor travel times (affecting autos, freight, and buses), mode share and on-street parking mitigation measures could reduce the degree of impact down to a non-significant level for the Preferred Alternative. The subarea plans do not contain goals or policies that would result in an increase in VMTs and use of active transportation facilities compared to the preferred alternative. The EIS identified mitigation measures to address transportation impacts in the two MICs including, in some cases, requirements for transportation management plan requirements, parking maximum quantities for new development, and explicit requirements for street and trail improvements with new development. Several of these mitigation measures were adopted when the City implemented zoning changes in 2023 to implement the Industrial and Maritime Strategy with the adoption of the new industrial zones (SMC Chapter 23.50A). The subarea plans contain goals and policies that align with these mitigation strategies including establishing a 50% single occupancy vehicle mode split goal, potential expansion of requirements for transportation management plans, and policies that encourage expansion of active transportation networks. Expansion of active transportation networks was based on proposed routes in the Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan both of which have been combined into the Seattle Transportation Plan which maintained the same project lists. Due to these factors the proposed subarea plan does not alter the conclusion of the FEIS that although there are significant impacts, the impacts could be mitigated down to a level that is below the threshold of significance.

The FEIS found that significant impacts were identified to safety due to the projected increase in people walking, and biking, and rolling in areas with network gaps and the increased potential for vehicle conflicts (particularly trucks) and rail with vulnerable users. These gaps were evident in areas experiencing the greatest pedestrian and bicycle traffic concentrated in areas now zoned Urban Industrial (UI) and Industry and Innovation (II). While the City can pursue a variety of mitigation measures to improve active transportation facilities for people walking and biking and pursue supplemental funding through federal or state programs, it is not expected that all network gaps can be addressed given the number of locations needing improvement and the limited funding available.

The proposed subarea plan contains goals and policies that would result in greater employment than currently exists in the BINMIC but not more than was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy Final EIS and will not result in additional adverse transportation impacts than were identified in the FEIS. In the BINMIC industrial employment is below the 50% threshold of all employment studied but subarea plan policies and legislative changes adopted in 2023 are intended to move industrial employment closer to or above the 50% threshold. Policies in the proposed BINMIC plan include some of the mitigation strategies identified in the FEIS including expansion of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips, mode share targets to be advanced through TDM programs and last mile connections, and improvement to the active transportation network.

As a mechanism for further mitigation and tracking, the City of Seattle passed Resolution 32097 in 2023. The Resolution calls on City departments to monitor and evaluate growth and development patterns and operation of the freight network. The Resolution calls for periodic studies and reports to the Council on these topics. The presence of these reports and the actions that decisionmakers may take based on their results are further mitigation of the transportation impacts identified in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS.

Transportation impacts are evaluated in the One Seattle FEIS, which incorporates analysis and information from the Seattle Transportation Plan. For the BINMIC these analyses were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS evaluated impacts from an increase in residential density and growth of the overall amount of housing throughout the city. Some minor cumulative impacts on the transportation network are likely to result in the BINMIC as a result of the overall intensification of growth in other parts of the city called for according to the new One Seattle Plan growth strategy. Such impacts would not be the result of adoption of the BINMIC Subarea Plan, and such impacts are contemplated and considered within the analysis of the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS.

### **3.11 HISTORIC, ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The Industrial and Maritime Strategy EIS details the current historic, archaeological, and cultural resources policy and regulatory frameworks, describes the current conditions (affected environment), analyzes the alternatives' potential impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources, and suggests possible mitigation measures. Impacts on historic, archaeological, and cultural resources are considered significant if they result in:

- Substantial adverse changes to, alteration, or loss of a resource that impacts its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the Washington Heritage Register (WHR), or as a City of Seattle Landmark (SL). Resources that are not eligible for these registers will not be adversely impacted by the proposed alternatives.

Impacts to historic, archaeological, and cultural resources in the study areas from the No Action Alternative and three Action Alternatives were identified by assessing potential for both above and below-ground changes. Such impacts are actions that would alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property in such a way that would diminish its integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and would affect its eligibility to qualify for inclusion in the NRHP or other historic registers.

The analysis finds that since development may occur in any location in the study area under any alternative, it is possible that cultural resources could be impacted under each alternative. Changes to zoning that allows a wider range of industrial or non-industrial uses could spur redevelopment in those locations. This could occur, for example, where the Industry and Innovation or Urban Industrial Districts allow for more mixed industrial/office near station areas, or caretakers' quarters and makers studios for live/work options throughout the study area. This could also occur where areas are removed from the MIC and allowed for mixed-use residential near Georgetown and South Park. Even where there are no

formally designated historic landmarks, there are numerous properties with historic period buildings, or a very high or high risk of archaeological resources.

This FEIS provides a range of mitigation strategies including identifying federal, state, and local laws regarding preservation of historic and cultural resources and identifies additional actions that could be taken to enhance mitigation efforts.

The analysis concludes that all the alternatives have some potential for adverse impacts to historic, archaeological, and cultural resources in the MICs. Such impacts can include physical alteration, damage, or destruction of all or part of a resource; alteration of the characteristics of the surrounding environment that contribute to the property's significance; and the introduction of visual or audible elements that are out of character with the property. Such impacts could alter the characteristics of a historic property in such a way as to diminish its integrity thus affecting its eligibility to qualify for inclusion in the NRHP. No additional significant adverse impacts are anticipated under the Action Alternatives as compared to Alternative 1 No Action, and the proposed MIC plan analyzed in this addendum does not alter this conclusion.

The proposed BINMIC subarea plan assumes the same level of future development as was studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS and its adoption is unlikely to result greater potential for substantial adverse changes to, alteration, or loss of a resource that impacts its eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or the Washington Heritage Register (WHR), or as a City of Seattle Landmark (SL) than was identified in the FEIS.

Impacts to historic and cultural resources were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime FEIS and adoption of the One Seattle Plan did not alter any protections or mitigations for historic or cultural resources. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse impacts to historic and cultural resources are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.12 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION**

The FEIS analyzes the potential for open space and recreation impacts. Open space and recreation resources include parks, trails, public shoreline access, and water access. The primary government agency offering these facilities is Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR). The Port of Seattle also provides shoreline access and recreational opportunities in the study area(s). The Seattle Office of Sustainability and Environment (OSE) also provide partnership and coordination to advance equity and environmental justice goals. Impacts of the alternatives on open space and recreation are considered significant if they:

- Result in insufficient parks, open space, and trail capacity to serve expected population or employment based on levels of service.
- Feature inconsistencies with shoreline public access policies.

- Have the potential to decrease public access to parks and open space or shoreline access in census tracts identified as high disadvantage in the Seattle Racial and Social Equity Composite Index.

The analysis describes the existing conditions, the Level of Service standards for open space and recreation across the city, outlines policies and plans establishing open space and recreation goals across the City. Updates to the LOS standard were adopted with adoption of the new City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan (discussed below). Mitigation strategies include existing regulations and commitments, potential construction of new parks, and other measures beyond construction of new parks.

The Industrial and Maritime Strategy EIS completed in 2023 used the former 2017 parks level of service of 8 acres per 1,000 residents and found that no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to open space and recreation were identified for the FEIS alternatives. The City updated its level of service standard in 2024 to provide parks and park facilities within a 10-minute walk of a park or park facility, and within urban and regional centers park facilities should be within a 5 minute walk of residents. As of 2023, approximately 95% of the City's population are within a 10-minute walk of a park or park facility. The Gilman Playground and the Ross Playground provide open space in close proximity to the BINMIC, within a 10 minute walking distance of UI zoned land. Therefore portions of the BINMIC that could have a limited quantity of industry-supportive homes meets the City's new level of service standard for open space.

The proposed subarea plan does not contain goals and policies that would increase the residential population or level of employment within each MIC beyond that studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final EIS. Using the 2017 standard they are not expected to have a significant adverse impact on open space and recreation. The updated level of service standard is based on walking distance of residents to parks, however the position of existing open spaces enables the portions of the BINMIC that could have limited housing to be in compliance with the new LOS standard for open space. Additionally, there are opportunities to further meet and exceed the City's level of service for parkland through implementation of the Seattle Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan.

Open space impacts were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS in the public services chapter and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse open space impacts are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES**

The Industrial and Maritime EIS evaluated the potential for public service impacts for each of the alternatives. Public services discussed in this section include fire, police, school, and library services. The primary providers of these services for the study area are the Seattle Fire Department (SFD), the Seattle Police Department (SPD), the Port of Seattle Police Department (POSPD), Seattle Public Schools (SPS), and the Seattle Library System (SLS). The Primary Study Area includes industrially zoned lands both

inside and outside of the manufacturing industrial centers. Secondary Study Areas include fire stations, police stations, schools, and libraries in proximity to the Primary Study Area.

Impacts of the alternatives on public services are considered significant if they:

- Negatively affect the response times for police and/or fire and emergency medical services.
  - Increase demand for special emergency services beyond current operational capabilities of service providers.
  - Results in increases in students and lack of facilities unanticipated in district plans or that would reduce adopted levels of service.

The analysis provides an overview of current conditions for each of the public services identified above. For police and fire, the overview of current conditions includes an inventory of facilities, volume of calls for police (including Port of Seattle Police) and fire from 2016 to 2020, response times, and facility planning. The FEIS also identified which precincts serve each subarea. For schools and libraries, the FEIS inventories facilities by subarea.

Mitigation measures identified for public service impacts primarily rely on existing regulations and commitments. For fire and emergency services this means compliance with the International Fire Code, Seattle Municipal code regulations including Title 22 Subtitle VI Fire Code, Title 10 Health and Safety, Title 11 Vehicles and Traffic and Title 23 Land Use Code. For police this means ongoing enforcement of City of Seattle regulations, ongoing evaluation of where best to focus resources, and ongoing capital improvement planning. For Schools and Libraries this means ongoing capital facilities management planning. The analysis found that for all alternatives, potential impacts are driven by population increase, building height and density (for fire), hazardous materials (for fire), construction (for fire) and transportation network and traffic volumes.

All alternatives studied would increase the demand for public services with alternatives 2, 3, and 4 and the Preferred Alternative increasing jobs above No Action. The increase in industrial jobs could result in a greater need for fire and emergency services. Increased non-industrial jobs would require apparatus for taller structures in the case of fire or rescue. All alternatives, particularly alternatives 3 and 4 and the Preferred Alternative would increase housing and increase demand for school and library services.

The proposed BINMIC subarea plan does not change the anticipated total level of employment growth or other sources of demand for public services and does not result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts to fire and emergency medical services, police, or schools and libraries are anticipated with application of mitigation measures and regular capital planning. The proposed subarea plan is subject to the same forces that could drive impacts, such as population increase and increased pressure on the transportation network, but with application of mitigation measures are unlikely to result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

Public services impacts were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS in the public services chapter and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle

Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse public services impacts are anticipated due to cumulative effects.

### **3.14 UTILITIES**

The FEIS documents the effected environment, impacts, mitigation measures, and significant unavoidable impacts of the public utilities that provide services to the study area.

Impacts of the alternatives on utilities are considered significant if they:

- Are inconsistent with utility system planned growth and capital plans.
- Have the potential to require major new projects or initiatives for energy system upgrades to accommodate redevelopment.

The analysis in the FEIS includes a description of the affected environment service providers. The analysis documents, by subarea, the existing wastewater and combined sewer system and electrical power system.

The analysis found several potential impacts for all alternatives:

- Wastewater and Combined Sewer: Development under any of the alternatives could result in greater demands on the local wastewater collection system and on the downstream conveyance and treatment facilities. Increased wastewater flow is related to increased water consumption.
- Stormwater: In general, increases in impervious area result in higher peak flows and total runoff, but because the majority of the Primary Study Area is impervious, redevelopment expected under all alternatives is not expected to significantly increase total impervious area.
- Electrical Power: Under all alternatives, including the No Action Alternative, future growth and development would increase demand for electrical energy.

Mitigation strategies include existing regulations and commitments including compliance with federal, state, and local wastewater regulations, Capital improvement programs of King County and the Seattle of Seattle and identifies other potential measures including conservation strategies or construction of LEED compliant buildings.

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts on wastewater and combined sewer systems are anticipated based on the proposed BINMIC plan. The proposed subarea plan does not change the future levels of development studied for the preferred alternative. Wastewater and Combined Sewer systems are managed through King County WTD and SPU's existing, ongoing processes for identifying CIP projects to address system capacity issues and reduce CSO frequency. The proposed BINMIC plan, if adopted, would still anticipate redevelopment levels consistent with the preferred alternative and would not result in significant adverse impacts.

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts on the stormwater system are anticipated based on the proposed BINMIC plan studied in this addendum. The plan includes policies that future development use innovative stormwater management and all projects within the BINMIC are subject to City stormwater codes that would likely improve stormwater management (i.e., reduced flow rates and

improved water quality) relative to existing conditions, and CIP projects identified in the study area as part of SPU's asset management program would improve system capacity and performance.

No significant unavoidable adverse impacts on the electrical system are anticipated for the proposed BINMIC plan. Recent SCL investments in the power system are anticipated to meet growth needs under all studied alternatives. The proposed plan encourages use of electrical and other non-fossil fuels which will be addressed at a planning level through regular capital planning cycles as well as on a project-by-project basis.

The subarea plan analyzed in this addendum contains no goals and policies that increase demands on public utilities beyond those studied in the Industrial and Maritime Final FEIS. This plan assumes the same level of development activity and employment growth over 20 years that are assumed in the Final EIS and therefore no adverse impacts are anticipated with approval of the plan.

Impacts on utilities were studied in the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan FEIS and for the BINMIC were based on the conditions studied in the Industrial and Maritime Strategy FEIS. The One Seattle Plan contains no policies that would increase or decrease employment or redevelopment activity in the BINMIC. After consideration of the potential for cumulative impacts from the proposed BINMIC plan in combination with other recent and pending plans including the One Seattle Comprehensive Plan and the Seattle Transportation Plan it is determined that no new adverse impacts on utilities are anticipated due to cumulative effects.