

## SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

### ***Purpose of checklist:***

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

### ***Instructions for applicants:***

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

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.

### ***Instructions for Lead Agencies:***

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

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

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS \(part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

## ***A. Background***

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

Urban Center College Housing Amendments

**2. Name of applicant:**

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections  
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-233-2781

**4. Date checklist prepared:**

August 9, 2021

**5. Agency requesting checklist:**

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections

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

Q1/Q2 2022.

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

Approval of this proposal would accommodate a college such as Seattle Central College advancing a housing development proposal for permitting, within the next year or two.

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

None except this environmental checklist.

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

No.

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

Approval of the proposal by the Mayor and City Council.

**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 would update the Land Use Code (SMC Chapter 23.69) for major institution master plan actions, to support an easier minor amendment process to allow the addition of housing. It would newly allow a single previously-unanticipated housing development at community colleges in Urban Centers to be approvable as a minor amendment to an existing master plan. The only college that currently matches these criteria is SCC.

This minor amendment pathway for housing could be used just once per master plan period, which would support a degree of regulatory flexibility and adaptability to achieve student housing options sooner. Otherwise, SCC would need to complete a new campus-wide master plan process before new student housing could be permitted.

The proposal would:

- 1) Add a statement saying that accommodating on-campus student housing at educational Major Institutions is a purpose of the regulations in Chapter 23.69;
- 2) Allow a single housing development at a community college or technical college<sup>1</sup> in an Urban Center to not trigger the required creation of a whole new campus-wide Master Plan, and not be a “major amendment” to an existing Master Plan;
- 3) Allow this kind of housing development proposal to be evaluated as a “minor amendment” to an existing Master Plan;
- 4) Allow the floor area of this residential use (and other related uses in the building) to be exempt from the calculations of total development capacity of the major institution overlay zone, and the total amount of floor area permitted by the master plan. This would allow a housing development without causing an institution to alter its existing plans for other future developments already covered by the existing Master Plan;
- 5) Clarify that this kind of housing may be “affiliated” with the college, meaning that it does not have to only be housing “owned” by the college. This allows flexibility in ownership arrangements of the housing while ensuring it retains a relationship to the college.

**12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.**

The proposal is a non-project action that will affect land in designated Urban Centers that have a community or technical college as a Major Institution in them. At present, these criteria only apply to the Capitol Hill Urban Center and Seattle Central College’s campus, located in the vicinity of the Pine Street/Broadway Avenue intersection.

## ***B. Environmental Elements***

### ***1. Earth***

#### **a. General description of the site:**

**(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other \_\_\_\_\_**

This non-project proposal has no particular site but relates to a portion of the Capitol Hill Urban Center that includes the Seattle Central College campus. In this vicinity, the existing landform is relatively flat with mild slopes descending toward the west.

---

<sup>1</sup> This kind of community or technical college is part of the Washington State Community and Technical Colleges system.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The relevant campus vicinity has only one or two manmade slope features or rockeries that may have steep topography, on a property on Boylston Avenue. On a part of this location, the earth incline may reach approximately 40% 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.**

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide range of soils, including many areas in glacial till. Other developed properties may include imported fill soils due to their past development with structures.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The relevant portion of Capitol Hill is mostly developed with impervious surfaces; only the limited area with earthen slopes described in the response to Question #1.b above may show signs of uncontrolled surface soils in aerial photos.

**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.**

This non-project proposal has no particular site. If a future development proposal arises as a result of this non-project proposal, it would be subject to permit review addressing project details such as grading and fill amounts. At this time, this kind of information is not available.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. Future development in the worst-case could contribute to slight erosion during construction. However, most areas in the relevant vicinity are already developed with impervious surfaces, which limits the potential for erosion damage and transport of soils from the development site.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site.

**h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:**  
None proposed.

**2. Air**

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The non-project proposal would not adversely impact construction-phase emissions in a significant manner.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

### **3. *Water***

**a. Surface Water:**

**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.**

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

None. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

No. This non-project proposal has no particular site.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. Subject areas are not within a 100-year floodplain.

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

No.

**b. Ground Water:**

**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.**

No.

- 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.

None.

**c. Water runoff (including stormwater):**

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The non-project proposal will not cause water runoff. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. No.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. No.

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

None proposed.

**4. Plants**

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

deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

shrubs

grass

pasture

crop or grain

Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

other types of vegetation

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The relevant vicinity potentially relating to the non-project proposal are mostly already developed in impervious pavement and buildings, not vegetation.

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

This non-project proposal has no particular site. None.

- c. **List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.**  
None known. This non-project proposal has no particular site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.
- d. **Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:**  
None proposed.
- e. **List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.**  
This non-project proposal has no particular site. None known.

**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 \_\_\_\_\_**

This non-project proposal has no particular site. The affected vicinity only has typical ranges of animal life that is habituated to dense urban settings, such as crows, robins, squirrels, rats, and the like.

- b. **List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.**  
This non-project proposal has no particular site. None known. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.
- c. **Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.**  
This non-project proposal has no particular site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of birds.
- d. **Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:**  
None proposed.
- e. **List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.**  
This non-project proposal has no particular site. See the response to Question #5.a above. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

**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.**

This non-project action has no project-specific energy needs. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No. This non-project action has no particular project site.

**c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal?  
This non-project proposal is not a project proposal and has no plans for particular energy conservation features.**

**7. Environmental Health**

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

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

This non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites, some of which include environmental health hazards. Such conditions are regulated by other City and State environmental laws and standards.

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

The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites, some of which include hazardous chemicals and conditions. Such conditions are regulated by other City and State environmental laws and standards. This non-project action has no particular project site, and would not result in additional hazardous chemicals or related conditions.

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

See the response to Question 7.a.2 above.

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

The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites. This non-project action has no particular site, and would not generate added demands for special emergency services.

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

None proposed.

**b. Noise**

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

None. The proposal does not have a particular project site.



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

None. The proposal does not have a particular project site, and thus no potential for site-based noise impacts. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use**

**a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.**

The non-project action has no particular project site. The Capitol Hill neighborhood that might be relevant to the action is a designated Urban Center with among the densest pattern of urban uses in the state of Washington. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

**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?**

No. The non-project action has no particular project site.

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

No.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site.

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

No.

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

This non-project action has no particular project site. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of zoning classifications, including typical Neighborhood Commercial, Midrise and Highrise zones in the Capitol Hill neighborhood, among other zones. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

The non-project action has no particular project site. The Capitol Hill Urban Center is designated "Urban" by the Comprehensive Plan.

**g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**  
The non-project action has no particular project site. The Capitol Hill neighborhood does not have shoreline-designated land.

**h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.**  
The non-project action has no particular project site. The feature described in the response to Question #1.b of this checklist may be considered an environmentally critical area unless it can be proven to not meet criteria for an environmentally critical area.

**i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**  
The non-project action has no particular project site, and so the question is not relevant to the proposal.

**j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**  
None.

**k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:**  
None.

**l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:**  
None proposed.

**m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:**  
None proposed.

## **9. Housing**

**a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**  
The non-project action has no particular project site and does not provide housing units. The effect of the non-project action could be to induce future development that would include student housing such as a dormitory.

**b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**  
The non-project action has no particular project site and would not be likely to indirectly eliminate any existing housing units either.

**c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**  
None proposed.

## **10. Aesthetics**

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

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

The non-project proposal does not alter or obstruct views. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

**11. Light and Glare**

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

The non-project proposal would not produce light or glare impacts as a result of its effect on future development.

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

No.

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

None.

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

None proposed.

**12. Recreation**

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

There are a variety of designated and informal recreational opportunities in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

**13. Historic and cultural preservation [\[help\]](#)**

**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? If so, specifically describe.**

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- 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.**

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- 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.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- 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.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. None proposed.

#### ***14. Transportation***

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

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- 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?**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

- 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).**

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

**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 nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?**

None. The proposal will not impact vehicular trips. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

No.

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

None proposed.

**15. Public Services**

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

No. The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

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

None proposed.

**16. Utilities**

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

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal

**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.**

The non-project proposal has no particular project site. See Section D of this checklist for discussion of potential impact concerns related to the non-project proposal.

**C. Signature [\[HELP\]](#)**

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: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/\_\_\_\_\_

Name of signee Mike Podowski

Position and Agency/Organization Manager, SDCI

Date Submitted: 8/9/2021

#### ***D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions***

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant increases in discharges or emissions of toxic or hazardous substances, to the air or water, or increase the production of noise. Rather, it would provide more flexibility in code requirements to accommodate earlier permitting processes for future development of student housing on the campus of SCC. This future housing could be built with or without the proposal, but the difference would arise from additional time to create campus master plans and receive City Council approval on that master plan before a new housing development could even be proposed. Under these assumptions, there would be no net new potential for adverse environmental impacts of these kinds. However, consideration of the potential impacts of a future development indirectly related to the non-project proposal are summarized below.

Given the eligibility criteria of the proposed regulations, the proposal would only be likely to generate a total of one future development over a 10-20 year period, in the SCC campus vicinity. Such a development could generate stormwater runoff, emissions to air, and noise, much of which could be most likely to occur during future construction. But, such a development would be subject to future project-specific permitting at a later date, which would likely include consideration of environmental impacts, application of regulatory requirements, and the possibility of mitigation measures that would be able to reduce or avoid environmental impacts. These typical actions relating to future development permitting and regulation of uses (during and after construction) would be able to ensure that the environmental impacts of this one future possible development could be mitigated so that no significant adverse impacts are likely to occur.

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

None proposed.

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

Similar to the response to Question D.1 above, the proposed non-project action would not be likely to directly, indirectly or cumulatively create significant adverse impacts on plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The environment potentially affected by this is already very densely occupied, covered with impervious surface, and largely occupied by buildings and roads. In this setting, there is very little existing habitat potential for plants and animals, and none for fish or marine life. One future housing development is likely to occur over the long term in the most relevant area (a portion of the SCC campus), with or without the proposal. Future permit reviews would be able to apply regulatory requirements in a typical manner that would avoid or reduce any marginal plant and animal impacts that might be possible from one potential future housing development.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant adverse impacts on energy or natural resource depletion. Rather, due to recent advances in energy and building code requirements, the proposal may indirectly lead to future buildings with mechanical features and designs that are more energy efficient than existing buildings on affected properties. Also, the ability for students to live on campus would provide for greater efficiencies, including transportation and related energy consumption on a per-capita basis, for SCC students.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant adverse impacts on environmentally sensitive areas or resource areas of this kind. Most of these natural resources are not present within the area potentially most affected by the proposal (a portion of the Capitol Hill Urban Center). Cal Anderson Park is a large park located approximately two blocks to the east of the SCC campus vicinity most relevant to the proposed action. However, its mix of passive and active recreation features would not be affected by any outcomes related to the proposed action.

The proposal would not directly or indirectly affect any existing historic building or known cultural resource site. Rather, the location most potentially affected by the proposal currently has an existing parking garage on it with a couple of small café spaces included at the ground floor.

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

None 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?**

The proposed non-project action is not likely to generate significant adverse impacts on land use and shoreline use patterns, directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.

The proposal would not likely negatively affect the arrangement and combinations of land uses that could occur with future development in the Seattle Central College campus or local vicinity. No especially sensitive land uses are present in the affected campus vicinity generally near the Pine Street intersections with Harvard and Boylston Avenue. The proposal would not affect development standards such as building setbacks, bulk prescriptions, or zoning or height limit designations. Therefore, this analysis identifies no probable adverse impacts of the proposed action related to land use incompatibilities, height/bulk/scale impacts, visual impacts, or inconsistency with land use plans.

As noted elsewhere in this checklist, the proposal would accommodate the earlier

consideration of a future possible student housing development proposal of up to approximately 500 beds in size. Instead of waiting for a housing development to be included in the future adoption of a new campus master plan, the existing processes for considering minor amendments to the existing campus master plan for a single student housing development would be newly allowed to occur. And permitting processes for the housing development could then also occur sooner if a minor plan amendment was approved.

Such master plan amendment and permit review processes are not proposed to change, except that a single housing development proposal not documented in an existing campus master plan would become newly eligible to be considered as a minor amendment to that existing master plan (within the lifetime of the master plan). Currently, the master plan regulations in Chapter 23.69 of the Land Use Code are rather tightly defined, such that nearly any loosening of regulatory standards, height limits, master plan boundaries, increase in housing demolition, or nearly any proposed additions of floor area to an approved master plan, necessitate a major amendment to a master plan. Therefore, the primary net difference that could occur with this non-project action, with respect to the land use environment, is a difference in how soon a future development could occur.

The proposal to accommodate flexibility in ownership arrangements of the housing structure does not have substantive negative implications for land use impacts. This clarifier of phrasing about ownership is proposed to avoid overly strict interpretations that might preclude housing if future development projects would have certain configurations of ownership other than strictly ownership by the educational institution. Any nuancing of ownership, as experienced in the future land use built environment, would likely not be noticeable or substantive in terms of different potential for adverse land use impacts.

Other proposed amendments in the proposal about not counting the housing development's floor area against floor area limits in the existing master plan are primarily needed to complement the purpose of the proposal. This is to accommodate the ability to add a housing development that could be permitted if a minor amendment to the master plan is first approved. This is also to avoid causing an institution to have to unfairly weigh the need for one development over another in a way that might force them to reduce the size of a different development that was already previously approved in a master plan. That scenario would occur unless the newly contemplated housing development would not have to fit within a previously defined total maximum allowable floor area under the master plan. Using a college institution scenario, the provision of new student housing should not have to mean reducing the size of a different planned building that could be essential for instructional program needs. This particular type of content in the code proposal would not create new or different kinds of impacts on the land use built environment, but is merely a part of the proposed regulatory concept to allow consideration of added housing development as a minor amendment to an existing master plan.

The proposed action does not conflict with any policy provisions for Major Institutions in the City's Comprehensive Plan. These policies recognize the rationale for preparing master plans for large institutions located within neighborhood settings, and



accommodating zoning flexibility that relates to the institution's future development plans. Also, the policies generally seek to maintain compatible conditions between the institutional and non-institutional uses nearby; to avoid demolition of housing in surrounding areas (Policy LU 13.15); to *"balance the need for major institutions to grow and change with the need to maintain the livability and vitality of neighboring areas"* (Policy LU 13.3); and to require revisions to master plans or new master plans when a *"proposed major development...does not conform to the underlying zoning and is not included in an existing master plan."* (Policy LU 13.8). The latter is the policy concept most relevant to the proposed action. Its relationship depends on how large a development would be, a project's lack of zoning consistency, and lack of mention in an existing master plan. The interpretation made in this checklist is that the possibility of student housing on a community or technical college campus can be considered a type of complementary land use that will foster increased livability, vitality, and compatibility with a surrounding community, due to its fostering increasing residential presence in a neighborhood that already has a diverse mix of residential and non-residential uses. It would also conform to applicable zoning provisions, which would tend to avoid creating incompatibilities of land use. Further, the proposed action would merely enable the future consideration of such a use as a minor amendment to a plan, by using established practices involving the community, for evaluating such minor amendments and allowing these community advisory functions to review those possible actions and make recommendations on them.

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

None proposed.

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant adverse impacts on transportation or public services within the City of Seattle. The proposed flexibility to consider and potentially approve a student housing development sooner than would otherwise occur may not create any net new potential for adverse environmental impacts at all. Despite this, the potential impacts of a future development indirectly related to the non-project proposal are summarized below.

Given the eligibility criteria of the proposed regulations, the proposal would only be likely to generate a total of one future development over a 10-20 year period, in the SCC campus vicinity. Such a development could generate additional transportation trips and additional calls for service by fire, police, and emergency services. However, to a large degree a student housing proposal in the SCC vicinity would likely generate low rates of automobile ownership per resident, and instead other travel modes (light rail, bus, walking, bicycling) would be easily and frequently substituted for automobile trips. This would tend to reduce the potential magnitudes of transportation impacts. Also, such a development would be subject to future project-specific permitting at a later date, which would likely include consideration of environmental impacts, application of regulatory requirements, and the possibility of mitigation measures that would be able to reduce or avoid environmental impacts on transportation and public services. This would be able to reasonably ensure that the environmental impacts of this one future possible development would be minor, and could be mitigated.

Similarly, the proposed non-project action would not directly, indirectly or cumulatively generate significant adverse impacts on utilities. A single future potential development would be able to be served with by utilities in the vicinity of the SCC campus. If additional improvements to local utility features are necessary to accommodate a potential new housing development at SCC, they could be required per City codes or through impacts and mitigation that would be identifiable at the time of future project proposal permit reviews. Therefore, no indirect significant adverse impacts on utilities are identified in this checklist.

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

None proposed.

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

No conflicts with environmental protection laws are anticipated.