

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

This SEPA environmental review has been conducted in accord with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) (RCW 43.21C), State SEPA regulations [Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Chapter 197-11], and the City of Seattle SEPA ordinance SMC Chapter 25.05. The proposed action is considered a non-project action under SEPA. Non-project actions are broader than a single site-specific project (WAC 197-11-774, SMC 25.05.774). This type of non-project action is not categorically exempt from a SEPA Threshold Determination (SMC 25.05.305 and SMC 25.05.800); therefore, it must be analyzed to determine if there are probable significant adverse environmental impacts. The probable significant adverse environmental impacts analyzed in a non-project SEPA environmental checklist are those impacts foreseeable at this stage, before specific project actions are planned. The Seattle Office of Housing has prepared this SEPA Environmental Checklist under the non-project provisions of SEPA.

Annotations made by the SEPA analyst for the responsible official (in SDCI) are shown in the checklist in underline for added text and ~~strikeout~~ for deleted text. These demonstrate and reflect the review made of this SEPA checklist by SDCI.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project

Low-Income Housing/Affordable Units Land Use Code Omnibus Ordinance

2. Name of applicant:

Seattle Office of Housing

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

Seattle Office of Housing

700 5th Avenue, Suite 5700

Seattle, WA 98104

Contact: Laura Hewitt Walker
Strategic Advisor, Market Incentives & Land Use

Laura.Hewitt@seattle.gov

206.677.0455

4. Date checklist prepared:

~~March 27~~ April 10, 2023

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Office of Housing

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

The proposed council bill is expected to be considered by the Seattle City Council in the second quarter of 2023. Council review will include a public hearing. If approved by Council, the proposed regulations could take effect in the third quarter of 2023.

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

The proposal is a non-project action that is not dependent on any other current or future action.

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

Information is provided in this checklist.

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

The proposal is a non-project, non-site-specific action that would take effect in zones within the city that allow residential uses. There are no other applications pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting this proposal. Future public and private development projects may be subject to separate project specific SEPA environmental review.

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

The legislation associated with this proposal will need to be approved by Seattle City Council and Mayor by ordinance following standard legislative rules and procedures.

11. Give a 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.

This non-project proposal would implement changes in multiple chapters of the Land Use Code (LUC) to simplify and improve readability of the LUC where it regulates low-income housing and other developments with units subject to affordability restrictions. It is also intended to facilitate development of low-income housing. Specifically, the changes include (1) delete obsolete and redundant code phrasing and definitions related to affordable housing and eligible residents; (2) update the definition of “low-income housing,” and add new unit-specific definitions for “low-income unit,” “moderate-income unit,” and “restricted unit;” (3) simplify and increase consistency of housing affordability provisions by using those defined terms, as applicable, throughout Title 23; (4) expand design review exemption and

authorization to request waiver or modification of certain development standards currently allowed for “permanent supportive housing” to include all “low-income housing;” (5) increase consistency of standard provisions for low-income housing and other developments with units subject to housing affordability restrictions; (6) consolidate all affordable housing-related provisions of incentive zoning in downtown zones in SMC Chapter 23.58A; and (7) simplify and improve clarity of code provisions related to restricted units, which are residential units subject to restrictive housing covenants recorded on the property title, including those in otherwise market-rate buildings.

The proposed changes in this omnibus are summarized in the Director’s Report prepared by the Office of Housing. That report and the draft ordinance are published together with this checklist for public review.

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

The proposed legislation would affect low-income housing and other developments that include restricted units in zones throughout the City of Seattle.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

a) General description of the site: [Check the applicable boxes]

Flat Rolling Hilly Steep slopes Mountainous Other (identify)

This is a non-project action with no identifiable site or project location. The affected area contains a diversity of site conditions, from flat land to steep slopes. Most of the area has been substantially graded, developed, or otherwise disturbed consistent with urbanized areas.

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

This is a non-project action with no identifiable site. Slopes in Seattle range from 0% to greater than 40%. The steepest slopes occur primarily on the sides of the major hills in the city, including Queen Anne Hill, Capitol Hill, West Seattle, and Magnolia.

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 is a non-project action with no identifiable site. Seattle has numerous soil types, including mineral soils dominated by clay, silt, or sand, as well as organic soils such as peats and mucks (see, for example, <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>). No agricultural soils or prime farmland are

located within the Seattle corporate limits. As a densely urbanized area, much of Seattle's native soils have been extensively altered by filling, grading, and other activity.

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

This is a non-project action with no identifiable site. The Seattle area is known to be in an active seismic area, as is the entire Puget Sound region. The City's geologically hazardous areas are defined by SDCI as environmentally critical areas (ECA) (http://gisrevprxy.seattle.gov/wab_ext/DSOResearch_Ext/). Unstable soils and surfaces occur primarily in two contexts within the affected geographic area. The first context includes steep slopes and landslide-prone areas, where a combination of shallow groundwater and glacial sediments deposited in layers with variable permeability increases the risk of landslides. The second context includes areas of fill or alluvial soils where loose, less cohesive soil materials below the water table may lead to the potential for liquefaction during earthquakes.

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

This is a non-project action with no construction proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

No, the proposal is a non-project action. There is no project action so there is no land clearing or construction directly related to the proposal that could result in erosion. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

The proposal is a non-project action. No change of impervious surface is proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

None proposed. The proposed non-project action does not involve construction activity, and contains no proposed measures related to reducing or controlling erosion or other impacts at any specific location.

2. Air

a) What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal [e.g., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke, greenhouse gases (GHG)] during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would directly produce emissions. As such, the proposal would not directly affect odors, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, or climate change. Potential emissions impact of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

No. The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would be affected by emissions or odors.

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

None proposed.

3. Water

a) Surface

- (1)** Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If so, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

This proposal is a non-project action that does not include any specific project action or development proposal. Any future project actions indirectly related to this proposal will undergo appropriate review during future individual permitting processes.

Most of Seattle is located within the Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (Watershed Resource Inventory Area [WRIA] 8). The Duwamish Waterway and Elliott Bay, located in southwestern Seattle, are part of the Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9).

Seattle is characterized by a variety of surface water features, including marine areas, rivers, lakes, and creeks. Each type is briefly summarized below:

Marine: Seattle's west side is situated adjacent to Puget Sound, a major marine embayment.

Rivers: Portions of south Seattle drain to the lower reaches of the Duwamish River (also known as the Duwamish Waterway). The River receives flow from the South Park basin, Norfolk basin, Longfellow Creek, and other smaller urban creeks, and drains to Elliott Bay in south Puget Sound.

Lakes: Freshwater lakes and ponds, within or adjacent to the City, include the Lake Union/Ship Canal system, which links Lake Washington and Puget Sound through the Hiram Chittenden Locks. Other freshwater lakes include Green, Haller, and Bitter Lakes in the north portion of the City (also located in the Lake Union/Ship Canal drainage basin). Seattle also contains numerous small ponds and wetlands.

Creeks: Runoff from portions of Seattle's developed cityscape drains to creek systems of varying sizes. Major creeks in the western regions of the City drain directly to Puget Sound and include Pipers and Fautleroy creeks. Longfellow Creek is a main creek in the southwest portion of the city that drains to the Duwamish River. Thornton Creek, Taylor Creek, and other smaller creeks drain runoff from the eastern portions of the City to Lake Washington.

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

No. The proposal is a non-project action. No work over, in, or adjacent to the described waters is proposed. Individual projects that may be subject to provisions of this proposal may be located over, in, or adjacent to these waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

- (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.

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development or any fill and dredge in or near surface waters or wetlands. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

- (4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? If so, give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

This proposal is a non-project action. No surface water withdrawals or diversions will result from this proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through existing regulations and/or separate site specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would lie within a 100-year floodplain. Major streams and the Duwamish River have associated 100-year floodplains within the affected geographic area. Individual projects that may be subject to provisions of this proposal may be located over, in, or adjacent to these waters and their associated floodplains. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

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

No. This proposal is a non-project action. No discharges of waste materials to surface waters will result from this proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

b) Ground

- (7) 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. This proposal is a non-project action. No withdrawal of groundwater will result from this proposal for drinking water or other purposes. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

- (8) 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 known. This proposal is a non-project action. No waste materials are proposed to be discharged. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

c) Water Runoff (including storm water):

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

This proposal is a non-project action. No runoff will result from this proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

No. This proposal is a non-project action. This proposal will not result in waste materials entering ground or surface waters. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

No. The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns.

- (12) Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage impacts, if any:

None proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review.

4. Plants

a) Types of vegetation found on the site: [check the applicable boxes]

Deciduous trees: Alder Maple Aspen Other

Evergreen trees: Fir Cedar Pine Other

Shrubs

Grass

Pasture

Crop or grain

Orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops

Wet soil plants: Cattail Buttercup Bulrush Skunk cabbage Other

Water plants: Waterlily Eel grass Milfoil Other

Other types of vegetation: Various other vascular, non-vascular, native, and non-native plant species

The proposal is a non-project action and does not include a specific project action or proposed development. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of vegetation consistent with urbanized areas.

Generally, the Puget Sound basin is home to a wide diversity of plant species that depend upon marine, estuarine, freshwater, and terrestrial environments. The Seattle area has a broad variety of vegetation, including upland forest (deciduous, coniferous, and mixed), shrublands, riparian forests, and wetlands.

This flora includes species native to the region, as well as many non-native species. Seattle is a densely developed urban area having few remaining areas of native vegetation and high-quality habitat. These remaining fragments of quality native vegetation are found in parklands and open spaces. The plants found in most urban and suburban areas are those native and non-native species that tolerate or benefit from habitat degradation and disturbance.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. This proposal will not result in the direct removal or alteration of vegetation. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

This non-project proposal does not include any specific development proposal. No federally listed endangered or threatened plant species or State-listed sensitive plant species are known to occur within Seattle's developed area. Most of the Seattle area has been intensively disturbed by development and redevelopment over the last 100 years. Seattle's original vegetation has been extensively cleared, excavated, filled, paved, or occupied by streets and other built structures.

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

None. This proposal is a non-project action. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review.

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

The City of Seattle contains a diversity of invasive plants consistent with urbanized areas. These plants include but are not limited to common urban invasives such as ivy, blackberry, and bindweed.

The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of noxious weeds. See, for example, the noxious weed lists of the King County Noxious Weed Board (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/noxious-weeds/laws/list.aspx>).

5. Animals

a) List any birds and other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site: *[check the applicable boxes]*

This proposal is a non-project action. The affected area contains a diversity of animals consistent with urbanized areas including a diversity of birds, mammals, fish, and livestock.

Generally, the Puget Sound basin is home to an extremely wide diversity of animal species that depend upon marine, estuarine, freshwater, and terrestrial environments. This fauna includes species native to the region, as well as many non-native species. The Seattle area is an intensely developed urban area having few remaining areas of native vegetation and high-quality habitat. These remaining fragments of quality wildlife habitat are found in parklands and open spaces throughout the planning area. The wildlife found in most urban areas are those native and non-native species that tolerate or benefit from habitat degradation or close association with humans.

Birds: Hawk Heron Eagle Songbirds Other: osprey, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, purple martin, owl (various species), pileated woodpecker, belted kingfisher, waterfowl species, Canada goose. Also, typical urban species such as starling, pigeon, and crows.

Mammals: Deer Bear Elk Beaver Other: California sea lion, river otter, muskrat, raccoon, coyote. Also, a variety of urban adapted species such as possum, rat, rabbit.

Fish: Salmon Trout Bass Herring Shellfish Other: bass, rockfish, etc.

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

This proposal is a non-project action. A variety of threatened and endangered species including salmon and various birds are known to be on or near the affected area.

In King County, five wildlife species are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but these species are not likely to be found in the Seattle Direct Water Service Area. These include Canada lynx (*Lynx Canadensis*; Threatened), gray wolf (*Canis lupus*; Endangered), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*; Endangered), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*; Threatened), and northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*; Threatened). King County contains federally designated critical habitat for marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl; no designated critical habitat is located in Seattle. Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) was removed from the federal list under ESA on August 8, 2007, but is federally protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. Bald eagles are known to reside in Seattle.

Fish species listed as endangered or threatened under the ESA and found in freshwater tributaries of Puget Sound (PS) include Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, Threatened, PS), steelhead (*O. mykiss*, Threatened, PS), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*, Threatened, PS). Coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) is a Candidate species for listing as Threatened. All of these species reside in or near the planning area. Lake Washington contains federally designated critical habitat for bull trout and Chinook salmon. Because much of Seattle has been previously developed and the original habitats significantly altered or eliminated, the potential for threatened or endangered animal species to be present in developed parts of Seattle is low.

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

The City of Seattle is part of migratory routes. The Puget Sound region is known to be an important migratory route for many animal species. Portions of the planning area provide migratory corridors for bald eagles traveling to and from foraging areas in Puget Sound or Lake Washington. Marbled murrelets travel through the planning area between marine waters and their nests in late successional/old growth forests in the Cascade Mountains. Bull trout, steelhead, and Chinook, chum, pink, and coho salmon use the Puget Sound nearshore. Chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon use Lake Washington and Lake Union as migration corridors. Anadromous trout and salmon migrate through the area river and stream systems, including urban streams in Seattle. The Puget Sound region is also within the Pacific Flyway—a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl, migratory songbirds, and other birds. The Pacific Flyway extends from Alaska to Mexico and South America.

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

No measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are proposed. This non-project proposal is not expected to affect any wildlife.

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

Many species of invasive animal species are found within King County and the City of Seattle, including nutria (*Myocastor coypus*), rat (*Rattus* spp.), pigeon (*Columba livia*), New Zealand Mud Snail (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*), and Asian gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*).

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.

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would result in additional energy needs. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

No. The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would affect potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

None. The proposed non-project action does not include any energy conservation features or other measures to reduce or control energy impacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

7. Environmental Health

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of conditions consistent with urbanized areas. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

- c) 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.**

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of conditions consistent with urbanized areas. These include natural gas transmission pipelines. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review.

- d) 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.**

None. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The City of Seattle includes a wide variety of sites, some of which include toxic or hazardous chemicals. Such conditions are regulated by other City and State environmental laws and standards.

Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- e) Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. This proposal will not result in the need for special emergency services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

None. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

8. Noise

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of noise sources and conditions consistent with urbanized areas. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- b) 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.**

The proposed non-project action does not include any construction or development that would generate noise. Temporary construction noise associated with future development would indirectly result from the proposal and may vary greatly depending on the extent of the activity. Noise, including construction noise and daytime and night-time noise levels, is regulated by City codes at certain levels, which accommodate temporary higher-level noise from construction activities.

Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through these regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Because the proposed non-project action would not itself generate noise, no measures to reduce or control noise are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through City noise control regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

9. 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 geographic area affected by the proposed non-project action is all areas of Seattle where residential uses are allowed. The affected area contains a diversity of land uses consistent with urbanized areas including but not limited to housing, office, institutional, and retail uses. Most property in Seattle has been developed at urban densities and existing uses are often mixed.

b) Project-specific impacts on land and shoreline use would be determined during permitting of individual projects. 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 non-farm or non-forest use?

There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle. The proposal is not likely to affect working farmlands or forest land; and it would not impact compliance with agricultural or forestry issues. It would not be likely to result in conversion of agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance.

c) 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. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not directly alter farm or forest land.

d) Describe any structures on the site.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. Seattle's urban area is developed with a wide range of structures, ranging from single-family residences to high-rise office towers to large industrial structures. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

e) Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

No. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

f) What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Zoning in Seattle includes a range of residential, commercial, and industrial designations. Zoning designations are found in Seattle’s Land Use Code, Title 23 of the SMC. Projects subject to this proposal may be in any of Seattle’s zones where residential uses are allowed.

Project-specific information on zoning would be determined during the permitting of individual projects.

g) What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of comprehensive plan designations. Current comprehensive plan designations in the City of Seattle can be found in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan, adopted on July 25, 1994, and last amended in 2022. Individual projects that may be subject to the provisions of the proposed non-project action may be located in areas shown with a Comprehensive Plan Designation of Urban Center, Hub Urban Village, Residential Urban Village, Multi-family Residential Area, and Commercial/Mixed Use Area. Project-specific information on Comprehensive Plan designations would be determined during the permitting of individual projects.

h) If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of shoreline master program designations, including both freshwater and marine shorelines that are regulated by the City’s shoreline master program (SMP). Shoreline resources regulated under the SMP include all marine waters, larger streams and lakes, associated wetlands and floodplains, and upland areas called shorelands that extend 200 feet landward from the edges of these waters. Individual projects subject to the provisions of this proposal may be located in areas subject to the SMP. Project-specific information on land and shoreline use would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

i) Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally critical” area? If so, specify.

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The affected area contains a diversity of critical area designations including but not limited to wetlands, riparian areas, and steep slopes. Individual projects subject to the provisions of the proposed non-project action may be located in environmentally critical areas, and would be subject to regulations in SMC Chapter 25.09. Project-specific information on site classification would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

j) Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The proposed non-project action would not create a completed project in which to reside or work. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

k) Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

Because the proposal will not directly result in the demolition of any structure, no people would be directly displaced by the proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include any proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would establish regulations for new residential land uses. There are no known incompatibilities with existing or projected land uses and plans. Potential project-specific impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

n) Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

None. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. No impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance are expected.

10. Housing

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

The proposed non-project action would not directly provide housing. The proposal would ease the development burden for affordable housing. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review. See Section D for additional details.

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

The proposed non-project action would not eliminate housing, but instead would encourage more housing development serving low-income and moderate-income households.

Specifically, uses demolished at future development sites could vary widely and include residential uses which might range from low- to higher-income housing, probably in low-density forms. Demolished uses might also include non-residential uses; it is not possible to accurately predict the range, amount, or of type of uses demolished at a future date. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control housing impacts are proposed. Potential adverse housing impacts, if any, of future specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

11. Aesthetics

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. This proposal will not directly result in new buildings. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal does not alter or restrict views. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts are proposed.

12. Light and Glare

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not directly result in additional light or glare. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action does not include construction or development that would produce light or glare. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Light or glare would not affect the proposed non-project action. Potential impacts of light or glare on future, specific development proposals would be addressed through separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control light and glare are proposed.

13. Recreation

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

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where residential development is allowed. Seattle Parks and Recreation operates and maintains a large number of city

parks, trails, gardens, playfields, swimming pools, and community centers. In addition to these public facilities, public and private schools, outdoor associations, and commercial businesses provide residents of and visitors to Seattle with a variety of organized recreational facilities and activities, such as school athletic programs, hiking and gardening groups, and private health clubs and golf courses. Seattle is particularly rich in recreational opportunities focused on the area's natural features. Seattle's many parks and shorelines offer abundant recreational opportunities, including water contact recreational activities (such as swimming, wading, snorkeling, and diving); water-related and non-water-related recreational activities (such as walking, hiking, playing, observing wildlife, and connecting with nature); and recreational activities that involve consumption of natural resources (such as fishing and noncommercial shellfish harvesting). Project-specific information on site-specific recreational opportunities would be determined during the design, environmental review, and future permitting of individual projects.

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

No. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not displace any recreational uses. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed.

14. Historic and Cultural Preservation

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

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where residential development is allowed. There are a number of landmarks, properties, or districts in Seattle that are listed on, or proposed for, national, state, and local preservation registers. In addition, while Seattle today comprises a highly urbanized and developed area, it is also an area with potential for Native American cultural artifacts. Project-specific information on site-specific historic buildings, structures, and sites would be determined during permitting of individual projects. See the response to Question #D.4 for more discussion.

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.

There are a number of landmarks, properties, or districts in Seattle that are listed on, or proposed for, national, state, and local preservation registers. In addition, while Seattle today comprises a highly urbanized and developed area, it is also an area with potential for Native American cultural artifacts. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be identified and addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 Archaeology and Historic Preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

The proposed non-project action does not involve construction or disturbance of any particular site. No methods were used to assess potential impacts to cultural and historic resources. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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 proposed non-project action does not include construction or development, so there are no activities that would require the avoidance, minimization, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbance to historic and cultural resources. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

15. 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 proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where residential development is allowed. The area has dense grids of urban streets (residential and arterials) that provide connections to major routes, including Interstate 5 and State Route 99, which run north and south through the City, and Interstate 90 and State Route 520, which connect Seattle to points east across Lake Washington. More specific information on site-specific public streets and highways would be determined during future permitting of individual projects.

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?

Seattle is served by bus, trolley, and light rail public transit. Site-specific information on the local public transit would be determined during future permitting of individual projects.

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

None. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. This proposal will not directly result in the creation or elimination of parking spaces.

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. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not result in direct improvements to transportation facilities. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposed non-project action would take effect throughout areas of Seattle where residential development is allowed. Seattle is served by railroads, sea ports, and airports. Project-specific information on proximity to and use of water, rail, and/or air transportation would be determined during permitting of individual projects.

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

This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not impact vehicular trips. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

- 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. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. The proposal will not impact or be impacted by movement of agricultural or forest products. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control transportation impacts are proposed.

16. 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. This proposal is a non-project action and does not include any specific development proposal. This proposal will not directly result in increased need for public services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

No measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services are proposed.

17. Utilities

- a) Check utilities available at the site, if any: [check the applicable boxes]**

The proposed non-project action would be in effect throughout areas of Seattle where residential development is allowed. All areas have electricity, telephone, water and refuse service. Most (but not all) areas have cable/fiber optics, sanitary sewers, and natural gas. Project-specific information on site-

specific utilities would be determined during the design, environmental review, and permitting of individual projects.

- Electricity Natural gas Water Refuse service Telephone Sanitary sewer
 Septic system Other: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#) None

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 proposed non-project action does not include construction or development of any utilities.

- None

C. SIGNATURE

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

E-Signature: *Laura Hewitt Walker*

Laura Hewitt Walker
Strategic Advisor, Market Incentives & Land Use
Seattle Office of Housing

Supplemental Sheet for Non-Project Actions is required if the proposal applies to a program, planning document, or code change.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON-PROJECT ACTIONS

(Do not complete this sheet for project actions)

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

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

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

The proposal could possibly mean the following:

(1) *Aesthetic appearance is more flexible for a greater number of future low-income housing developments.* A design review exemption adopted during the pandemic and scheduled to sunset in January 2024 would be made permanent and the exemption would for the first time include housing with initial and resale restrictions on sale prices for households with incomes no higher than 80 percent of

area median income (AMI). This exemption is currently permanent for permanent supportive housing and temporary for certain other low-income housing, typically rental, with $\leq 60\%$ AMI units. This change would modestly increase the number of developments eligible for a design review exemption. Based on OH ownership funding awards for 2020, 2021, and 2022, the potential net annual increase in use of the design review exemption would average approximately two to three projects totaling approximately 40 to 60 units. As noted, multifamily housing developments with units affordable $\leq 60\%$ AMI are currently eligible for the design review exemption according to temporary provisions in place throughout the pandemic and extended through January 2024 by [Ordinance 126741](#). Based on OH rental funding awards for 2020, 2021, and 2022, annual new construction of multifamily housing that is not permanent supportive housing but is eligible for the exemption from design review under temporary provisions averages five to six projects totaling approximately 685 units. In the last three years, approximately one-third of OH-funded new construction rental housing developments went through administrative design review instead of using the exemption. Reasons for pursuing design review vary depending on circumstances of a specific project or site and might include desire to request certain departures. The proposed change described here replaces detailed eligibility requirements for affordable housing with the term “low-income housing.” To date, the design review exemption for low-income housing has not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(2) *Authorization to request waiver or modification of certain development standards applies to a greater number of low-income housing developments.* The ability to request for low-income housing waivers and modifications related to the size of parking spaces, ratios of vehicle parking sizes, overhead weather protection, façades and street level floors (but not width of structure), and other standards would be made permanent. Waivers or modifications that could increase the size of a development’s building envelope would continue to not be permitted. Waivers and modifications could be approved if they facilitate development of low-income housing. Authorization of these requests is currently allowed for permanent supportive housing on a permanent basis and allowed for other low-income housing, typically rental, with $\leq 60\%$ AMI units according to temporary provisions in place since the onset of the pandemic and extended through January 2024 by [Ordinance 126741](#). Based on OH rental funding awards for 2020, 2021, and 2022, annual new construction of multifamily housing that is not permanent supportive housing but is eligible to request waiver or modification of certain development standards under temporary provisions averages five to six projects totaling approximately 685 units. Requests for waiver or modification of development standards are not currently allowed for ownership low-income housing for buyer households with incomes no higher than 80% AMI, even under the temporary

provisions. The change makes ownership developments for low-income buyer households newly eligible to request modification and waiver under the same terms as currently allowed for permanent supportive housing and other low-income housing with units affordable \leq 60% AMI. Based on OH ownership funding awards for 2020, 2021, and 2022, the potential net annual increase in use of the request authorization would average approximately two to three projects totaling approximately 40 to 60 units. The proposed change described here includes replacing detailed eligibility requirements for affordable housing with the term “low-income housing.” To date, the temporary provisions for low-income housing have not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(3) In Multifamily, NC, C, and SM zones, exemption of accessory human services for purposes of calculating floor area limits provides slightly more usable floor area or slightly different allocations of uses for a greater number of low-income housing developments. This floor area exemption, which currently applies to permanent supportive housing, would be expanded to apply to all low-income housing. Although permanent supportive housing has accessory human service uses far more frequently than typical low-income housing, OH does have examples of the latter. For example, Plaza Roberto Maestas (completed 2016) has a business opportunity center on site, the University Food Bank is on the ground level floor of the Marion West Apartments (completed 2016), and Mercy Magnuson Place (2019 substantial renovation of historic buildings at Magnuson Park) hosts a food pantry. Although it has not been done to date, a medical clinic/day center for seniors is another example of a human service use that would be compatible with some low-income housing developments. The proposed change described here replaces the term “permanent supportive housing” with the term “low-income housing.” To date, the existing provisions related to accessory human services for permanent supportive housing have not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(4) In NC, C, and SM zones, allowable uses along street-level, street-facing façade are more flexible for a greater number of low-income housing developments. This flexibility, which currently applies to permanent supportive housing, would be expanded to all low-income housing. Based on OH rental funding awards for 2020, 2021, and 2022, new construction of multifamily low-income housing that is not permanent supportive housing and could potentially benefit from increased flexibility for street-level use requirements would average five to six projects totaling approximately 685 units, with roughly two-thirds of this development activity being in NC, C, and SM zones. The proposed change described here replaces the term “permanent supportive housing” with the term “low-income housing.” To date, existing

provisions related to flexibility of uses along street-level facades for permanent supportive housing have not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(5) *In DMR zones, including DMR/C zones in South Downtown, slightly different maximum width requirements and authorization of Type I decisions that waive or modify width requirements for street-facing façades and separation of structures apply to a greater number of low-income housing developments.* Different maximum width requirements currently apply to existing housing if the owner commits to long-term affordability. The waiver and modification provisions currently apply to low-income housing with units \leq 60% AMI, which is a large majority of but not all low-income housing. These changes would have minimal impact in part due to low likelihood of regularly securing developable sites in DMR zones. In the past 10 years, OH has funded three DMR zone low-income housing developments with approximately 140 units each on average. The proposed change described here replaces detailed eligibility requirements for affordable housing with the term “low-income housing.” To date, existing allowances for low-income housing structure width and separation have not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(6) *The LR1 zone’s one unit per 400 square feet of lot area density exception applies uniformly to all low-income housing.* This provision already applies to low-income housing, but the language is unnecessarily complicated and includes conditions at odds with the low-income housing definition (i.e., developer type, lease terms, and duration for life of structure). The technical change to this provision is unlikely to increase utilization of the L1 density exception for low-income housing.

(7) *In SM-RB zones, a higher FAR limit applies to a greater number of low-income housing developments.* Currently this provision only applies to affordable housing with \leq 60% AMI units, which comprises a large majority of low-income housing development activity but excludes most affordable ownership homes for buyer households with incomes no higher than 80% AMI. For certain uses, including affordable housing with \leq 60% AMI units, the FAR limit is increased by an amount equal to twice the floor area occupied by such use, up to a maximum increase of 1.0 FAR in SM-RB 55 and SM-RB 85 zones and 2.0 FAR in SM-RB 125 zones. The proposed change described here replaces detailed eligibility requirements for affordable housing with the term “low-income housing.” OH has funded one 119-unit low-income housing development in an SM-RB zone. The maximum was 4.75 FAR for that project, which is 1.0 FAR higher than the standard maximum. The higher FAR limit for low-income housing has not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

(8) *In C2 zones, allow uses permitted outright to include a greater number of low-income housing developments.* Permanent supportive housing is currently the only type of low-income housing permitted outright in C2 zones. A conditional use permit is required for other non-PSH multifamily development. This change would help facilitate low-income housing development in C2 zones, where appropriate. This could include redevelopment of a 1.4-acre property acquired by a non-profit developer in 2021 with the intention of securing permanent financing for construction of approximately 240 affordable apartments and childcare for people in need. Any potential increase in C2 zone low-income housing development activity is expected to be minimal. Applicants for City funding of low-income housing must demonstrate that location of sites maximize choice for low-income residents of Seattle and promote City goals to affirmatively further fair housing. Funding decisions take into account the extent to which locations provide access to transit, access to opportunities such as jobs, quality education, parks and open space, and services, advance equitable development goals, including those of local, community-based, historically-rooted non-profit organizations, and serve the needs of the intended population.

(9) *Allow an existing waiver of minimum parking requirements to potentially apply to a greater number of restricted units.* The proposed change replaces detailed eligibility requirements for affordable units with the term “moderate-income unit,” which limits housing costs to no higher than 80% AMI for rental units and 100% AMI for ownership units. For rental units, this means the provision’s existing 80% AMI limit still applies. It does theoretically expand the waiver to include ownership units with long-term housing covenants requiring affordability as high as 100% AMI. To date, there are no homes subject to affordability limits higher than 80% AMI in Seattle. Development of such units would require exclusively private sector financing, which is unlikely. In addition, few areas of Seattle have minimum parking requirements for multifamily housing. Since 2018 when this parking exemption was first adopted to date, only one developer has elected to execute a housing agreement for the purpose of reducing the amount of required parking. With that agreement, parking was not required for eight 80% AMI units in a 44-unit project. Based on these findings, this change is unlikely to alter the number of units with a parking exemption and any increase would probably be minimal. Furthermore, parking is no longer within the scope of environmental impact analysis.

(10) *Allow existing provisions that waive or modify long-term bike parking requirements to apply to a greater number of restricted units.* The LUC currently exempts \leq 30% AMI units from long-term parking requirements, and the Director has discretion to also waive bike parking requirements for units $>$ 30% AMI but \leq 60% AMI, provided a reasonable alternative is provided (in-unit vertical bike storage, for

example). The proposal focuses the applicability of those waiver provisions on units in low-income housing. Restricted units in developments that are not publicly funded and in which units are largely market-rate would not be eligible for this exemption. In those cases where alternative bike storage must be provided, the proposal increases the affordability limit to 80% AMI. That change provides additional flexibility and potential cost savings for publicly funded development of for-sale homes guaranteeing ongoing affordability (at initial sale and all future resales) for low-income buyers. The existing bike provisions for low-income housing have not resulted in any known adverse impacts.

Based on facts outlined above, the proposed changes would not result in direct impacts and are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to discharges to water, emissions to air, production, storage, release of toxic or hazardous substances, or production of noise. This relates to a lack of substantial difference that future development could generate in relation to increased levels of water pollution from newly developed sites, or similar differences in air pollutant or toxic emissions or use of hazardous substances, or noise impacts from a development. This is based on a comparison of conceptual development outcomes that could occur under the current regulations versus the proposed regulations. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review. Additional discussion of comparative potential impacts is provided below.

Regardless of adoption of the proposal, future development sites would likely be fully or almost fully cleared during construction. For that reason, construction-period worst-case potential for spillover impacts to the environment, such as stormwater runoff carrying sediments from graded soils off the site, air emissions from construction dust, and construction noise would be approximately the same regardless of whether the proposal is adopted.

Post-construction discharge to water, emissions to air, and noise production would also be approximately equivalent with or without the proposal. Future development meeting City drainage control requirements would likely have no or almost no runoff-related cumulative water quality and quantity impacts. Future development operations would be the same or similar with or without the proposal and therefore no difference in potential air, toxic or hazardous substance, and noise impacts is expected.

In certain zones, the proposal exempts human service uses accessory to low-income housing from FAR calculations. Medical services, including alcohol and drug services, for residents and possibly non-residents could generate medical waste materials. Service providers would be required to follow normal

precautionary safety protocols for collection and disposal of medical waste. No measurable increase in production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances is expected in the rare circumstance that future low-income housing development includes medical services.

For these reasons, this proposal poses no likely significant adverse impacts to water, emissions to air, production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances, and production of noise. Future development is unlikely to have these types of impacts, either on a site-by-site basis or cumulative impact basis, regardless of whether the proposal is adopted.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Based on facts outlined in response to question D.1 above, the proposed changes would not result in direct impacts and are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to plants, animals, fish, or marine life. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

Regardless of whether the proposal is or is not adopted, future development sites would likely be fully or almost fully cleared during construction. For that reason, the worst-case potential for spillover impacts due to construction on plants, animals, fish, and marine life would be approximately the same under both scenarios. The proposal does not increase the likelihood of sediment escaping from sites and reaching streams and other potential fish and wildlife habitat areas nearby.

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

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Based on facts outlined in response to question D.1 above, the proposed changes would not result in direct impacts and are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts in terms of depleted energy and natural resources. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

Although the proposal might provide more flexibility in configuration of future low-income housing, the overall size of such developments would be relatively ~~the same~~ similar with or without the proposal. Energy expended during construction likely would be similar on a site-by-site and cumulative basis with or without the proposal. To the extent the proposal slightly increases total gross floor area within a low-income housing development, energy use levels on a per-unit and possible per occupant energy consumption ~~basis would likely~~ may be slightly reduced.

Importantly, all future new construction and most rehabilitations of City-funded low-income housing is are required to satisfy [Washington State's Evergreen Sustainable Development Standards](#). In addition, low-income housing is newly constructed or substantially rehabilitated according to 2018 energy code rules, which largely prohibit fossil fuels. Future development would be subject to all applicable energy efficiency and conservation regulations, which are becoming more progressive and stringent with time.

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

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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?

Based on facts outlined in response to question D.1 above, the proposed changes are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts on environmentally sensitive areas, such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands, or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

The proposal does not increase likelihood of development in environmentally sensitive areas, nor does it cause development in locations that would likely cause adverse impacts on wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, floodplains, or prime farmlands. Similarly, the proposal is not likely to increase future development in park areas, wetlands, and the limited habitat areas that are home to threatened or endangered species. Future development would be subject to the same protections and regulations for critical areas, if any, that apply currently.

None of the proposed changes would increase the likelihood of historic sites or structures being redeveloped. Such sites and structures are subject to strict protections, making demolition rare and subject to explicit approval by the City. Low-income housing often addresses multiple public objectives, including preservation of historic structures. The Pacific Hotel and St. Charles Hotel apartments in downtown Seattle are two examples of low-income housing in locally designated landmark buildings. Rehabilitation is done consistent with recorded landmark covenants on the property title.

None of the proposed changes would increase potential disturbance of cultural sites or resources. Although most cultural sites and artifacts are buried under ~~rocks and~~ soil in unknown locations, items of cultural significance are more likely to be found in certain vicinities, such as near shoreline areas historically frequented and lived in by indigenous peoples for example. None of the proposed changes would alter the likelihood of potential cultural sites being developed.

The City's regulatory protection of cultural sites and artifacts, consistent with other local, state, and federal regulations, policies, and practices remains the same with or without the proposal. In cases of potential cultural resource disruption, existing regulations would continue to require developers to pause construction until sites and artifacts are assessed, and to assure protection or preservation of areas and items of significance.

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

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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?

Based on facts outlined in response to question D.1 above, the proposed changes are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts on land and shoreline use. Uses would continue to be compatible with existing plans. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

The proposal updates some land use code provisions related to development of low-income housing as well as unsubsidized housing with a minority of restricted units, but it does not change where residential development is allowed or conditionally permitted. Low-income housing could be developed in C2 zones without a conditional use permit, whereas that option is currently only available to permanent supportive housing, which is a certain class of low-income housing. This would not alter Council-adopted policies,

including location priorities, that govern the award of City funds for low-income housing development. Although existing Code requirements could apply more uniformly to development that satisfies low-income housing criteria, it is not expected to substantively change the types of uses allowed by zoning and related regulatory overlays. While the proposal would facilitate permitting of low-income housing, it is unlikely to result in development and land uses that would be incompatible or substantially and adversely different in locational pattern, scale, siting, or bulk from residential uses developed for income-eligible renter and owner households that would be built under today's regulations. SEPA would continue to require mitigation of height, bulk, and scale impacts of low-income housing developments, as applicable.

Changes to the existing design review exemption so that it applies to a greater number of low-income housing developments, including those with $\leq 80\%$ of AMI units, could mean the aesthetics of any given future development are different compared to one subject to design recommendations from appointed design review board members. However, perception of aesthetic differences in terms of positive or negative could vary depending on the personal perspective of any person or persons doing the assessment. No known significant, adverse impacts, aesthetic, land use, or otherwise, have resulted from the temporary design review exemption for low-income housing with units $\leq 60\%$ AMI, which has been in effect since the onset of the pandemic.

The ability of SDCI to consider requests for waiver or modification of specified development standards such as minimum building modulation, overhead weather protection, street-level glazing, blank façade limits, and use-type requirements could reduce or eliminate those standards' benefits in terms of moderating the appearance of building bulk and scale. The relative aesthetic quality and overall consistency and compatibility of future buildings within the immediate built environment could also be reduced. This could potentially be most noticeable in areas with pedestrian designations and design performance standards. Future development could potentially appear bulkier or look different than existing structures. Some people might perceive new development as negatively contrasting with the character of select existing structures or street-level uses.

Overall, the proposal would likely simplify and improve readability of existing land use code provisions and potentially increase consistency and efficiency of permit processes, including reviews, for low-income housing. Future low-income housing would continue to be located where residential uses are authorized according to the City's Comprehensive Plan and land use code. No evidence or analysis to date suggests that future development would be incompatible with land or shoreline uses due to the proposed land use

code changes. Any difference in height, bulk, and scale of future development because of the proposal would likely be minimal, and perhaps at a level that would be difficult for passersby to see. Changes to gross floor area and allocation of uses, and differences in overall building form, if any, ~~would~~ may also be minimally interpretable. Low-income housing comprises a small share of Seattle's residential development. Facilitating development of low-income housing through land use code changes outlined in this checklist is not likely to result in direct or cumulative adverse land use impacts.

The proposal is consistent with housing goals and policies of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The following is a selection of relevant goals and policies.

GOALS

LU G5 Establish development standards that guide building design to serve each zone's function and produce the scale and character desired, while addressing public health, safety, and welfare.

H G1 Provide fair and equal access to housing for all people in Seattle.

H G2 Help meet current and projected regional housing needs of all economic and demographic groups by increasing Seattle's housing supply.

H G3 Achieve a mix of housing types that provide opportunity and choice throughout Seattle for people of various ages, races, ethnicities, and cultural backgrounds and for a variety of household sizes, types, and incomes.

H G4 Achieve healthy, safe, and environmentally sustainable housing that is adaptable to changing demographic conditions.

H G5 Make it possible for households of all income levels to live affordably in Seattle, and reduce over time the unmet housing needs of lower-income households in Seattle.

POLICIES

H 5.1 Pursue public and private funding sources for housing preservation and production to provide housing opportunities for lower-wage workers, people with special needs, and those who are homeless or at risk of being homeless.

H5.2 Expand programs that preserve or produce affordable housing, preferably long term, for lower-income households, and continue to prioritize efforts that address the needs of Seattle's extremely low-income households.

H 5.3 Promote housing affordable to lower-income households in locations that help increase access to education, employment, and social opportunities, while supporting a more inclusive city and reducing displacement from Seattle neighborhoods or from the city as a whole.

H 5.4 Monitor regularly the supply, diversity, and affordability of housing for households by income level, and use this information to help evaluate whether changes to housing strategies and policies are needed to encourage more affordable housing or to advance racial and social equity.

H5.5 Collaborate with King County and other jurisdictions in efforts to prevent and end homelessness and focus those efforts on providing permanent housing and supportive services and on securing the resources to do so.

H 5.6 Increase housing choice and opportunity for extremely low- and very low-income households in part by funding rent/income-restricted housing throughout Seattle, especially in areas where there is a high risk of displacement. Also increase housing choice in areas where lower-cost housing is less available but where there is high frequency transit service and other amenities, even if greater subsidies may be needed.

H 5.13 Seek to reduce cost burdens among Seattle households, especially lower-income households and households of color.

H5.16 Consider implementing a broad array of affordable housing strategies in connection with new development, including but not limited to development regulations, inclusionary zoning, incentives, property tax exemptions, and permit fee reductions.

H 5.20 Implement strategies and programs to help ensure a range of housing opportunities affordable for Seattle's workforce.

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

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

Based on facts outlined in response to question D.1 above, the proposed changes are unlikely to increase demands on transportation, public services, or utilities. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

The proposal simplifies existing provisions that exempt long-term bike parking requirements for developments with restricted units with affordability $\leq 30\%$ AMI and $\leq 60\%$ AMI. The proposal revises the affordability limit at the upper end from 60% AMI to 80% AMI so that developments creating affordable homeownership opportunities for low-income buyers could also potentially benefit from flexibility afforded by the provision. New construction of ownership low-income housing averages approximately two to three projects totaling approximately 40 to 60 units each year. For housing with restricted units $> 30\%$ AMI and $\leq 80\%$ AMI, the exemption continues to be conditioned on provision of a reasonable alternative (e.g., in-unit vertical bike storage). The proposal focuses applicability of the provisions on restricted units within low-income housing. This reduces the potential that units in largely market-rate residential buildings would have different bike accommodations depending on their status as restricted or non-restricted. Although no such projects appear to have used the bike parking waiver to date, the average annual number of restricted units $\leq 60\%$ AMI that would have been potentially eligible decreases by 60 to 70 units based on agreements for restricted units executed in 2020 through 2022. The proposal could modestly increase flexibility in the use of interior space, modestly reduce costs of publicly

funded housing, and better tailor bike parking accommodations to the needs of the intended population for each low-income housing development.

The proposal also modifies an existing vehicle parking exemption for restricted units with affordability \leq 80% AMI. As modified, the 80% AMI limit is unchanged for rental units and a new, higher 100% AMI limit applies to ownership units. To date, there are no homes subject to affordability limits higher than 80% AMI in Seattle. Development of such units would require exclusively private sector financing, which is unlikely. The change does provide greater consistency in use of defined terms, in this case the term “moderate-income unit.”

With or without the proposal, motor vehicle and bicycle parking would continue to be tailored to meet the needs specific to each low-income housing development. Areas with planned or existing transit access are already a priority for Office of Housing investments (see Map D: Access to Frequent Transit Service in the Seattle Office of Housing’s [2022 Annual Investments Report](#)). Residents of low-income housing in transit-rich areas may be more likely to choose public transit than other modes of travel (cars or bikes, for example). However, marginal increases in transit ridership due to low-income housing development would be within ranges already contemplated by transit providers for multifamily areas. With or without the proposal, the Office of Housing will continue to prioritize funding for low-income housing development in areas that provide sufficient access to transit, jobs, quality education, parks and open space, and services, many of which are also areas where people are at high risk of displacement.

The proposal would not be likely to generate different discernible growth patterns and trends in local development locations viewed at either a neighborhood, city sector, or citywide basis. Affordable housing organizations would continue to compete for developable properties available in the Seattle real estate market. Also, the particulars of the proposed code revisions would not be expected to generate overall demographic differences in the patterns of growth for the relevant kinds of housing. Therefore, no probable identifiable differences are anticipated that might adversely affect the provision of parks, police, fire/emergency services, or school facilities. The same finding applies to provision of utilities serving existing and future utility customers. This means that differential amounts or kinds of adverse impacts on these public services and utilities are not anticipated.

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

No measures are proposed. Potential impacts of specific future development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposal presents no known conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.