

# 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*** [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Proposed Ordinance 2019-0143.2 - 2019 King County Shoreline Master Program Updates

2. Name of applicant:

King County

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

Christine Jensen  
King County Permitting Division  
35030 SE Douglas St, Suite 210, Snoqualmie, WA 98065  
206-477-0581

4. Date checklist prepared:

July 16, 2019

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County

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

The Proposed Ordinance is scheduled to be adopted by the King County Council in October 2019

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

No plans for future additions or expansions beyond the issues addressed in the Proposed Ordinance, as voted out of the King County Council's Mobility and Environment Committee on July 2, 2019, as advertised in the Public Hearing Notice, and as noticed by the King County Council in conjunction with the Public Hearing Notice.

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

Based on the analysis included in this SEPA Checklist, King County will prepare the appropriate SEPA documents to support adoption of the Proposed Ordinance.

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.

None are pending.

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

None are needed.

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.)

This is a non-project action related to the state mandated 2019 periodic review and update to the King County Shoreline Master Program, as adopted in Chapter 6 of the King County Comprehensive Plan and in King County Code Titles 20 and 21A.

Proposed Ordinance 2019-0143.2 would modify the regulations within the shoreline jurisdiction by:

- Establishing new definitions for commercial salmon net pens, geoduck aquaculture, nonnative marine finfish aquaculture, noncommercial native salmon net pens;
- Revising the definition of aquaculture to exclude harvest of wild geoduck associated with a state-managed wildstock geoduck fishery;
- Revising the definition of aquatic area to include conveyance systems with contributing water from a wetland;
- Establishing policies for net pen aquaculture;
- Prohibiting commercial salmon net pens and nonnative marine finfish aquaculture in King County and native marine finfish aquaculture in Quartermaster Harbor;
- Adding requirements for certain types of geoduck aquaculture to obtain a substantial development permit and/or conditional use permit consistent with state law;
- Adopting the 2014 wetland rating manual and adjusting wetland scoring, both within and outside of the shoreline jurisdiction;
- Modifying buffers for Categories I, II, and III wetlands and provisions for buffer reduction and buffer averaging, both within and outside of the shoreline jurisdiction;
- Establishing a provision for granting relief from shoreline master program permitting for certain restoration work within the urban growth area;
- Establishing a targeted review time of 90 days for state highway projects with an estimated cost of less than 500 million dollars;
- Establishing that the shoreline master program applies in the shoreline jurisdiction, and identifies shorelines, shorelines of statewide significance, shorelands and the one-hundred-year floodplain as comprising the shoreline jurisdiction; and
- Updating definitions for terms used in the shoreline master program.

In addition to the proposed amendments contained in the Proposed Ordinance, additional amendments may be considered by the Council. Amendments that may be considered for adoption by the Council include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Revising the definition of wetlands consistent with the state definition;
- Establishing standardized buffer widths for all wetlands in unincorporated King County; and
- Updating minimization measures, averaging requirements, land use intensity impacts, and allowed alterations.

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.

If adopted, the changes in the Proposed Ordinance would apply to parcels in unincorporated King County that 1) are within King County's shoreline jurisdiction and/or 2) have wetlands and associated buffers.

## **B. Environmental Elements** [\[HELP\]](#)

### **1. Earth** [\[help\]](#)

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

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

King County, covering 2,130 square miles, is the size of the state of Delaware, but much more geographically diverse. It extends from Puget Sound in the west to 8,000-foot Mt. Daniel at the Cascade crest to the east. King County's various landforms include saltwater coastline, river floodplains, plateaus, slopes and mountains, punctuated with lakes and salmon streams. Lake Washington, covering 35 square miles, and Lake Sammamish with 8 square miles are the two largest bodies of fresh water. Vashon-Maury Island in Puget Sound and Mercer Island in Lake Washington provide different island environments. The Proposed Ordinance would apply to such land that are in unincorporated King County that 1) are within King County's shoreline jurisdiction and/or 2) have wetlands and associated buffers.

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

See response to B.1.a; there may be steep slopes on impacted properties.

#### **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.**

See response to B.1.a; there may be agricultural soils on impacted properties, which may include agricultural land of long-term commercial significance. Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for clearing and grading in some areas. Incentives are proposed to mitigate soil disturbances.

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

See response to B.1.a; there may be unstable soils on impacted properties.

#### **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.**

Unknown for this non-project action.

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

See response to B.1.a; Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for clearing and grading and associated erosion in some areas.

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

See response to B.1.a; Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading and associated impervious surfaces in some areas.

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

King County's existing regulations related to erosion and soils would apply to any development proposals, which includes mitigation and impact avoidance measures. Additionally, incentives are proposed to mitigate soil disturbances.

## 2. Air [\[help\]](#)

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.

It is not anticipated that these regulatory changes would increase emissions.

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:

It is not anticipated that these regulatory changes would increase emissions.

## 3. Water [\[help\]](#)

a. Surface Water: [\[help\]](#)

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.

Yes, see response to B.1.a; this includes Puget Sound and various lakes, rivers, streams, ponds, and wetlands.

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.

- 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.

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for clearing and grading in some areas.

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

No.

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

Yes, see response to B.1.a; this includes 100-year floodplains throughout unincorporated King County.

- 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: [\[help\]](#)

- 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.

Not applicable.

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.

Not applicable.

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

No.

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

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated changes to drainage patterns.

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

King County's existing regulations related to surface, ground, runoff water, and drainage would apply to any development proposals, which includes mitigation and impact avoidance measures.

#### 4. **Plants** [\[help\]](#)

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of vegetation types on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated removal of vegetation. Incentives for conservation of vegetative corridors along Priority Habitat areas is also proposed to mitigate disturbances to wetlands and associated vegetation.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of threatened and endangered species types on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to, including Chinook Salmon and Orca Whales.

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

Incentives for conservation of vegetative corridors along Priority Habitat areas is also proposed to mitigate disturbances to wetlands and associated vegetation. Additional changes to incentivize native plantings and vegetation management to mitigate disturbances are also being considered.

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

See response to B.1.a; this may include a variety of noxious weeds and invasive species on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

## 5. **Animals** [\[help\]](#)

- 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 \_\_\_\_\_

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of birds and animals on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of threatened and endangered species types on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to, including Chinook Salmon and Orca Whales.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes migration routes on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to A.11, which includes a variety of increased protections for preservation and enhancement of wildlife, including: establishing higher environmental, ecological, and wildlife protection standards for aquaculture uses; using best available science to update wetland classifications and associated buffers, which will result in increasing buffers and associated protections in some areas.

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



See response to B.1.a; this may include invasive animal species on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

## **6. Energy and Natural Resources** [\[help\]](#)

- 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.

None.

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

No.

- 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.

## **7. Environmental Health** [\[help\]](#)

- 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.

No.

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

See response to B.1.a; this may include sites with contamination on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

- 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.

See response to B.1.a; this may include sites with hazardous chemicals/conditions on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

- 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 response to B.1.a; this may include sites that store, use, or produce toxic or hazardous chemicals on the various lands that the new regulations would apply to.

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

None.

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

See response to A.11, which includes a variety of increased environmental protections from health hazards resulting from aquaculture uses.

*b. Noise*

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

See response to B.1.a; this may include sites with noises on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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.

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated noise. Incentives for mitigating noise disturbances are also proposed.

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

Incentives for mitigating noise disturbances are proposed.

**8. Land and Shoreline Use** [\[help\]](#)

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.

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of land uses on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to. The proposals would limit some aquaculture uses.

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?

See response to B.1.a; this includes a working farmlands and forest lands and agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance. It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in conversion of such lands to other uses.

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.

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of structures on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in structures being demolished.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of zoning classifications on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of land use designations on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of shoreline master program designations on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of critical areas on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of people that reside and work on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in the displacement of people.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in the displacement of people.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would be incompatible with existing and projected land uses. The proposals were evaluated for compatibility and consistency with existing regulations in land use plans, including the Shoreline Master Program and Comprehensive Plan. That evaluation generally found that the proposals were compatible and consistent with the plans and, in areas where they were inconsistent, amendments to the Plans are proposed as part of the Proposed Ordinance.

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

Incentives are proposed to mitigate soil disturbances, which would help protect agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

## **9. Housing** [\[help\]](#)

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

None; the proposals do not impact housing regulations.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in the elimination of housing units.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in impacts to housing.

## **10. Aesthetics** [\[help\]](#)

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

Not applicable.

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

None; shoreline views would be improved by prohibiting some and further limiting other aquaculture uses.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

Shoreline views would be improved by prohibiting some and further limiting other aquaculture uses.

## **11. Light and Glare** [\[help\]](#)

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

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated light and glare impacts. Incentives for mitigating light and glare disturbances are also proposed.

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

Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated light and glare impacts. Incentives for mitigating light and glare disturbances are also proposed.

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of existing off-site sources of light and glare on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

Incentives for mitigating light and glare disturbances are proposed.

## **12. Recreation** [\[help\]](#)

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of designated and informal recreational opportunities on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in displacement of existing recreational uses.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in impacts to recreation.

## **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.

See response to B.1.a; this may include a variety of historic buildings, structures, or sites on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

- 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.

See response to B.1.a; this may include a variety of cultural landmarks, structures, sites, materials, or artifacts on the various lands and waters that the new regulations would apply to.

- 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.

King County's existing regulations related to cultural and historic resources would apply to any development proposals, which includes consultation with tribes and associated agencies, and use of archaeological surveys, GIS data, and historic maps.

- 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.

King County's existing regulations related to avoidance of, minimization of, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbance to cultural and historic resources would apply to any development proposals.

#### **14. Transportation** [\[help\]](#)

- 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.

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of public streets and highways in the areas that the new regulations would apply to.

- 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?

See response to B.1.a; this may include public transit service to the areas that the new regulations would apply to.

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

None; it is not anticipated that the proposals would result in additional parking.

- 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).

None; it is not anticipated that the proposals would result in new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle, or state transportation facilities.

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

No.

- 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; it is not anticipated that the proposals would result in additional vehicular trips.

- 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; it is not anticipated that the proposals would result in transportation impacts.

## **15. Public Services** [\[help\]](#)

- 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.

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

None; it is not anticipated that the proposals would result in public service impacts.

## **16. Utilities** [\[help\]](#)

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

See response to B.1.a; this includes a variety of utilities in the areas that the new regulations would apply to.

- c. 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.

None.

### 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: Christine Jensen

Name of signee Christine Jensen

Position and Agency/Organization Legislative/Policy Analyst, King County Permitting Division

Date Submitted: 7/16/19

### D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [\[HELP\]](#)

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

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

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

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

Adoption of the regulations for aquaculture uses would improve water quality. Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated impacts (such as water runoff and noise). Incentives for mitigating impacts and disturbances are also proposed.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

See A.11; incentives for mitigating wetland impacts and disturbances are proposed.

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

Adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would improve conditions for plants, animals, fish, and marine life. Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated impacts (such as impacts to plants, animals, and fish). Incentives for mitigating impacts and disturbances are also proposed.



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

See A.11. Adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would improve conditions for plants, animals, fish, and marine life. Incentives for mitigating wetland impacts and disturbances are also proposed.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in depletion of energy or natural resources.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in depletion of energy or natural resources.

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?

Adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would improve conditions for sensitive areas. Adoption of Ecology's 2014 Wetland Rating System and associated buffers may reduce buffers in some areas, which may result in increased ability for development and/or clearing and grading in some areas and associated impacts (such as impacts to sensitive areas). Incentives for mitigating impacts and disturbances are also proposed.

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

See A.11. Adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would improve conditions for sensitive areas. Incentives for mitigating wetland impacts and disturbances are also 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?

Adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would reduce shoreline uses that are not compatible with shoreline policy goals and plans.

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

See A.11; adoption of the proposed regulations for aquaculture uses would reduce shoreline uses and associated impacts.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would result in increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities.

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

It is not anticipated that the proposals would conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment; the proposals would result in improved alignment with such laws and requirements.