



King County

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

Parks and Recreation Division

King Street Center

201 South Jackson Street, Suite 5702

Seattle, WA 98104

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/parks>

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Green to Cedar Rivers South Interim Trail Segment A (1141259)

2. Name of applicant:

King County Parks and Recreation Division

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

Linda Frkuska, Capital Project Manager

King County Parks and Recreation Division

201 South Jackson Street, Room 5702

Seattle, WA 98104

206-477-7372 (SEPA)

KCParks.SEPA@kingcounty.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

October 25, 2023

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks

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

The start of construction is anticipated in July 2024 and will be completed by Spring 2025.

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

The county may pave the trail with hot mix asphalt (HMA) at some point in the future. The current design will accommodate this future condition. A separate review of the impacts associated with paving would be completed under SEPA at that time.

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

The following information has already been prepared:

- Geotechnical Report
- 30% Design Stormwater Approach Technical Memorandum
- Critical Areas Report
- Cultural Resources Assessment

The following information is still to be prepared:

- Technical Information Reports for each jurisdiction (City of Maple Valley and King County)
- Tree Inventory and Tree Removal and Retention Plans

Current information is available for review on the King County website at:

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/parks/publicnotices>

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

No known applications of other proposals are pending for governmental approvals that would directly affect the property covered by this proposal.

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

- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway Design and Construction Approval
- King County Clearing and Grading Permit
- City of Maple Valley Site Development Permit (clearing and grading and stormwater review)
- City of Maple Valley Right-of-Way Permit
- Washington State Department of Natural Resource (DNR) Class IV Forest Practice Permit
- Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Stormwater Permit
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Access Connection Permit
- WSDOT General Permit

- 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. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)**

King County Parks and Recreation Division (the county), in partnership with the City of Maple Valley (the city), is proposing to develop a 1.8-mile interim trail that extends from Southeast Kent-Kangley Road in the City of Maple Valley to the Black Diamond Open Space in unincorporated King County. The interim shared-use path will be a 12-foot-wide gravel trail with 2-foot-wide gravel shoulders (on both sides) over existing railroad bed that is currently 6- to 8-foot-wide gravel in most locations. The trail will have profile grades less than 5% to meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. Improvements include a new, approximately 170-foot-long pedestrian bridge crossing over the active BNSF Railroad line and at-grade crossings with safety lighting and signals that are designed for pedestrian safety at SE Kent-Kangley Road, SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street.

- 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 project area is located in both the City of Maple Valley and unincorporated King County, Washington, Section 3, Township 21 North, Range 06 East. In Maple Valley, the trail extends through parcels 2722069019, 3422069101, 3422069102, 3422069019. In unincorporated King County, the trail extends through parcels 0321069001 and 8556550820. See attached vicinity map.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

Circle or highlight one: Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:

The proposed interim trail and the surrounding area slopes from north to south and gains approximately 16 feet over 2 miles.

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

The steepest side slope is 90% where the proposed interim trail crosses the BNSF railroad.

- 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.**

Geotechnical investigations identified the following soil types, depending on the investigation location:

- Organic rich topsoil, approximately 3- to 18-inches thick (with the exception of an area where a fill layer covers a 4-inch-thick layer of topsoil).
- Fill to a depth of 5 to 12.5 feet, generally consisting of loose to medium-dense gravel with variable amounts of sand, silt, and organics, or sand with variable amounts of silt, gravel, and organics. Fill is similar to existing, underlying recessional outwash.
- Weathered recessional outwash between topsoil and underlying recessional outwash with a composition of slightly silty to silty sandy gravel with slightly silty and silty gravelly sand.
- Recessional outwash to a depth of 25 feet with a composition of sandy gravel to silty sandy gravel or slightly silty to silty gravelly sand with variable amounts of cobbles and boulders.
- Glacial till at about 12 feet and about 6 inches thick consisting of silty sand and gravel.
- Advance outwash below depths of 25 feet consisting of dense to very dense, sandy gravel to silty gravelly sand with variable amounts of cobbles.

The United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service soils mapping shows the majority of the site as Everett Gravelly Sandy Loam, with a rating of “farmland of statewide importance.”

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

There are no surface indications nor a known history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity of the project; however, King County interactive mapping (iMap) shows “potential steep slope hazard areas” near the project footprint in the vicinity of Ravensdale Creek.

- 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.**

Clearing and grubbing, excavation, and fill will be required to expand the trail footprint and finished grade elevations. Approximately 6.5 acres of the total 22.5-acre project site, will be cleared and grubbed for the expanded footprint. Approximately 11,100 cubic yards of excavation and 5,850 cubic yards of fill will be needed. Excavated material will be reused as fill if suitable or disposed of at a King County approved location. Any imported fill will be from an approved source that can verify the fill is free of invasive species.

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

Some minor erosion may occur during the construction period due to temporarily exposed soils and minor exposed fill slopes. The majority of the project site will not be cleared.

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

Approximately 15.9 percent of the site will be impervious after construction. This includes non-paved, compacted, crushed gravel; paved transition areas between the trail and the roadways; and the approaches and trail over BNSF railroad.

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

Temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented during construction. These measures could include stabilized construction entrances, temporary and permanent seeding, mulching, plastic covering, check dams, silt fences, storm drain inlet protection, sediment traps, construction stormwater infiltration and dust control.

2. Air

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

During construction, air emissions typically include particulate matter (i.e., PM10 and PM2.5) from dust and diesel exhaust and small amounts of carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen from construction machinery exhaust. The increase in particulate emissions and exhaust may be temporarily noticeable.

Air emissions post-construction at the site are not expected to change from existing conditions. Long term, this will be a nonmotorized trail and will not introduce any new activities that would result in a measurable increase in air emissions, including greenhouse gases.

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

No off-site sources of emissions or odor are expected to affect this proposal.

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

Construction BMPs will be implemented to control dust and limit impacts to air quality. These could include wetting down dust on the site; removing excess dirt, dust, and debris from adjacent roadways if necessary; shutting off equipment when not in operation; and maintaining construction equipment in good working condition.

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

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

Yes, surface water bodies are in the immediate vicinity of the site as outlined in the tables below. All surface water bodies and buffers are located in unincorporated King County and are rated and classified according to King County Code (KCC) 21A.24. The segment of Ravensdale Creek that passes through the project is listed as a 303(d) waterbody for fine sediment; a total maximum daily load has not been established. No work will occur in or over water, so the potential for encountering aquatic invasive species is minimal.

Summary of Identified Wetland in the Project Vicinity

Wetland	Jurisdiction	USFWS Classification ^a	HGM Classification ^b	Ecology Rating ^{c,d}	Habitat Rating Score ^c	Buffer Width (feet)
W1	King County	PFO, PSS	Riverine	II	8	190
W2	King County	PFO, PSS	Depressional	I (bog)	7	190

HGM = hydrogeomorphic PFO = palustrine forested, PSS = palustrine scrub/shrub

a FGDC 2013; Cowardin et al. 1979

b Brinson 1993

c Hruby 2014

d King County adopts the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, Washington state Department of Ecology publication number 14-06-029, published October 2014.

Summary of Identified Streams in the Project Vicinity

Stream	Jurisdiction	Classification	Buffer Width (feet)
Ravensdale Creek	King County	F	165
Unnamed Stream	King County	F	165

F = fish bearing

The Critical Areas Report provides a detailed description of the surface waterbodies within the project's immediate vicinity.

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.

The project will not directly impact wetlands or streams. The project will have temporary and permanent impacts within the buffer of Ravensdale Creek. Project impacts are summarized in the table below. All temporary impact areas will be revegetated with native species suitable for the site. Although the areas noted as permanent buffer impact areas will be revegetated with native species, their proximity to the trail and necessary safety sightlines will limit tree regrowth in these areas. Therefore, the project proposes designating additional buffer area to provide buffer averaging mitigation as allowed under KCC 21A.24. The Critical Areas Report provides a description of the proposed mitigation.

Green to Cedar River Trail: Interim Segment A Project Impacts

Resource Impacted	Temporary Impacts (acres)	Permanent Impacts (acres)
Buffer of Ravensdale Creek	0.05	0.05
Streams and Other Aquatic Areas	none	none
Wetlands and Wetland Buffers	none	none

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.

No fill or dredge material will be placed in or removed from the streams or wetlands.

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

No surface water withdrawals or diversions would occur under this project.

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

The proposal does not lie within a 100-year floodplain.

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

The proposal does not include discharges of waste materials to surface waters. The proposed interim trail is non-pollutant generating, and BMPs are expected to prevent hazardous or waste materials from entering surface waterbodies or the stormwater conveyance system during construction.

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give a general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

The proposal would not withdraw groundwater from a well for drinking water or for other purposes.

See Section c (1) for an understanding of the proposal's management of stormwater.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (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.**

There is the potential for oil or other fuels from equipment used for construction or ongoing maintenance to discharge waste material to the ground. BMPs will be in place to avoid or minimize this occurrence. Examples of BMPs include minimizing storage of petroleum products on the site and the preparation of a spill prevention, control, and countermeasures plan.

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.**

Runoff from the railroad bed currently sheet flows from multiple discharge locations onto adjacent vegetated property and infiltrates into the ground and/or ultimately discharges to one of the following surface waterbodies: Jenkins Creek, Ravensdale Creek, or Lake Sawyer. The existing discharge locations will be preserved. The project proposes infiltration trenches, closed depressions, and sheet flow for dispersion to meet flow control requirements of the 2021 King County Surface Water Design Manual (KCSWDM). The proposed trail will be a non-pollution generating surface and no water flow will be discharged directly to surface waterbodies.

The stormwater management approach for the trail proposes to meet all core and special requirements specified in the 2021 KCSWDM. Based on soil information provided in the Draft Geotechnical Report and the preliminary design infiltration rates, infiltration trenches

and closed depressions will provide flow control for the portion of trail within the City of Maple Valley. Sheet flow for dispersion will provide flow control for the remaining portion of the trail, within unincorporated King County.

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

Yes, waste materials could enter ground or surface waters from equipment used for construction or ongoing maintenance. Although nonmotorized trails are classified as non-pollutant generating and generally not expected to introduce waste materials to ground or surface waters, an improved trail could increase the trail use by dog owners and equestrians. Combined, dog and equestrian waste are sources of contamination to waterbodies, namely fecal coliform bacteria, and the introduction of nitrogen and bacteria can deplete the level of oxygen necessary for fish and other water-based organisms as well as encourage algae growth.

The BMPs described below give a broad overview of measures that will be taken to prevent or minimize stormwater from coming into contact with pollutants on site, during construction and operation.

Construction

TESC has been developed and construction stormwater pollution prevention plan (CSWPPP) will be developed as part of the final stormwater site plan. BMPs from the county's stormwater pollution prevention manual will be integrated into these plans.

Operation

Drawing from the county's stormwater pollution prevention manual, the project will integrate the following BMPs:

- Post signage along the trail reminding users to pick up after their pets.
- Place pet waste stations along the trail, including bags and trash cans, in areas where it is expected there will be the greatest use by pet owners (e.g., near trail-roadway intersections or other areas where high volumes of users access the trail).
- Pet waste stations will be maintained to keep pet waste bags stocked and disposal stations empty.

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

No, the project intends to maintain current drainage patterns.

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

TESC plans will be included with construction plans and provided in the Final Drainage Report. The CSWPPP will be prepared and submitted prior to construction as a separate document. And, as described above, the project proposes infiltration trenches, closed depressions, and sheet flow for dispersion to meet flow control requirements of the 2021 KCSWDM.

4. Plants

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

- deciduous tree:** alder, maple, aspen, other: cottonwood, bitter cherry, Scouler's willow, crab apple, pear, cascara
- evergreen tree:** fir, cedar, pine, other: Cyprus
- shrubs**
- grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops.**
- wet soil plants:** cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
- water plants:** water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other
- other types of vegetation**

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

Approximately 250 to 300 trees would be removed, mostly consisting of Big Leaf Maple (*Acer macrophyllum*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*). Low-growing shrubs and herbaceous plants will also be removed.

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

No threatened or endangered species were observed during field reconnaissance by project biologists. Review of Washington Department of Natural Resources Washington Natural Heritage Program Data on August 28, 2023 did not show any "rare or imperiled species" or plant communities near the site. However, there are several areas mapped as "Rare or High-Quality Ecosystem" in the area, with the closest occurrence approximately 2.75 miles to the south.

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

As required by King County, compensation for impacts to vegetation in wetland buffer will comply with King County Code (KCC) 21A.24.325. The landscape and mitigation plan for wetland buffer impacts are shown on sheets LS1 and LS2 of the plan set.

Maple Valley Municipal Code (MVMC) 18.40.140 requires the project to maintain 15% canopy coverage. With large swaths of forested areas along the trail alignment, this project will exceed the minimum coverage requirement by retaining the majority of forested cover.

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

King County iMap on August 28, 2023, showed the presence of tansy ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*) and spotted knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*) near the trail alignment.

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.

Examples include:

- **Birds:** hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
- **Mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: coyote
- **Fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

The above underlined birds and mammals are likely to be observed on or near the trail alignment.

King County requires protective measures for wildlife habitat conservation areas, which are habitats for species the King County Comprehensive Plan requires the county to protect (KCC 21A.24.382). Protective measures consider the following: bald eagle active nests; great blue heron rookeries; marbled murrelet active nests; northern goshawk active nests; osprey active nests; eyrie on a cliff face, rim of the cliffs, or areas immediately below a cliff utilized by peregrine falcons; spotted owl active nests; caves or mines used by Townsend's big-eared bat; and Vaux's swift active nests.

Project biologists performed a site visit, and none of the habitat requirements described above were observed. Additionally, a search of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) on the Web on October 24, 2023, did not result in any of the above species recorded nearby.

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

Review of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's interactive mapping for PHS on October 26, 2023, identifies the northwestern pond turtle within a half-mile of the site. The northwestern pond turtle is recognized as an endangered species in the state of Washington. Project biologists have not identified any suitable habitat within the project footprint.

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

The project site is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a major north-south route of travel for migratory birds in America, extending from Alaska to Patagonia. Migrating and nesting birds within the project area will be protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

According to the online mapping resources, PHS on the Web and King County data Ravensdale Creek is a wildlife migration corridor and habitat for several salmonid species (resident coastal cutthroat trout and coho). Migratory and resident elk use the winter range. The project area also includes cave-rich areas, but none were observed near the site.

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

The project has been designed to avoid wildlife habitat to the greatest extent feasible. An alternative analysis was performed to identify an alignment that balances the needs and uses of the project while minimizing impacts to wetland/stream and buffer areas, which support wildlife habitat. The alternative selected had the least impacts to wetlands, aquatic areas, and their buffers. There will be no impacts to wetlands and only temporary impacts to aquatic areas and their buffers.

Construction impacts will be minimized by using temporary erosion and sediment control procedures as well as appropriate best management practices (BMPs). Potential BMPs for erosion and sediment control include, but will not be limited to, placement of silt barriers or straw bales/matting, as necessary. All erosion control measures will be inspected regularly to ensure adequacy and to assess maintenance needs. A spill prevention control and countermeasure plan will also be implemented during construction activities.

The following conservation measures and BMPs have been incorporated into the project design to avoid or minimize construction-related impacts on aquatic and riparian habitats:

- Earthwork and clearing near streams will be limited to the dry season to reduce the potential for sediment runoff to the extent practical.
- The boundaries of clearing limits will be clearly flagged to prevent disturbance outside of the limits. The contractor must install high-visibility fencing.

If project biologists identify any protected species in the project area during construction, appropriate measures will be taken to protect the species.

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

No known invasive animal species are known to be on or near the site.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

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

Electricity will be used for signal and lighting at key intersections of trail and roadway. Flashing beacons will use solar power. New illumination will likely be connected to the existing electrical grid. All other electrical features are being reconfigured to accommodate the trail alignment and provide safety.

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

The project is at grade and will not affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

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.

No specific energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal. This project inherently encourages non-motorized use, providing opportunities for commuting to work or school, which could reduce the use of petroleum and reduce carbon emissions.

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 because of this proposal? If so, describe.

No environmental health hazards are expected to occur because of this proposal.

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

Twelve sites within 1 mile of the project alignment are shown on the Ecology “What’s in My Neighborhood: Toxics Cleanup” interactive mapping site. Of the twelve sites, ten have been cleaned up and comply with the standards in the state’s environmental cleanup law, the Model Toxics Control Act. Cleanup has started for the remaining two hazardous materials sites, and the details are as follows:

Four Corners Cleaners [facility site id #12513, cleanup site id #5867], an operating dry-cleaning facility, is located at 23886 SE Kent-Kangley Road, about 430 feet northeast of the trail entrance at the intersection of SE Kent-Kangley Road. The site is undergoing cleanup for contaminant type “Halogenated Organics – Halogenated Solvents” and is being monitored for progress.

Maple Valley BP [facility site id #12272, cleanup site id #15126], an automotive service station, is located at 26821 Maple Valley Black Diamond Road SE, about 540 feet east of the trail entrance at the intersection of SE Kent-Kangley Road. The site is undergoing cleanup for benzene and petroleum (gasoline).

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.

A natural gas transmission line owned and operated by Northwest Pipeline LLC is approximately 2.75 miles west of the trail alignment. This is outside the 660-foot “project consultation zone.”

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.

During construction, typical activities associated with heavy equipment include fueling and engine maintenance activities that involve oil, grease, solvents, and other toxic engine fluids. There is the potential that these materials could leak from material storage containers, spills from improper handling of liquids, drips from the undercarriages of vehicles, water used to clean equipment and control dust, improper disposal of waste liquids, or other miscellaneous accidents.

No environmental health hazards are expected to occur as a result of this proposal.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

No special emergency services are anticipated to be required.

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

King County has mapped the site as a Category I critical aquifer recharge area or a wellhead protection area. BMPs will be in place during construction. The construction contractor would be required to prepare a site-specific health and safety plan and spill prevention, control, and countermeasures plan.

b. Noise

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

Noise in the project area would not affect the proposed project.

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)?

Typical site construction noise would be generated by the project in the short term. Noise-generating equipment would likely include excavators, loaders, bulldozers, diesel and gasoline powered work trucks, and dump trucks.

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

Operation of construction equipment will follow the operating hours specified in King County Ordinance, Title 12, Public Peace, Safety and Morals, which limits heavy equipment operation to 7am to 7pm on weekdays and 9am to 7pm on weekends and Maple Valley Municipal Code (MVMC) 9.05.480, which limits construction equipment, power tools, hammering, motor vehicles, deliveries, including equipment/material drop-offs and pick-ups, and persons congregating between the hours of 6pm and 7am on weekdays, and between the hours of 5 pm and 9 am on Saturdays. In addition, MVMC prohibits sound originating from construction site on Sundays and holidays. Construction is currently not anticipated on the weekends for this project. In addition, construction equipment will not be allowed to idle on site.

No noise reduction or control measures are proposed for the project during operation.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

The project site, consisting of multiple parcels, is a former rail corridor purchased by King County with the intent of formally integrating it into a regional trail system: the Green to Cedar Rivers Trail. The current site is used as a trail, but the conditions of the trail are variable and also disjointed due to several roadway crossings and a railroad crossing, which acts as a barrier to the continuation of the regional trail.

Nearby land uses include commercial uses, single-family residential, and parkland, including Summit Park and Black Diamond Open Space.

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 because of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

No, the project site has not been used as working farmlands or working forest lands, nor is the site designated as agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance. Therefore, no land that is farmlands or forest lands will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use.

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

King County iMap shows a forest protection district about 1 mile to the east of the site, and it is possible that haul routes would use State Route (SR) 169. However, because most of the trail is sited away from roadways, there is little to no potential for interference with

forest practice operations. Farmland preservation properties/farmland district are located about 4 miles southwest of the project alignment, and for the same reasons as with the forest practice district, there is little to no potential interference with farm operations.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

No structures are on the site.

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

No structures will be demolished.

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

The Maple Valley zoning classification for the proposed trail alignment is PRO (Parks, Recreation, Open Space). The King County portion of the site is zoned RA-10 (rural area with one dwelling unit per 10 acres).

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

The Maple Valley comprehensive plan designation for the majority of the site is PRO. The King County comprehensive plan designation is RA-10.

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

Not applicable, the alignment does not extend through a designated shoreline.

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

King County maps the entire site as a Category I critical aquifer recharge area or a wellhead protection area. Other King County-mapped critical areas include geologic hazards [steep slope (near Ravensdale Creek)], wetlands, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. The Critical Areas Report provides additional information.

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

No people would reside or work in the completed project.

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

The project would not result in the displacement of people.

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

No displacement would occur; therefore, no avoidance or reduction measures are proposed.

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

The Green to Cedar Rivers Trail is a longstanding priority regional trail project in south King County. The path's overall planned alignment runs approximately 11 miles from the Cedar River Trail in north Maple Valley to the Green River Valley south of Black Diamond. The trail's alignment is on an abandoned railroad spur line that once carried coal between the mines in Black Diamond and Maple Valley.

The Green to Cedar Rivers Trail is developed for 3.3 miles as a gravel regional trail in the City of Maple Valley between the Cedar River Trail and SE Kent-Kangley Road (SR 516). This project is the continuation of the abandoned rail line south of SE Kent-Kangley Road, which currently provides an informal local trail in south Maple Valley. (The city previously placed gravel on part of this segment to encourage walking by local residents.)

The Green to Cedar Rivers Trail is included in the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) Regional Trails Needs Report (RTNR), which is an adopted plan that is part of Technical Appendix C2 of King County's Comprehensive Plan. The trail was included in the first edition of the RTNR in 2008. The trail was also envisioned by earlier regional trails plans. It was included in the Regional Trails Plan (1992) and in the DNRP Regional Trail Inventory and Implementation Guidelines (2004).

Development of the Green to Cedar Rivers Trail is considered a part of the DNRP Strategic Climate Action Plan. The current action plan goals envision the completion of an additional 10 miles of new paved or interim regional trails by Parks by 2025, and Green to Cedar Rivers Trail development during the current Parks Levy period will contribute to this effort.

The development of the Green to Cedar Rivers Trail is also consistent with the mobility and safety goals of the county's strategic plan. Regional mobility enhancements have been an important consideration in trail development. Extending the regional trails through Maple Valley and Black Diamond will enhance travel alternatives and promote active transportation and integration of modes of travel.

Additionally, this proposal is consistent with the King County Open Space Plan: Parks, Trails, and Natural Areas which provides a framework for how the county plans, develops, manages, and expands its parks system.

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

No measures are proposed. The project is not sited on agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, and the Green to Cedar Rivers trail segment would not interfere with agricultural and forestry operations.

9. Housing

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

None. The project does not provide housing units.

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

The project would not eliminate housing.

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

No measures to reduce or control housing impacts is proposed since the project would not eliminate housing.

10. Aesthetics

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

The project will introduce lighting at the beginning of the trail improvements at SE Kent-Kangley Road and where the trail crosses over roadways at SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street. The light poles will be 20 feet in height.

The project also includes a bridge crossing over the BNSF railroad. The bridge structure will be 13.5 feet tall with a maximum clearance of 21.5 feet above the lowest point of the railway.

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

Trees will be removed to accommodate widening of the trail or for improved roadway crossings, which will alter views.

Most of the tree removals that would occur along the trail, are outside of the roadway crossings, and are within an existing forested greenbelt. Although the views in these forested areas will be altered, it is expected that the remaining trees will continue to provide a visually pleasing forested setting for trail users. Some views looking towards the trail from adjacent residential parcels north of the trail's intersection with SE 271st Place

may be altered with the removal of several trees; otherwise views towards the trail will generally be unchanged.

At roadway crossings, these areas are already visually altered with powerlines, signage, signals, light poles, and other visual clutter. Although the trees that will be removed soften the visual clutter of these manmade features, the removal of them would not change the general aesthetics of the area.

The addition of the pedestrian bridge over the BNSF railway line will alter the view from existing trail users north and south of the bridge, BNSF rail workers, and from SR 169 looking west. The bridge is expected to provide an aesthetically pleasing point of interest for these viewing groups.

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

The proposed trail widening is designed to avoid tree removal to the greatest extent possible. In areas of stream and wetland buffers, trees and other vegetation will be planted as required by local code requirements.

11. Light and Glare

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

As discussed above, the project will introduce lighting at the beginning of the trail improvements at SE Kent-Kangley Road and where the trail crosses over roadways at SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street.

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

No glare would be generated from the finished project. Light emanating from the proposed luminaires at roadway crossings will not pose a safety hazard or interfere with views. The proposed lighting is intended to increase safety for trail users.

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

Off-site sources of light or glare would not affect the proposal.

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

No special measures are proposed to reduce or control light and glare impacts. Luminaires proposed at roadway crossings will meet WSDOT standards for medium to low pedestrian activity areas. No lighting is proposed in a wetland or stream buffer. The closest wetland/stream buffer to proposed lighting is approximately 200 feet southwest of the trail crossing with SE 288th Street.

12. Recreation

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

The proposed interim trail is within the Green to Cedar Rivers Trail corridor, and it is currently used as a nonmotorized trail. Other nearby recreational opportunities include Summit Park and the Black Diamond Natural Area:

- Summit Park. Located west of the trail at SE 271st Place. Park amenities include a multiuse sports field for soccer, lacrosse, and flag football; baseball fields, a softball field, children's play area, skatepark, picnic shelter and restroom, off-leash dog park, and sport court for pickleball and basketball. Provides access to the Green to Cedar Rivers Trail corridor.
- Black Diamond Natural Area. Located at the interim trail terminus. Provides 17 miles of trails for nonmotorized use. Contains streams, peat bogs, and wetlands.

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

The proposed interim trail will not displace any of the existing recreational uses. The proposed interim trail will enhance access to the other recreational uses through improved nonmotorized access.

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 are proposed to reduce or control impacts on recreation. The proposed interim trail will enhance recreational opportunities.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

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

Review of the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) Washington Information System for Architectural and Archeological Records Data does not show any buildings, structures, or sites located on or near the site that are over 45 years old and listed in or are eligible for listing in any national, state, or local preservation registers.

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 two recorded archaeological sites in the Interim South Segment A project area that are evidence of Native American and historical use of the vicinity. One precontact

isolated cryptocrystalline silicate (CCS) flake (45KI1267) is in the project area. Isolate 45KI1267 is Not Eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The project is along site 45KI722, a relic grade of the Columbia & Puget Sound/Pacific Coast Railroad that was constructed in 1884 and abandoned in the early 1990s. Site 45KI722 is also Not Eligible for listing on the NRHP.

No other material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance were identified on or near the project area during review by professional archaeologists. Sites 45KI1267 and 45KI722 are described in the project's cultural resources assessment report "*Green to Cedar Rivers Regional Trail Project, King County, Washington*" (Ostrander et al. 2015). DAHP concurred with the site's eligibility recommendations. The project area was investigated further during monitoring of project geotechnical investigations and no significant cultural materials were identified (Kunas 2022). Two additional sections of 45KI722 were recorded during the geotechnical investigations. The corresponding report is titled "*Cultural Resources Monitoring for the Green to Cedar Rivers Regional Trail Project Geotechnical Exploration.*"

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.**

The King County Historic Preservation Program (KCHPP) reviewed this project in December 2014 for the presence of archaeological and above-ground resources and for the potential of an inadvertent discovery of such resources during project construction. This screening included a review of historic registers, databases (including the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation's "WISAARD"), historical maps and aerial photographs, and predictive GIS modeling. KCHPP identified one segment of this project where there is moderate potential for encountering cultural resources. Segment 5 is an approximately 1,000-foot-long segment of the trail alignment between SE Kent-Kangley Road and SE 271st Place with heightened archaeological sensitivity. Therefore, KCHPP recommended sub-surface survey with shovel probes in Segment 5, as well as pedestrian surface survey of the rest of the project alignment. KCHPP also recommended monitoring of work in the Green River floodplain due to the sensitive natural and cultural setting.

To look for buried cultural resources in Segment 5, 19 shovel probes were excavated by professional archaeologists. As described in 13(b), one flake, site 45KI1267, was identified. In addition to sub-surface survey in areas identified as high risk by HPP, the cultural resources assessment included a pedestrian survey and site 45KI722 was documented during this work. Additional sections of 45KI722 were recorded during archaeological monitoring of geotechnical investigations planned in sensitive parts of the project area.

Prior to field investigations in 2015, Parks reached out to area Tribes to inquire about potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project area. Updates on the project status were sent to representatives from the Tulalip Tribes, the Snoqualmie Tribe, and the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe in 2018. Additional consultation was also completed with DAHP regarding the identified cultural resources.

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 Parks will continue to monitor ground disturbance in archaeologically sensitive portions of the current project area during construction following a project specific Archaeological Resources Monitoring Plan (ARMP), as recommended in the cultural resources assessment (Ostrander et al. 2015). King County Parks will also develop an Inadvertent Discovery Plan to use during unmonitored construction throughout the rest of the project area. These documents will be developed prior to construction to establish procedures to be followed if cultural resources are found during construction. If human remains are encountered, the County will follow state laws dictating procedures (RCW 68.50.645, 27.44.055, and 68.50.055).

No state-issued excavation permits are required for with within and around 45KI722 and 45KI1267 because the sites are Not Eligible for listing in the NRHP. In addition to this SEPA checklist, the cultural resources assessment completed for the project (Ostrander et al. 2015) may be submitted to support Section 404 and Section 106 permits.

14. Transportation

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

Public streets and highways serving the site include SR 169, SE Kent-Kangley Road, SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street. The interim trail will be improved for safety at SE Kent-Kangley Road, SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street. The site plans show the interim trail in relation to the local street network.

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?

Yes, the site is served by two bus routes operated by King County Metro: bus routes 168 and 907. Bus route 168 provides fixed, all-day service from roughly 6 a.m. until about 1 a.m., Monday through Sunday. The route extends along SE Kent-Kangley Road, just north of the proposed interim trail. The closest stops to the interim trail are about 0.25 miles to the west for bus service headed westbound and eastbound and about 0.10 miles to the east for bus service headed in the eastbound direction.

Bus route 907 offers fixed, daytime service from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and a dial-a-ride service that allows for a deviation from the fixed route if requested in advance. Several stops are located on SR 169 near key interim trail and roadway crossings including the following:

- Two stops, 0.15 miles northeast and southeast of the interim trail near the intersection of SE Kent-Kangley Road, offering northbound and southbound service.

- One stop about 0.06 miles of the interim trail crossing at SE 276th Street, offering northbound and southbound service.
- Two stops, one about 0.07 miles to the north and the other about 0.04 miles to the south of the interim trail crossing at SE 280th Street, offering northbound and southbound service.

c. 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).

The project will provide improvements related to the proposed interim trail crossings at SE Kent-Kangley Road, SE 271st Place, SE 276th Street, SE 280th Street, and SE 288th Street. Improvements include installation of curb and gutter, sidewalk additions or improvements, relocation of streetlights or installation of new streetlights, installation of new pedestrian signals, and pavement crosswalk markings.

In addition, a driveway will be constructed along the 28000 block of SR 169 to allow for short-term- construction access and long-term maintenance operations.

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

Yes, the proposed interim trail includes a bridge across the BNSF Railroad. The structural design is being coordinated through BNSF Railroad for their approval.

e. 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?

The trail upgrades, which includes new access over the BNSF bridge, could increase vehicles parking at various designated recreational parking areas along the trail and in adjacent neighborhoods. This is a qualitative estimate, no data or transportation models were used to make this estimate.

f. 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.

King County iMap shows a forest protection district about 1 mile to the east of the site and farmland preservation properties/farmland district about 4 miles southwest of the project alignment. It is possible the movement of agricultural and forest products would use SR 169, which extends north-south just east of the proposed interim trail. However, because most of the trail is sited away from roadways, there is little to no potential for interference with the movement of agricultural and forest products.

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

The proposed interim trail is designed to provide safety where the trail interfaces with roadways. During construction, the contractor will provide temporary traffic control, which will be permitted through Maple Valley, King County, and WSDOT, depending on the location of the work and controls.

15. Public Services

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

The project is not expected to result in an increased demand for public services.

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

Nonmotorized crossings will be improved for safety. This has the potential to reduce the demand for emergency services.

16. Utilities

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

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

No new utilities are proposed. Some existing utilities within the existing road/BNSF right-of-way or trail prism will have to be relocated or adjusted to accommodate the trail.

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.

DocuSigned by:

0913A67339D244E...

10/30/2023 | 6:38 AM PDT
Date: _____

Linda Frkuska, Capital Project Manager
King County Parks and Recreation Division