

SEPA¹ 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.

¹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/Checklist-guidance>

A. Background

[Find help answering background questions](#)²

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Amendments to King County Code Chapters 6.27, 13.24 and 21A.06 related to approval processes and requirements of water system and general sewer plans, requirements for new wells and new withdrawals from existing wells, and related definitions.

2. Name of applicant:

The proposal was initiated by King County.

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

Robin Proebsting
King County Dept. of Local Services
201 S. Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104
206-848-0334
rproebsting@kingcounty.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

January 16, 2026

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County.

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

The King County Council anticipates possible action on the proposed ordinance in Q1 of 2027.

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

There are no known plans to add or expand the proposed ordinance in the future.

If adopted, King County anticipates permit applications for individual developments that will be subject to the proposed regulations.

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

SEPA checklist for this proposal.
2024 King County Comprehensive Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement
Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan
King County Board of Health Code

² <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-A-Background>

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

The proposal is a nonproject action and applies to all of unincorporated King County. Any pending reviews of water system plans, general sewer plans, or development projects proposing to exempt well installation or withdrawal would be considered under the existing code.

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

Approval by the King County Council is the only government approval required for adoption of the proposed ordinance. Individual development projects, water system plans, and general sewer plans that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all applicable federal, state and local permitting and licensing requirements.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The goals of the proposed ordinance are to: 1) implement KCCP Action 14 from the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, which adds review criteria for water system planning on Vashon-Maury Island; 2) update groundwater withdrawal code standards pursuant to Chapter 19.27 RCW and Chapter 90.94 RCW (instated in response to the *Whatcom County v. Hirst, Futurewise, et al.* decision); 3) update the timing of required water system plan and general sewer plan submittal; and 4) update the King County Code for internal consistency and usability.

The ordinance proposes the following specific changes:

- Adding definitions for the terms used in chapter 13.24 K.C.C.;
- Adding review standards for Satellite Management Agency plans, mirroring state requirements;
- Adding requirements for County-approved water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island that support climate resilience and affordable housing goals;
- Clarifying the schedule on which water and sewer plans must be submitted to the County;
- Limiting groundwater withdrawal volumes for new development that proposes to use a permit-exempt well or for proposed new withdrawals from an existing permit-exempt wells, and requiring properties where such development takes place to connect to a public water system when it becomes available;
- Updating the definition of “Alternative water sources” to remove the provision stating that such water sources are not considered potable pursuant to the King County Board of Health Code; and
- General code clean up, including: changes to make consistent use of terminology; reordering criteria to improve usability; and revising code language to clarify existing intent.

Compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations is presumed for purposes of this SEPA checklist, including compliance with the regulations in the proposed ordinance itself, as well as others such as those related to drinking water, stormwater, wastewater treatment, septic systems, critical areas, and zoning requirements. Any noncompliant uses or structures would be subject to code enforcement and would not be considered an impact related to the proposed ordinance.

The King County Council could modify the proposed ordinance and still accomplish the proposal's objective. Depending on the modification, the likelihood, scale, or scope of potential impacts to various elements of the environment could be the same, greater, or less.

As would be the case for any nonproject or project action that undergoes changes after the publication of a SEPA threshold determination, the King County Executive branch, which pursuant to KCC 20.44.020 is the Lead Agency for SEPA for King County, would evaluate any modifications that are proposed to be made to the proposed ordinance and would update this environmental review if the changes would result in greater or different impacts than those identified in this checklist. The timing of additional environmental review process may vary depending on other variables, including future public processes.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would apply to all of unincorporated King County, which totals 1,095,680 acres, except for the proposed new requirements for County-approved water system plans that support climate resilience and affordable housing goals, which would apply only to Vashon-Maury Island.

In general, King County is located in western Washington and includes 39 incorporated cities, including Seattle, Federal Way, Kirkland, and Bellevue. Approximately three-quarters of the County is unincorporated and includes areas primarily to the east of the County urban growth area boundary and the urban Puget Sound region, with the exception of Vashon-Maury Island located to the west and some isolated blocks of unincorporated area within the Urban Growth Area.

Nearly 75 percent of unincorporated King County is zoned as Forest (F), particularly the eastern portion of the County. To the west, near the more urban incorporated areas of the County, the predominant zoning category is Rural Area (RA), with some areas zoned Agricultural (A), particularly in the areas northeast of Sammamish Valley and the area northwest of Enumclaw. Smaller areas of residential, business, office, and industrial zoning are also located throughout unincorporated King County.

Some provisions proposed in this ordinance would apply only to Vashon-Maury Island, which is located outside of the Urban Growth Area in western King County. Vashon-Maury Island is one of four areas in unincorporated King County declared a Critical Water Supply Area, a designation that triggers additional review and regulation by King County and Washington state Department of Ecology.

B.Environmental Elements

1. Earth

[Find help answering earth questions³](#)

a. General description of the site:

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no identifiable “site,” the ordinance applies to all of unincorporated King County, which includes areas that are flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, and mountainous. King County landforms include saltwater coastline, river floodplains, plateaus, slopes, and mountains, punctuated with lakes and streams.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, unincorporated King County includes 16,596 acres of steep slope critical areas. On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, there are mapped steep slopes, generally along shorelines and ravines. It is possible there may be steep slopes on properties to which the proposed ordinance would apply, however any such new development projects would be subject to existing regulations, including critical areas regulations, that would be addressed during permit review.

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.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, soil in unincorporated King County generally reflects geologically recent glacial and alluvial (river and stream) activity, as well as human activity. River valleys are generally occupied by poorly drained, silty loams that commonly have a substantial organic content. Soils on upland areas between valleys typically are coarser-grained sandy and gravelly sandy loams, but soils with high organic content do occur locally in these upland areas and along water bodies. Some areas of unincorporated King County are classified as farmland of statewide importance, prime farmland, and prime farmland with conditions (which means that it is prime farmland if drained, irrigated, protected from flooding, or not frequently flooded). King County’s Farmland Preservation Program restricts use on participating properties to agriculture or open space use and restricts activities that would impair the agricultural capability of the property.

In accordance with the State Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.170 and 36.70A.050), King County designated “agricultural lands that are not already characterized by urban growth and that have long-term significance for the commercial production of food or other products.” The lands that meet these criteria are designated as an Agricultural Production District, of which there are five in King County (Enumclaw, Snoqualmie, Upper Green River, Lower Green River, and Sammamish).

³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-earth>

Development projects within an Agricultural Production District that are subject to the proposed ordinance may result in the removal of some of these soils. However, existing regulations regarding those soils, and limitations on square footage and impervious surfaces would limit such removal.

On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, the primary soils are Alderwood gravelly sandy loam, Alderwood and Kitsap soils, Coastal beaches, and Everett-Alderwood gravelly sandy loams.⁴

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, geologically hazardous areas, including landslide and erosion-prone areas, some abandoned mining areas, and seismic risk areas, exist within unincorporated King County. Landslide and erosion-prone areas are associated primarily with steep slopes. Hazardous mining areas that may be subject to surface subsidence are associated primarily with past coal mining that occurred in the area from Newcastle through Renton south to Black Diamond. On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, there are areas of mapped potential landslide hazard areas, generally along shoreline and ravines. Any development subject to the proposed ordinance that is located on a parcel where landslide or erosion-prone areas exist would be subject to existing regulations governing landslide hazards and steep slopes and, for new uses, would be identified and addressed under existing regulations during permit review.

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.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly authorize any fill, excavation, or grading, individual projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include fill, excavation, or grading. All such development projects would continue to be subject to existing development regulations related to stormwater management, impervious surfaces, critical areas, clearing and grading, and/or landscaping. Unless exempt under state and county requirements, filling, excavation and grading is also subject to SEPA review.

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

Although the proposed ordinance would not direct any development activities, potential erosion can result from clearing, construction or use of land for development that is subject to the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance does not amend existing regulations on clearing, grading, or construction that could cause erosion. For example, the King County Surface Water Design Manual and shorelines and critical areas regulations, would be unchanged by the proposed ordinance, and would continue to apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance.

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

The proposed ordinance would not have any direct impacts to impervious surface percentages. King County projects subject to the ordinance could alter the percentage of impervious surfaces on their respective sites.

⁴ Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soils Survey: <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>

All such development projects would continue to be subject to existing regulations concerning new and replaced impervious surfaces and evaluated during project-level environmental and permit reviews.

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

Because the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that does not result in direct development activity, no measures to control erosion or other impacts to the earth are proposed. King County's existing regulations related to erosion control and soils would apply to any development to which the proposed ordinance would apply.

2. Air

[Find help answering air questions⁵](#)

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.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not result in any direct emissions to the air. Projects subject to the proposed ordinance may result in air emissions from construction and operation activities, but would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations for these types of emissions. The proposed ordinance would not modify any federal, state, or local codes that provide standards or controls for these types of emissions. Air emissions are discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not be affected by off-site sources of emissions or odor, and no known off-site sources of emissions or odor are likely to impact implementation of the proposed ordinance.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not have any direct impacts to air emissions, and the development projects to which it would apply would be subject to existing regulations regarding emissions and reporting requirements. Additional federal, state, and local codes may provide standards and controls for these types of emissions and would not be modified by the proposed ordinance. As a result, no measures to reduce or control emissions or other potential impacts to air are proposed.

⁵ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-Air>

3. Water

[Find help answering water questions](#)⁶

a. Surface:

[Find help answering surface water questions](#)⁷

- 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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, numerous streams, lakes, ponds, and wetlands and the Puget Sound are located within unincorporated King County. King County maintains an inventory of water bodies within unincorporated King County, which would be considered during development review. On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, there are multiple mapped streams and wetlands of various types and categories, including Beal Creek, Shinglemill Creek, and Dillworth Creek.⁸

- 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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly require any work over, in, or adjacent to the described waters. State and local shoreline regulations would apply to any development subject to the proposed ordinance that is within 200 feet of waters within unincorporated King County's shoreline jurisdiction (60,451 acres in total countywide). Other development regulations, including critical areas regulations, concerning the protection of waterbodies may also apply depending on the proximity of any development to these waters.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not authorize filling or dredging from surface water or wetlands. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to all state, local, and federal regulations, including mitigation requirements, concerning fill or dredge material placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not require any surface water withdrawals or diversions. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to

⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water>

⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Surface-water>

⁸ Source: King County iMap: <https://gismaps.kingcounty.gov/iMap/>

existing regulations concerning surface water diversions and withdrawals, including those regarding in-stream flows, if applicable.

As described in response to question B.3.b below, the proposed ordinance may limit or reduce the volume of groundwater withdrawals within unincorporated King County by adding requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells. Due to the interrelationship between groundwater and surface water in some basins, this proposal may result in a minor decrease to surface water withdrawals or diversions.

The proposed ordinance includes a change to the definition of "Alternative water sources" in 21A.06.057. This might enable new development that would otherwise not have a source of drinking water to use rainwater catchment as a source. This would increase the likelihood of reducing surface water withdrawals by collecting some rainwater before it reached surface water bodies.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, several areas of unincorporated King County lie within a 100-year floodplain. On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, there are mapped 100-year floodplains along Shinglemill Creek, Judd Creek, Fisher Creek, and Tahlequah Creek.⁹ Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to King County rules and limitations pertaining to floodplain development and fill.

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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of and discharge of waste materials to surface waters, including state regulations on water usage, wastewater disposal, and state antidegradation standards. Discharges to surface waters are discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

b. Ground:

[Find help answering ground water questions](#)¹⁰

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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly involve any withdrawals of groundwater or discharge to groundwater. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance that use groundwater or discharge to groundwater would be subject to all existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning groundwater removal and protection.

⁹ Source: King County iMap: <https://gismaps.kingcounty.gov/iMap/>

¹⁰ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-3-Water/Environmental-elements-Groundwater>

The proposed ordinance includes changes that would add requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells, which would include limits of :1) a maximum annual average of nine hundred fifty gallons per day per connection, up to a maximum of five thousand gallons per day for domestic use only; and 2) three hundred fifty gallons per day for interior use or specified fire control under declared drought conditions. Properties with subject wells would also be required to maximize stormwater infiltration. This is likely to limit, and may reduce, the volume of groundwater withdrawal within unincorporated King County.

The proposed ordinance adds requirements for County-approved water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals. Such changes may result in a reduction of groundwater withdrawals in Vashon-Maury Island.

The proposed ordinance includes a change to the definition of "Alternative water sources" in 21A.06.057. This might enable new residences that would otherwise not have a source of drinking water to use rainwater catchment as a source, which would reduce the need to get drinking water from other sources, thereby potentially reducing groundwater withdrawals from wells.

- 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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any discharge of waste material into the ground. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may discharge waste material from septic tanks or other sources and would be required to treat and dispose of any waste in a manner compatible with state and local regulations.

The timeframe in which general sewer plans are required to be submitted to King County is proposed to be updated, but the standards by which general sewer plans are reviewed are not proposed to change.

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.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate or affect water runoff. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may generate some water runoff. As with any development in unincorporated King County, on-site stormwater management would need to comply with the King County Surface Water Design Manual, including applicable Best Management Practices (BMPs) for treatment and flow prior to discharge, and existing maximum impervious surface regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any waste material entering ground or surface waters. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may result in waste matter that could enter ground or surface waters, but such projects would be subject to existing state, local, and federal regulations concerning the protection of surface and ground water.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, and would not alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing drainage regulations, which are unchanged by the subject ordinance.

The proposed ordinance includes changes that would add requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells, which would include limitations on the per-day volume of water that can be withdrawn. However, given the use of septic systems and the mitigation projects identified in streamflow restoration and enhancement plans for each WRIA¹¹, drainage patterns are unlikely to be altered.

The proposed ordinance would also require the maximization of stormwater infiltration, which may affect drainage patterns by increasing the volume of water infiltration that would occur compared with existing codes.

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

As mentioned in response to questions B.3.c.3, the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action unlikely to alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns apart from increased water infiltration. Existing federal, state and local regulations related to surface water discharge and withdrawal, groundwater discharge and withdrawal, runoff water (stormwater), and drainage would apply to any development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance, which would control drainage patterns in the unlikely event that drainage is impacted. No additional measures to reduce or control any potential surface, ground, and runoff water and drainage pattern impacts are proposed under this ordinance. Individual development proposals may be required during project review to provide these measures.

4. Plants

[Find help answering plants questions](#)

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**

¹¹ Dept. of Ecology, Watershed planning: <https://ecology.wa.gov/water-shorelines/water-supply/improving-streamflows/watershed-planning>

X **water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**

X **other types of vegetation**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, unincorporated King County includes a variety of vegetation types on the various lands that development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would apply to, including those listed above. Lands within King County include three ecoregions: the Puget Lowland Ecoregion in the western half of the County, which is now largely urbanized, but which contains forest plantations, farms, and cottonwood; and the North Cascades Ecoregion in the northeastern and east central area and the Cascades Ecoregion in the southeastern portion of the County, which both contain Pacific Silver Fir, Alaskan cedar, Mountain hemlock, Subalpine fir, black sedge, mountain heliotrope, and Alaskan spirea.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly remove any vegetation, the development of individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include the removal or alteration of vegetation (potentially of the types identified in question B.4.a). Such development projects would be subject to existing state and local regulations that regulate vegetation removal or alteration, in the same manner as other uses.

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

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service lists the following endangered or threatened plant species in Washington state: Kincaid's Lupine, Showy stickseed, Spalding's Catchfly, Umtanum desert buckwheat, Ute ladies'-tresses, Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow, White Bluffs bladderpod, and Whitebark pine. The Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow and Whitebark pine are known to be in eastern King County; none of these other plant species are known to be located in King County.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance will be required to meet all federal, state, and local laws regarding endangered or threatened plant species.

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

Although, the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation could be proposed for individual developments subject to the proposed changes. As with any development in unincorporated King County, development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be subject to existing regulations governing landscaping, use of native plants, and vegetation preservation on their respective sites.

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

The King County Noxious Weed Program regulates invasive plant species, and requires eradication or control, or recommends control, for over 150 plant species. Class A noxious weeds, adopted in accordance with RCW 17.10 and WAC 16-750, that are known to or have been located in King County, and require eradication by property owners, include Common crupina, Common cordgrass, Dense flowered cordgrass, Salt meadow cordgrass, Smooth cordgrass, Dyers woad, Eggleaf spurge, False brome, Floating primrose-willow, Flowering-rush, French broom, Garlic mustard, Giant hogweed, Goatsrue, Hydrilla, Johnsongrass, Bighead knapweed, Short fringed knapweed, Kudzu, Meadow clary, Orange peel clematis, Palmer amaranth, Purple starthistle, Reed sweetgrass, Ricefield bulrush, Roundleaf bittersweet, Rush broom, Clary

sage, Mediterranean sage, Silverleaf nightshade, Small-flowered jewelweed, Smooth frogbit, Soft broom. Syrian bean-caper, Texas blueweed, Ashen thistle, Marsh Thistle, Milk thistle, Shore thistle, Slenderflower thistle, Variable-leaf milfoil, and Wild four o'clock. Class B noxious weeds, that are known to have been located in King County, and require control by property owners, include Blueweed (Viper's bugloss), Annual bugloss, Common bugloss, Camelthorn, Common reed (non-native genotypes), Dalmatian toadflax, Egeria, Fanwort, Gorse, Grass-leaved arrowhead, Hairy willowherb, Hardheads, Meadow hawkweeds (all non-native species and hybrids of the meadow subgenus), Autumn hawkweed, Orange hawkweed, Oxtongue hawkweed, Hoary alyssum, Houndstongue, Indigobush, Black knapweed, Brown knapweed, Diffuse knapweed, Meadow knapweed, Spotted knapweed, Kochia, Garden loosestrife, Purple loosestrife, Parrotfeather, Perennial pepperweed, Policeman's helmet, Rush skeletonweed, Saltcedar, Leafy spurge, Yellow starthistle, Sulfur cinquefoil, Tansy ragwort, Cotton thistle, Musk thistle, Plumeless thistle, Tocalote, Tussilago, Velvetleaf, Water primrose, White bryony, Wild basil, Wild chervil, Yellow floating heart, and Yellow nutsedge.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, a variety of noxious weeds and invasive species exist in unincorporated King County. The proposed ordinance does not change any obligations to control noxious weeds identified by the King County Noxious Weed Control Board.

5. Animals

[Find help answering animal questions](#)¹²

- 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:**
- **Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, a variety of birds, mammals, and fish have been observed in unincorporated King County. There are 221 bird species that are common, uncommon, or usually seen on an annual basis in King County. Bird species include hawks, herons, eagles, owls, woodpeckers, songbirds, waterfowl, and shorebirds. There are 70 mammal species that can be found in King County, including shrews, bats, beavers, elk, deer, bears, rabbits, wolves, seals, and whales. There are 50 species of freshwater fish in King County, including 20 introduced species. More information on birds and animals found in King County can be found at <https://kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/biodiversity/defining-biodiversity/species-of-interest.aspx>.

It is unknown which species and in what quantities those species exist specifically on Vashon-Maury Island.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, there are a number of federally threatened and endangered species in King County according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

¹² <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-5-Animals>

Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These species include the Canada Lynx, Gray Wolf, North American Wolverine, Marbled Murrelet, Mt. Rainier White-tailed Ptarmigan, Northern Spotted Owl, Streaked Horned Lark, Yellow-billed Cuckoo, Blue whale, Bocaccio, Fin whale, Gray Whale, Humpback whale, Leatherback sea turtle, Southern resident killer whale, Sei whale, Sperm Whale, and Yelloweye Rockfish.

The Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists the following salmonid species as those federally threatened that are known to occur in King County. Skykomish Bull Trout, White River (Puyallup) Bull Trout, Cedar Chinook, Green River (Duwamish) Chinook, Sammamish Chinook, Snoqualmie Chinook, White River Chinook, Cedar River Winter Steelhead, Green River (Duwamish) Winter Steelhead, North Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish Winter Steelhead, Snoqualmie Winter Steelhead, Tolt Summer Steelhead, and White River (Puyallup) Winter Steelhead.

In addition to the federally listed species above, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife lists additional threatened and endangered species not included with the federally listed species include the Western gray squirrel, Mardon skipper, Northwestern pond turtle, and Oregon vesper sparrow. One additional species, fisher, was historically in King County but is thought to now be extinct in this area. It is unknown which species and in what quantities those species exist specifically on Vashon-Maury Island.

As with any development in unincorporated King County, development projects subject to the proposed ordinance must comply with existing state, local, and federal regulations that protect these species.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no identifiable site, King County is within the Pacific Flyway migratory pathway for birds, and migratory birds use water bodies, shorelines, mud flats, and grassy areas/meadows throughout King County. There are numerous streams and water bodies within the County that serve as migration routes for anadromous fish. These water bodies could potentially be near or cross through sites where proposed development projects could be subject to the proposed ordinance. Elk, other mammals, and bird species migrate seasonally. Daily movements include animal species moving around to get their daily needs met, and this movement can be impacted by fences, roads, culverts, and land use cover and change. Mammals, amphibians, and reptiles are most affected by barriers to movement.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and does not propose any direct impacts to wildlife, so no measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are proposed. Any development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would also be subject to existing federal, state, and local wildlife regulations.

The proposed ordinance adds requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells, which would include limitations on the per-day volume of water that can be withdrawn. Due to the interconnectedness of some surface and ground waters, this may have a positive impact on fish species by increasing surface water flows.

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

The Washington Invasive Species Council, established by the Washington State Legislature, has identified 16 animal species and 13 insect species that are considered invasive in Washington State. King County is known or suspected to have the following invasive animal and insect species: African Clawed Frog, American bullfrog, European Chafer, European green crab, New Zealand mudsnail, Nutria, Tunicate,

European Starling, House Sparrow, Eastern gray squirrel, and Fox squirrel. It is unknown which species and in what quantities those species exist specifically on Vashon-Maury Island.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, numerous invasive animal species are known to exist in unincorporated King County. Invasive species may be located on a development project site that could be subject to the proposed ordinance.

6. Energy and natural resources

[Find help answering energy and natural resource questions](#)¹³

- 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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct energy needs, any development proposal approved under the ordinance may require energy for activities such as lighting, heating/cooling, and operation of equipment. Any future development projects would also be subject to existing energy codes and regulations

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to the use of solar energy by adjacent properties. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could affect solar energy by adjacent projects.

- 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.**

The proposed ordinance a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to energy use, and therefore no energy conservation features are included. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could include energy conservation features or other measures to reduce any energy impacts.

7. Environmental health

[Health Find help with answering environmental health questions](#)¹⁴

- 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.**

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any environmental health hazards, it is possible that development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could result in exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spills, or hazardous waste. To the extent any such development created such exposure or risk, those hazards would be regulated by existing state and local regulations. This topic is discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

¹³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-6-Energy-natural-resou>

¹⁴ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-7-Environmental-health>

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. Sites with contamination exist within unincorporated King County where development projects could be proposed that are subject to the proposed ordinance. These sites would be required to meet any remediation requirements prior to grading.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. Sites with hazardous chemicals/conditions exist within unincorporated King County and development subject to the proposed ordinance could be proposed on them. Such development would be subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding chemical hazards and liquid and gas transmission pipelines.

On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, there are four sites identified as awaiting clean up on the Washington Department of Ecology's "What's in My Neighborhood" database.¹⁵

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.

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not include the storage, use, or production of any toxic or hazardous chemicals, development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could require the use of toxic or hazardous chemicals, such as gasoline or diesel fuel, to operate construction equipment. Individual development projects would be required to store, use, and produce any toxic or hazardous chemicals, such as cleaning supplies, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. This topic is discussed in more detail in Part D of this checklist.

4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts, and implementation of the proposed ordinance is not anticipated to generate any additional special emergency services for the development projects to which it would apply. Any development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would be required to meet existing regulations where special emergency services may be required.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impact on the environment nor create environmental health hazards. No measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards are proposed. Any development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would be required to meet existing regulations for reducing or controlling environmental health hazards.

¹⁵ Source: Washington state Department of Ecology What's in My Neighborhood: Toxics Cleanup: <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/neighborhood/>

b. Noise

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location that can be evaluated for impacts of noise levels. Various types of noise exist in the areas where the proposed ordinance could apply, including noise from traffic, operation of equipment, and more. These noise sources are not anticipated to affect implementation of the proposed ordinance.

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)?

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts. Any development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would be required to meet existing regulations pertaining to noise.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct noise impacts. As such, no measures to reduce or control potential noise impacts are proposed.

8. Land and shoreline use

[Find help answering land and shoreline use questions](#)¹⁶

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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location and would not have any direct impacts on the current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties. As a whole, unincorporated King County is predominantly forestland to the east and predominantly rural to the west, adjacent to more urban incorporated areas of the county, with agricultural areas between. On Vashon-Maury Island, where requirements for County-approved water system plans to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals are proposed, land uses are largely residential, with some areas of agriculture and parks, and there is a concentration of commercial and industrial uses in Vashon Rural Town. The proposed ordinance would not change or impact current land use designations or zoning classifications in unincorporated King County. The proposed ordinance does not change the uses allowed on properties in the King County Code land use tables.

The proposed ordinance revises water system and general sewer system plan requirements and adds requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells. These proposals add conditions for obtaining domestic water access for development projects and associated land uses.

¹⁶ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-8-Land-shoreline-use>

By adding review criteria for water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island regarding planning for affordable housing, the proposed ordinance may increase the likelihood of additional affordable housing being built in the future.

- 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?**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location and would not have any direct impacts to working farmlands or forestlands. Some sites where a development project is proposed that would be subject to the proposed ordinance could have been or may currently be used as working farmland or forestlands. However, existing regulatory limitations on properties enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program, within the Agricultural Production District or Forest Production District, or in Agricultural (A) or Forestry (F) zones would continue apply to development projects that would be subject to the proposed ordinance.

- 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?**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly affect or be affected by the normal business operations of working farmland or forestland.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, various structures may be located on parcels within unincorporated King County, where the proposed ordinance would apply to development projects.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in any demolition, existing structures could be demolished as part of a development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance. The nature of and extent to which those structures could be demolished is unknown at this time and would be subject to all existing applicable regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location and will be applicable throughout unincorporated King County. Zoning classifications in unincorporated King County include: Agricultural, Forest, Mineral, Rural Area, Urban Reserve, Urban Residential, Neighborhood Business, Community Business, Regional Business, Office, Industrial, Regional Use, Property-specific development standards, Special District Overlay, Potential Zone, and Interim Zone. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could occur in any zoning classification that allows the construction of buildings.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location; development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would occur in any land use designation throughout unincorporated King County.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, unincorporated King County includes of the following shoreline master program designations: High Intensity shoreline, Residential shoreline, Rural shoreline, Conservancy shoreline; Resource shoreline, Forestry shoreline, Natural shoreline; Natural shoreline, and Aquatic. Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance that occurs within or proximate to the County's shoreline jurisdiction would be required to comply with the County's shoreline master program.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location, portions of unincorporated King County are classified as critical areas where development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could be proposed. Specifically, King County Code designates the following as critical areas: coal mine hazard areas, erosion hazard areas, flood hazard areas, coastal high hazard areas, channel migration zones, landslide hazard areas, seismic hazard areas, volcanic hazard areas, steep slope hazard areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, wetlands and wetland buffers, aquatic areas, and wildlife habitat networks and conservation areas.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in a completed project where people would reside or work. Individual development projects that are subject to the proposed ordinance would have employees or residents, or both. The number of persons living or working in the subject buildings would depend on the individual land uses, square footages, and regulations affecting those individual development projects.

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly result in any displacement, it is possible that development projects subject to the proposed ordinance could result in displacement. However, implementation of the proposed ordinance is not anticipated to affect the likelihood of displacement.

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

Because the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action not anticipated to affect the likelihood of displacement, no measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts are proposed. King County projects would be subject to existing policies and regulations governing displacements and relocations and would be evaluated during project-level environmental and permit reviews.

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

As no measurable impacts to land uses and plans are likely, no proposed measures to ensure compatibility are proposed. The proposed ordinance supports Growth Management Act Goal 12 to ensure that public facilities and services necessary to support development are adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use, and it supports compliance with the King County

Comprehensive Plan, which includes policies regarding the timely provision of services, consistency with land use patterns, recycled water use opportunities, and protection of water quality. Proposed development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be required to meet regulations to ensure compatibility with existing and projected land uses and plans.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action and would not directly impact agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance; as such, no measures to reduce or control impacts to such lands are proposed. King County projects subject to the proposed ordinance may occur on lands used as working farmland or forest lands. Existing development limits on properties enrolled in the Farmland Preservation Program, within the Agricultural Production District or Forest Production District, or in Agricultural (A) or Forestry (F) zones would continue apply to development projects under the proposed ordinance.

9. Housing

[Find help answering housing questions](#)¹⁷

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

Although the proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have direct impacts to housing, the development of a project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in any additional units of housing above what might occur under existing code.

By adding review criteria for water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island regarding planning for affordable housing, the proposed ordinance may increase the likelihood of additional affordable housing being built in the future.

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

Neither the proposed ordinance itself nor the development allowed under the ordinance would result in greater elimination of housing than what might occur if the ordinance were not adopted.

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

No measures to reduce or control housing impacts are proposed.

10. Aesthetics

[Find help answering aesthetics questions](#)¹⁸

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that does not directly involve the construction of any structures, and does not regulate or change the height requirements of any structures or principal exterior

¹⁷ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-9-Housing>

¹⁸ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-10-Aesthetics>

building materials. The height and any exterior building material of any development project subject to the proposed ordinance will be subject to existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in the alteration or obstruction of views to a greater degree than development allowed under existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to views or aesthetics, and as such, no measures are proposed to reduce or control aesthetic impacts.

11. Light and glare

[Find help answering light and glare questions](#)¹⁹

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly cause any light or glare and any development allowed under the proposed ordinance would not produce any light or glare beyond that allowed under existing regulations.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to light or glare. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would not result in a greater increase in light or glare than any other development allowed under existing regulations. Any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would have to comply with existing development regulations, including any related to light and glare.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. Various off-site sources of light or glare exist throughout unincorporated King County, which will be identified and addressed during project permit review. It is unlikely that any development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would be impacted by any off-site sources.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct light and glare impacts. No additional measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts are proposed beyond existing development regulations.

¹⁹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-11-Light-glare>

12. Recreation

[Find help answering recreation questions](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. A variety of designated and informal recreational opportunities exist in unincorporated King County where the proposed ordinance would apply.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly displace any existing recreational uses. The proposed ordinance would not result in a greater displacement of recreational uses than what may occur under current code.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to recreation; no measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed.

The proposed ordinance adds requirements for new permit-exempt wells and new withdrawals from existing permit-exempt wells, which would include limitations on the per-day volume of water that can be withdrawn. Due to the interconnectedness of some surface and ground waters, this may have a minor increase to surface water flows, which would create a positive benefit to water-related recreational activities such as boating, fishing, or beach use.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

[Find help answering historic and cultural preservation questions](#)²⁰

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. A variety of buildings, structures and sites within unincorporated King County are listed or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers, and are potentially on sites where development projects could be proposed that are subject to the proposed ordinance. Such developments would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local regulations related to historic and cultural resources.

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.

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. However, landmarks, features, and other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation exist throughout unincorporated King

²⁰ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-13-Historic-cultural-p>

County, and potentially on sites where development projects could be proposed that are subject to the proposed ordinance. Such projects would continue to be required to comply with federal, state, and local rules related to historic and cultural resources.

- 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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have any direct impacts to historic and cultural resources. Existing King County and state regulations related to cultural and historic resources would apply to any proposed development projects subject to the proposed ordinance. Such requirements could include consultation with tribes and associated agencies as well as use of archaeological surveys, GIS data, and historic maps to assess potential impacts to cultural and historic resources if needed. The Muckleshoot, Puyallup, Samish, Snoqualmie, Squaxin, Stillaguamish, Suquamish, and Tulalip tribes are regularly notified during the County's SEPA process for proposed development projects, and affected tribes receive notice when the County receives an application for a Type 2, 3, or 4 project, or for a Type 1 project subject to SEPA.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that will not have any direct impacts to cultural or historic resources. However, King County's existing regulations related to avoidance, minimization of, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbances to cultural and historic resources would apply to development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance.

14. Transportation

[Find help with answering transportation questions](#)²¹

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. The proposed ordinance would apply to development project sites that are served by a variety of public streets and highways throughout unincorporated King County. Identifying public streets and highways serving project sites or affected geographic areas and proposed access to existing street systems would occur during project permit review.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. However, unincorporated King County is generally served by public transit. Where applicable, determining approximate distance to

²¹ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-B-Environmental-elements/Environmental-elements-14-Transportation>

the nearest transit stop would occur during project permit review for future development proposals subject to the proposed ordinance.

- 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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly involve any roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian improvements. Where applicable to individual development projects, required or proposed improvements to existing roads, streets, or pedestrian or bicycle transportation facilities will be determined during project permit review.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to transportation facilities. However, individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may use or occur proximal to water, rail and air transportation.

- 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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly generate any vehicular trips. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance would likely generate vehicular trips, and where required, the volume of those vehicular trips will be determined as part of project permit review.

- 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.**

Although the proposed ordinance would not have any direct impact on the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area, individual development projects allowed under the proposed ordinance could generate some additional traffic that could interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products. Where required, such impacts will be determined as part of project permit review.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to transportation volumes. No additional measures to reduce or control transportation impacts are proposed. Development projects subject to the proposed ordinance will be subject to existing zoning and development regulations, including, to the extent required, transportation analysis and mitigation.

15. Public services

[Find help answering public service questions²²](https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-15-public-services)

²² <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-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 proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not directly result in an increased need for public services such as fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, or schools. Any impacts to utilities are addressed in response to question 16.

Individual development projects subject to the proposed ordinance may require additional public services to be available and the need for increased levels will be determined during project permit review.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct impacts to public services, so no additional measures to reduce or control impacts on public services are proposed.

16. Utilities [Find help answering utilities questions²³](#)

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action with no specific site or location. A variety of utilities are generally available in unincorporated King County depending on the service area of specific utility providers. Municipal sanitary sewer is not likely to be available in most rural and agricultural areas in unincorporated King County, with notable exceptions for the Vashon and Snoqualmie Pass Rural Towns, which do have sanitary sewer service.

Domestic water service can be provided through a public water system (Group A or Group B) or private well if a public water system is not able to serve a given property. The proposed ordinance updates King County's review process for water system and general sewer system plans. For further details please see response to question in Part A Section 11, Part B Section 16.b, and Part D.

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

The proposed ordinance is a nonproject action that would not have any direct connection to utilities, and is not directly connected to a development site on which general construction activities would occur. The proposed ordinance includes changes that would affect permit-exempt well access and require new development to connect to public water when it is located within a public water system service area. This may cause affected properties to connect to public water sooner than would have been required under existing code.

The proposed ordinance updates the process for county's review and approval of water system plans and general sewer plans. The review and approval process will undergo changes under this proposal; however,

²³ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-b-environmental-elements/environmental-elements-16-utilities>

this proposed ordinance is not anticipated to result in any impacts to the number of approvals or the likelihood that a plan would obtain approval.

The proposed ordinance adds new requirements for County-approved water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island to support climate resilience and affordable housing goals. Such changes may affect water services in Vashon-Maury Island; however, with added opportunities for alternative water sources, this proposed ordinance is not anticipated to result in impacts to the number of water system plan approvals.

C. Signature

[Find help about who should sign](#)²⁴

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.

1/15/2026

X Robin Proebsting

Signed by: Proebsting, Robin

Type name of signee: Robin Proebsting

Position and agency/organization: Code Writer, King County Department of Local Services

Date submitted: January 16, 2026

²⁴ <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-guidance/SEPA-checklist-guidance/SEPA-Checklist-Section-C-Signature>

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

[Find help for the nonproject actions worksheet²⁵](#)

Do not use this section for project actions.

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

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

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. These activities are subject to existing federal, state, and local regulations that would not be amended by the proposed ordinance. Additional discussion of these impacts is included in response to questions in Part B of this Checklist.

Discharges to water: Discharges to water are anticipated to be unchanged or to decrease as a result of this proposal. The proposed ordinance would change the definition of “Alternative water sources” to allow rainwater catchment as a drinking water source, which may result in a slight reduction of stormwater discharges.

Water resources will have increased protection under this proposed ordinance and some water flows may increase due to the increased protection of groundwater. Refer to Part B.3.a (Surface Water), B.3.b. (Ground Water), B.3.c. (Water Runoff) for a discussion of the proposed changes and their impacts to water.

Emissions to Air: No air emissions are anticipated as a result of this project; however individual development proposals may include air impacts and would be considered under this ordinance and other regulations in effect at the time of project permit application.

Production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances: No change to release of toxic or hazardous substances is anticipated as a result of this proposed ordinance.

Production of noise: No change to noise impacts is anticipated as a result of this proposed ordinance.

• Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

As the proposed ordinance is unlikely to cause impacts from air emissions, toxic or hazardous substances, or noise, no measures to avoid or reduce impacts are proposed. Water discharge impacts are likely to be either minimal or result in improvements to water by limiting or reducing the volume of groundwater withdrawals, and therefore no measures are proposed to reduce or avoid impacts.

²⁵ <https://ecology.wa.gov/regulations-permits/sepa/environmental-review/sepa-guidance/sepa-checklist-guidance/sepa-checklist-section-d-non-project-actions>

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

The proposed ordinance will add requirements for water system plans and include limitations on the per-day volume of water that private wells can withdraw from groundwater. The proposal would also allow rainwater to be used as potable drinking water. Due to the interconnectedness of surface and ground water in some basins, these changes may affect fish and marine life due to a slight change in surface water flows. These impacts are expected to either be minor/negligible or provide positive outcomes for marine life.

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to plants or animals than would otherwise occur under the existing code.

Impacts to Plants and Animals are described in further detail in Part B, Sections 4 and 5.

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

As described above, this proposal is likely to have a minor or positive impact on fish and marine life, and it is not anticipated to affect plant or animal life. Existing regulations that protect and conserve energy and natural resources would apply to development projects reviewed pursuant to the proposed ordinance. No additional measures to avoid or reduce impacts are proposed.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to energy or natural resources than would otherwise occur under the existing code. However, individual development proposals undergoing review or approval under this ordinance may result in some depletion of energy or natural resources. Proposed updates would require recording a property title requirement to limit the volume of water that could be withdrawn from permit-exempt wells, thereby reducing the likelihood of depleting the natural resource of water. Impacts to Energy and Natural Resources are described in further detail in Part B, Section 6.

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

The proposed ordinance will add requirements for water system plans and include limitations on the per-day volume of water that private wells can withdraw from groundwater. The proposal would also allow rainwater to be used as potable drinking water. These changes may have a positive impact on natural resources and may provide some mitigation to impacts from individual development proposals.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to result in activities that would cause a greater impact to environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated as eligible or under study for governmental protection than might otherwise occur under the existing code. Any development project that would be subject to the proposed ordinance would be subject to the same development restrictions concerning environmentally sensitive areas that are currently in place.

The proposed ordinance will add requirements for water system plans and include limitations on the per-day volume of water that private wells can withdraw from groundwater. The proposal would also allow rainwater to be used as potable drinking water. Due to the interconnectedness of surface and ground water in some basins, these changes may positively impact critical aquifer recharge areas, endangered aquatic species and habitat, wetlands, and floodplains by reducing water diversion. However, these impacts are expected to either be minor or negligible.

Impacts to these resources are also addressed in detail in Part B.

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

Existing regulations that protect such resources would apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance and are not changed by the proposed ordinance. The proposed ordinance is anticipated to have a negligible or positive impact on these resources, and therefore no additional measures to avoid or reduce such impacts are proposed.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The proposed ordinance does not alter, and is not anticipated to affect, currently allowed land uses or shoreline uses in unincorporated King County. However, some of the changes proposed in this ordinance may result in indirect impacts to land and shoreline use by changing the requirements for water system plans and permit-exempt wells and withdrawals.

By adding review criteria for water system plans on Vashon-Maury Island regarding planning for affordable housing, the proposed ordinance may increase the likelihood of additional affordable housing being built in the future.

Impacts to land and shoreline use is also discussed in detail in Part B, Section 8.

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

The proposed ordinance does not directly alter currently allowed land uses or shoreline uses in King County. Any indirect impacts to land and shoreline uses would be regulated under existing regulations, and therefore no additional measures are proposed to avoid or reduce impacts.

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

The proposed ordinance is unlikely to increase demands on transportation or public services. The proposed ordinance may result in an increased demand for utilities by adding additional requirements for water system plans, general sewer system plans, and permit-exempt wells. Affected developments or properties may connect to public water sooner under the proposed ordinance than would have been required under the existing code. These impacts would be reviewed when individual development projects are considered.

Impacts to transportation, public services, and utilities are discussed in detail in Part B, Sections 14, 15 and 16.

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

Since it is unlikely that the proposed ordinance will increase demands on transportation or public services, no measures to reduce such demands are proposed. Any increase in utility connections would be reviewed based on availability and capacity. This proposed ordinance is not anticipated to result in an increased number of approvals beyond the utility capacity and therefore no specific measures are proposed to reduce or respond to such demand.

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

The proposed ordinance updates King County Code standards pursuant to Chapter 19.27 RCW and Chapter 90.94 RCW and is consistent with local, state, and federal law requirements for the protection of the environment. Existing regulations related to the protection of the environment, including the County's Critical Areas Code, Shoreline Master Program, King County Code (particularly development regulations such as Title 9 Surface Water Management, Title 10 Solid Waste, Title 13 Water and Sewer Systems, Title 21A Zoning, and Title 23 Code Compliance), the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and others, are not amended by the proposed ordinance. These regulations would still apply to development projects subject to the proposed ordinance in unincorporated King County.