



Snohomish County

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

M/S #604

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE

Proponent: Snohomish County Department of Planning & Development Services
County Administration Building
3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201

Description of Proposal: Proposed ordinance amending the Snohomish County Code titled:

ORDINANCE NO. _____ RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT, REVISING REGULATIONS FOR MARIJUANA BUSINESSES, AMENDING SECTIONS 30.22.100, 30.22.110 AND 30.22.130 OF THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY CODE

Proposed amendments:

This ordinance would amend sections of Title 30 of Snohomish County Code (SCC) to correct a minor code error to regulations for marijuana-related facilities that resulted from adoption of Amended Ordinance No. 15-009 on May 6, 2015.

Lead Agency: Snohomish County Department of Planning & Development Services

Threshold Determination: The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) **IS NOT** required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review by Snohomish County of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with this agency. This information is available for public review upon request.

This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments must be submitted by **May 6, 2016**, to the responsible official at the address listed below.

Appeals:

This DNS together with the subsequent legislative action by the County Council to amend the County Code may be appealed to the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board. **THIS DNS MAY BE APPEALED ONLY WHEN SUCH APPEAL IS COMBINED WITH THE APPEAL OF THE UNDERLYING ACTION PURSUANT TO SCC 30.73.100. THE APPEAL MUST BE FILED WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THE PUBLISHED NOTICE OF THE NOTICE OF ACTION ISSUED SUBSEQUENT TO THE FINAL DECISION BY THE COUNTY.** The Notice of Action describing the final decision by the County to pursue or not pursue the proposed action will be published in the County's paper of record. Any appeal must be filed with the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, at PO Box 40953 Olympia WA 98504-0953 within 60 days following publication in the paper, or as otherwise stated in the Notice of Action or provided by law.

Responsible Official: Barb Mock
Position/Title: Interim Director, Department of Planning & Development Services
Address: 3000 Rockefeller Avenue, M/S #604
Everett, WA 98201-4046



Barb Mock, Interim Director

For further information, contact Alison Hodgkin, Planning and Development Services, (425) 388-3311 ext. 2975.

Date Issued: April 21, 2016
Date Published: April 23, 2016

Distribution:

Washington State Department of Ecology	City of Granite Falls
DOE - SEPA register	City of Lake Stevens
State Agencies (13)	City of Marysville
Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	City of Everett
Snohomish County Assessor	City of Monroe
Snohomish County Public Works	City of Bothell
Snohomish County Sheriff	City of Mill Creek
Snohomish County Parks and Recreation	City of Mukilteo
Snohomish Health District	City of Woodway
City of Arlington	City of Brier
City of Gold Bar	City of Edmonds
City of Index	City of Lynnwood
City of Snohomish	City of Mountlake Terrace
City of Sultan	City of Stanwood
City of Darrington	



SNOHOMISH COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

This checklist is for an ordinance amending sections of Title 30 of Snohomish County Code (SCC) to correct a minor code error to regulations for marijuana-related facilities that resulted from adoption of Amended Ordinance No. 15-009 on May 6, 2015.

Use of Checklist for Nonproject Proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project: *Code amendment ordinance titled:*
RELATING TO GROWTH MANAGEMENT, REVISING REGULATIONS FOR MARIJUANA BUSINESSES, AMENDING SECTIONS 30.22.100, 30.22.110 AND 30.22.130 OF THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY CODE
2. Name of applicant:

Snohomish County, Department of Planning & Development Services
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

*Alison Hodgkin, Project Manager
3000 Rockefeller, M/S 604
Everett, WA 98201
Phone: (425) 388-3311 ext. 2975
E-mail: alison.hodgkin@snoco.org*
4. Date checklist prepared:

April 21, 2016
5. Agency requesting checklist:

Snohomish County, Department of Planning & Development Services

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

Planning Commission briefing and public hearing: April 26, 2016
County Council public hearing: TBD

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

This proposal is for a nonproject action with no directly related plans for future physical additions, expansions, or activities. In the future, the County will review all project-specific planning actions to ensure consistency with Comprehensive Plan policies, implementation of existing regulations, and compliance with SEPA.

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

The Washington State Liquor Control Board (LCB), the agency responsible for establishing a system to license and regulate recreational marijuana production, processing, and retail distribution, conducted a SEPA nonproject review and filed an Environmental Checklist and Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) on June 3, 2013. The LCB issued an addendum to the DNS on September 24, 2013.

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.

There currently are no known applications pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by this proposal.

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

No government approvals or permits are required for this proposal. The Snohomish County Planning Commission has made a recommendation to the County Council who will make a decision on final approval of the regulations.

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 of project description.)

Proposed Amendments:

- *Amend SCC 30.22.100 (Urban Zone Categories: Use Matrix) to add new reference note 131 prohibiting marijuana-related facilities in urban zones within the exterior boundaries of the Tulalip Indian Reservation.*
- *Amend SCC 30.22.110 (Rural and Resource Use Matrix) to: (1) remove reference note 124 from the use column for "Marijuana Collective Garden Dispensary, or Access Point" and "Marijuana Retail," and (2) add new reference note 131 prohibiting marijuana-related facilities in rural and resource zones within the exterior boundaries of the Tulalip Indian Reservation.*
- *Amend SCC 30.22.130 (Reference notes for use matrix) to: (1) repeal the Tulalip restriction from the text of reference note 124; and (2) create new reference note 131 prohibiting marijuana-related facilities within the exterior boundaries of the Tulalip Indian Reservation.*

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.

This nonproject proposal affects lands located within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (circle one): flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____.

Lands within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County include a variation of terrain such as flat, rolling, hilly and steep slopes.

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

Slopes in excess of 100% can be found within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County.

- 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 prime farmland.

A range of soil types are found within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County.

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

Certain areas within Snohomish County have a history of surface instability associated with periods of heavy rainfall. Other areas have a history of more deep-seated instability associated with landslide activity.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

As a nonproject action, no filling or grading is proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review of any proposed grading or filling activity.

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

As a nonproject action, no erosion will occur as a direct result of this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review of any proposed clearing and construction that might result in erosion.

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

As a nonproject action, no impervious surface coverage will occur as a result of this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no erosion reduction or control measures are proposed or required. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would require the implementation of applicable county regulations to reduce or control erosion or other impacts to the earth.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial woodsmoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

As a nonproject action, no emissions to air will occur as a result of this proposal.

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

Not Applicable

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control emissions are required or proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would require the implementation of applicable county regulations to mitigate impacts to air, if any.

3. Water

- a. Surface:

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

There are several streams, seasonal streams, and bodies of water located within Snohomish County.

- 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.

As a nonproject action, this proposal will not require any work in, or adjacent to the described waters. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would require the implementation of applicable county regulations to mitigate activities near surface water bodies, if any.

- 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.

As a nonproject action, no fill or dredge material will be placed or removed from surface water or wetlands.

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

As a nonproject action, no surface water withdrawals or diversion will be required.

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

Not Applicable as this is a nonproject action.

- 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.

As a nonproject action, no discharges of waste materials to surface waters will occur as a result of this proposal.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

As a nonproject action, no groundwater will be withdrawn or discharged. Any groundwater withdrawal will be required to provide documentation that adequate water quantity is available.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals.....; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

As a nonproject action, no waste material will be discharged from septic tanks or other sources as a result of this proposal. Future development or land use actions that would likely result in discharges from stormwater runoff would be subject to project-level SEPA and regulatory review.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 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.

As a nonproject action no runoff will occur as a result of this proposal. Future development or land use actions that would likely result in discharges from stormwater runoff would be subject to project-level SEPA and regulatory review.

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

As a nonproject action, waste materials will not enter ground or surface waters as a result of this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if

SEPA review is required and would address the potential of waste materials entering ground or surface waters.

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

As a nonproject action, no additional measures are required for this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include the implementation of measures to mitigate surface, ground, and runoff impacts.

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle 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
 wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other
 water plants: water lily, eel grass, milfoil, other
 types of vegetation

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

As a nonproject action, no vegetation will be removed as a result of this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include critical areas review of any proposed vegetation removal or alteration.

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

*U.S Fish and Wildlife Services provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.
National Marine Fisheries Service provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.
Washington State Department of Natural Resources provides legal listing of ESA species under its jurisdiction.*

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to preserve or enhance vegetation are required for this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review of any proposed landscaping or measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site.

5. Animals

- a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: **hawks, heron, eagle, songbirds**, other: _____
mammals: **deer, bear, elk, beaver**, other: _____
fish: **bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish**, other: _____

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

U.S Fish and Wildlife Services provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.

National Marine Fisheries Service provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.

Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife provides legal listing for ESA species under its jurisdiction.

Washington State Department of Natural Resources provides legal listing of ESA species under its jurisdiction.

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

Yes. Wildlife species do migrate through the county, but as a nonproject action the proposal will not impact migratory species.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are required or proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any.

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.

As a nonproject action, energy will not be consumed. Site specific actions allowed by this proposal may result in a small increase in demand for electricity.

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

As a nonproject action, there will be no impact on solar energy as a result of this proposal.

- 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:

As a nonproject action, energy conservation features are not applicable to this project. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to mitigate energy impacts, if any.

7. Environmental Health

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

As a nonproject action, no environmental health hazards will result as a consequence of this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no special emergency services are required by this proposal. Site specific actions allowed by this proposal may result in a small increase in demand for County services to protect public safety.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards are required for this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to mitigate environmental health hazards, if any.

b. Noise

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

This nonproject action will not be effected by noise.

- 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.

This nonproject action will not generate noise.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control noise impacts are required or proposed. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to mitigate noise impacts, if any.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

This nonproject action pertains to land within Snohomish County's jurisdiction which includes a wide range of land uses.

- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

This nonproject action pertains to property that may have been used for agricultural production in the past.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Not applicable to this nonproject action.

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

As a nonproject action, no structures will be demolished as a result of this proposal.

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

This nonproject action pertains to all land with the following zoning classifications within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County: Rural-5 Acre (R-5); Rural Business (RB); Rural Industrial (RI); Agriculture-10 Acre (A-10); Clearview Rural Commercial (CRC); Industrial Park (IP); Business Park (BP); Light Industrial (LI); Heavy Industrial (HI); Neighborhood Business (NB); Planned Community Business (PCB); Community Business (CB); General Commercial (GC) and Urban Center (UC).

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

This nonproject action may pertain to the following land use designations within the jurisdiction of Snohomish County: Urban Commercial (UC); Urban Industrial (UI); Urban Center (UC); Transit Pedestrian Village (TPV); Urban Village (UV); Urban Horticulture (UH); Rural Residential10 (RR-10); Rural Residential-5 (RR-5); Rural Residential (RR); Clearview Rural Commercial (CRC); Rural Industrial (RI); Upland Commercial Farmland (UCF); Riverway Commercial Farmland (RCF) and Recreational Land (RL).

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

Not Applicable.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Not Applicable.

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

As a nonproject action, no people would reside or work on the site as a result of this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no people would be displaced as a result of this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts are required by this proposal.

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

The proposed code amendments are compatible with the land use plans and regulations. The proposal requires setbacks, minimum lot size requirements and additional review with site specific mitigation measures to mitigate potential impacts identified for site specific proposals.

9. **Housing**

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

As a nonproject action, no housing units would be provided by this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no housing units would be eliminated by this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control impacts to housing are required or proposed.

10. Aesthetics

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

As a nonproject action, no structures are proposed.

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

As a nonproject action, no views will be altered or obstructed as a result of this proposal.

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

The proposal includes requirements for increased review to help ensure compatibility and mitigate any aesthetic impacts. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review and implementation of measures to mitigate aesthetic impacts, if any.

11. Light and Glare

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

As a nonproject action, no light or glare will occur as a result of this proposal.

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

As a nonproject action, no light or glare that could be a safety hazard or interfere with views will result from this proposal. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and will include review of light and glare from the development.

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

Not Applicable

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

The proposal includes requirements for setbacks and landscaping to help mitigate any light and glare impacts. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to mitigate light and glare impact, if any.

12. Recreation

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

Hunting, fishing, bird watching and many other recreational opportunities exist throughout Snohomish County.

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

This nonproject action will not displace any existing recreational uses.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation are proposed or required. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review and implementation of measures to mitigate impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

- a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to this site? If so, generally describe.

Not applicable to this nonproject action.

- b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

Not applicable to this nonproject action.

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

As a nonproject action, no measure to reduce or control impacts are proposed or required. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and would include review and implementation of measures to mitigate impacts, if any.

14. Transportation

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

Various highways and several state routes and local streets service Snohomish County.

- b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Not applicable to this nonproject action.

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

As a nonproject action, no parking spaces are proposed or required. Future

development must meet the minimum parking requirements as mandated by Chapter 30.26 of the Snohomish County Code.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

As a nonproject proposal, new transportation improvements are not required or proposed. Future development will be reviewed for impacts to the roadway system and improvements to existing roadways may be required on a project-by-project basis.

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

Not Applicable

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

This nonproject action will not directly generate any vehicular trips per day. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review of traffic issues.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control transportation are proposed or required. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include implementation of measures to mitigate any transportation impacts.

15. Public Services

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

As a nonproject action, this proposal will not likely result in an increased need for public services. County services may be needed to review license applications and provide for public safety. Site specific, project actions may affect services such as fire and police. These impacts will be reviewed during the project level permitting of the development.

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

As a nonproject action, no measures to reduce or control impacts on public services are proposed or required. Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required and include review and implementation of measures to mitigate any impacts on public services.

16. Utilities

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

Not applicable to this nonproject action. Any future site specific development or land use proposal would need to have access to electricity.

- 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.

As a nonproject action, no utilities are proposed or required. Any future site-specific development or land use action proposal would need to provide electricity to serve the proposed development.

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.

Signature: 

Alison Hodgkin, Project Manager
Senior Planner, Planning and Development Services

Date Submitted: April 21, 2016

OPTIONAL

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT 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 of 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?

As a nonproject action, no direct impacts will likely occur to water resources or air quality. There will not likely be a direct effect to the production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. Future site-specific land activity would be subject to project-level environmental analysis and threshold determinations. If needed, additional mitigation measures to address impacts would be identified at that time. For any future action related to a project-specific land use impact, County staff would analyze the project-specific land use impact implications and potentially require mitigation measures for any identified significant adverse impacts.

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

As a nonproject action, this proposal will not likely adversely impact animals, fish, plants, or marine life. Site specific proposals may be allowed under this proposal which may have the potential to effect plants, animals, fish or marine life, depending on the proposed facility.

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

As a nonproject action, there are no proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals or marine life. Future site-specific land activity would be subject to project-level environmental analysis and threshold determinations. If needed, mitigation measures to address impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life would be identified at that time. For any future action related to a project-specific land use impact, County staff would analyze the project-specific land use impact implications and potentially require mitigation measures for any identified significant adverse impacts.

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

As a nonproject action, this proposal is not likely to deplete energy or natural resources. There may be a small increase in demand for electricity. Site specific proposals may be allowed under this proposal which may have the potential to deplete energy or natural resources, depending on the proposed facility.

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

As a nonproject action, there are no proposed measures to protect or conserve energy or natural resources. The proposal does require any future site-specific land activity to be subject to project-level environmental analysis and threshold determinations. If needed, additional mitigation measures to address impacts would be identified at that time. For any future action related to a project-specific land use impact, County staff would analyze the project-specific land use impact

implications and potentially require mitigation to protect or conserve energy and natural resources.

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

As a nonproject action, this proposal is unlikely to directly affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for government protection.

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

Future site-specific, project-level actions which require issuance of any state or local permit or license, and that are not categorically exempt under Chapter 197-11-800 WAC, will be evaluated to determine whether review under SEPA and the County's Critical Area regulations (SCC Chapter 30.62A) is required. After reviewing applications for such project actions, the County may determine that mitigation measures are necessary to avoid probable significant adverse environmental impacts.

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?

This proposal does not encourage incompatible land or shoreline uses.

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

Additional project-specific environmental analyses and threshold determinations will be necessary for development of the site. For any future action related to a project specific land use impact, County staff would analyze the project specific land use impact implications and potentially require mitigation measures for any identified significant adverse impacts.

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

As a nonproject action, this proposal is unlikely to directly increase demands on transportation or public services.

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

Future site-specific development proposals would be evaluated at the permit-review level to determine if SEPA review is required. For projects requiring SEPA review, mitigation measures to address any increased demands on transportation or public services and utilities would be identified and required at that time.

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

The proposal should not result in conflicts with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for protection of the environment.