

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. **You may use “not applicable” or “does not apply” only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown.** You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to **all parts of your proposal**, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for lead agencies

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B, plus the [Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions \(Part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in “Part B: Environmental Elements” that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Public Schools Amendments to Land Use Code

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle, Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections ("SDCI")

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

City of Seattle, Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI)
700 Fifth Avenue
P.O. Box 34019
Seattle, Washington 98124-4019

Contact: Chanda Emery

Phone number: (206) 233-2527

Date checklist prepared:

March 31, 2025

4. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle, SDCI

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

The proposed code amendment will be referred to, discussed, and possibly enacted by the City Council during calendar year 2025.

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

No, SDCI does not plan any future additions, expansions or further legislative activity related to or connected with this proposal. Once enacted, the proposed code revision will likely inform future public school development proposals by Seattle Public Schools.

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

None

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

This proposal is a nonproject action that applies citywide. Seattle includes many individual parcels with differing improvements, uses and configurations. This proposal will apply to parcels owned and/or leased by Seattle Public Schools. Customary applications for unrelated governmental approvals of site-specific construction projects are likely in or will be in various stages on parcels across the area.

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

The legislation associated with this proposal will need to be enacted by City Council by ordinance following standard legislative rules and procedures. No other agency approvals are anticipated or required.

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

This proposal is a nonproject action to amend sections of the land use provisions of the Seattle Municipal Code (“SMC,” or “Code”). There is no specific site or development proposal associated with this proposal. Rather, the proposed amended code sections would affect school owned parcels citywide.

The proposal would help build new, modern school projects and allow for new school construction projects to support current educational needs such as flexible classroom design, gyms and outdoor play areas. Specifically, to better support school programming needs, the code updates would:

- Change the requirement to allow 45 feet for the structure height with an additional allowance of 15 feet for screened or enclosed rooftop mechanical equipment in neighborhood residential and lowrise zones;
- Update bus loading requirement to allow existing on-street (curbside) bus loading space to remain;
- Change the parking requirement to one parking space for every two classrooms;
- Update sign standards to allow electric/reader board signs. The update would allow one nonilluminated sign and one electric reader board sign outright, and adds new standards for frequency of movement, color, and operating standards. Current limits on size (height/width/sign area) would be maintained;
- Update the composition and service requirements of the Advisory Committee by modifying the composition of the Advisory Committee to allow a wider range of

expertise; allows more continuity of members, and affords more experience/training for committee members.

- 10. 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 subject area is citywide Seattle Public Schools properties, as mapped in materials accompanying this checklist.

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site:

This is a nonproject action with no specific development site or location. It affects the area of the city that is mapped in materials accompanying this checklist and described above. The sites are generally varied with some parcels containing steep slopes and others are very flat; several are in neighborhood residential areas and generally are highly urbanized citywide.

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

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

This is a nonproject action with no specific site or project location. It affects parcels owned by Seattle Public Schools citywide that have been substantially graded, developed, or otherwise disturbed. SDCI GIS data shows there are steep slopes in the vicinity, and King County iMap contour lines show elevation changes across the affected area.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them, and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

This is a nonproject action with no specific development site or project location. It affects parcels owned by Seattle Public Schools citywide that have been extensively altered by filling, grading, and other activity. No agricultural soils or agricultural land of long-term commercial significance are located within the affected district.

The Geologic Map of Seattle - a Progress Report, published by the U.S. Geological Survey (Report 2005-1252) and prepared in cooperation with the City of Seattle and the Pacific Northwest Center for Geologic Mapping Studies at the Department of Earth and Space Sciences, University of Washington, shows filled river channels and other artificial fill in the vicinity, as well as deposits of alluvium,

younger alluvium and peat. See <https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1252/of2005-1252.pdf>

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

This is a nonproject action. There is no specific site or project location; the affected area, which lies within an area mapped by SDCI as a potential liquefaction prone area. The Seattle area is known to be in an active seismic area, as is the entire Puget Sound region. The area is within a liquefaction prone area.

In the future, individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and applicable regulations for environmentally critical areas.

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.

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would require filling, excavation or grading. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate. For such projects, the amount of filling or grading will depend on site conditions and the scope of the project(s).

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any clearing, construction, development, or use that would cause erosion.

Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate. Existing erosion control measures would continue to apply on sites where construction occurs.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would convert pervious to impervious surfaces or create new impervious surfaces. The proposal covers a highly urbanized area with a comparatively high percentage of impervious surfaces, which would not be altered by the proposed non-project action.

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

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

There are no significant adverse erosion or earth impacts from this nonproject proposal, and no mitigation is required. The proposed non-project action does not involve construction activity, and the indirect effects of this nonproject proposal are not expected to significantly increase the area

subject to land clearing or other factors that could result in erosion. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through impervious surface regulations and/or project-specific environmental review as appropriate.

2. Air

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would produce emissions. As such, the proposal would not directly cause or affect emission of odors, greenhouse gases (GHG) or other pollution emissions.

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

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

Off-site sources of emissions or odor exist in locations around the city. Heavy trucks, especially older-generation trucks, are more likely to be powered by diesel fuels which emit a greater amount of particulates than other vehicle fuels. Sensitive receptors in the subject area could be exposed to emissions from trucks.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would produce, affect, or be affected by air pollution or emissions. Potential emissions impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project specific environmental review as appropriate.

3. Water

a. Surface Water:

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

This is a nonproject action without any specific site or project location in the affected district, which generally does not contain any known surface waters. There are several year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds and wetlands in the city as shown on the City's GIS layers.

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.

This is a nonproject action. There is no specific site or project location within the affected district. This

action does not propose construction of any kind, so the action does not include any work over, in, or adjacent to any waters.

Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through project-specific environmental review where applicable, as well as regulations governing in-water or over-water work as appropriate. Development over, in or adjacent to the described waters would be regulated under the Shoreline code, which is not affected by this proposal.

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

No construction, placement of fill material, or removal of dredging material is proposed as part of this nonproject action. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through project-specific environmental review where applicable, as well as regulations governing dredging and filling as appropriate.

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

This is a nonproject action that does not include surface water withdrawals or diversions of any kind. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through project-specific environmental review where applicable, as well as regulations governing surface water withdrawals or diversions as appropriate.

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

This is a nonproject proposal without a specific site. However, no part of the affected area lies within a 100-year floodplain according to SDCI GIS and King County iMAP. Outside of the area, the Duwamish Waterway has an associated 100-year floodplain. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through project-specific environmental review where applicable, as well as regulations governing flood preparedness.

5. 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 nonproject action does not involve any discharge of waste material to surface waters or anywhere else. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through project-specific environmental review where applicable, as well as regulations governing waste discharge.

b. Ground Water:

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

This is a nonproject action that does not include any withdrawal of groundwater for any purpose. In the future, individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and all applicable regulations pertaining to ground water.

- 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.**

This is a nonproject action that does not include any discharge of waste material into the ground from any source.

The City of Seattle is almost entirely served by sanitary sewage systems. However, future individual projects that may utilize the proposed amendments will be subject to applicable environmental review procedures and surface water regulations as described above, including regulations related to waste discharge to the ground.

c. Water Runoff (including stormwater):

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

This is a nonproject action that would not create or modify any existing source or flow of runoff nor any method of collection or disposal.

In the future, individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and all applicable regulations pertaining to runoff (including stormwater) and methods of collection or disposal. Seattle is served by stormwater systems that include combined, partially separated and separated systems.

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

This is a nonproject action that does not include any action that could cause waste materials to enter ground or surface waters from any source. Future individual projects that may utilize the proposed amendments will be subject to applicable environmental review procedures and water regulations as described above, including regulations related to waste materials entering ground or surface water.

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

This is a nonproject action that does not include any action that could alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity. Future individual projects that may utilize the proposed amendments will be subject to applicable environmental review procedures and water regulations

as described above, including regulations related to drainage patterns.

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

This is a nonproject action that does not include any construction or development activities that could have impacts related to water. There are no impacts to surface water, ground water, runoff, or drainage patterns, no mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed.

In the future, individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and applicable water regulations. These include established policies and regulations to minimize adverse water quality impacts of specific development projects.

4. Plants

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

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- shrubs**
- grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops.**
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- other types of vegetation**

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

No vegetation will be removed or altered by this nonproject action, which affects multiple parcels owned by Seattle Public Schools across a citywide urbanized area. Most of the area has been intensively disturbed by development and redevelopment over the last 100 years. Original vegetation has been extensively cleared, excavated, filled, paved, or occupied by streets and other structures. Remaining vegetation patterns may include greenbelts and urban forest, and including trees, grass, and other vegetation on individual properties. The proposal is not likely to significantly or adversely increase the amount of vegetation removed through redevelopment, but some minor changes in vegetation could occur indirectly as a result of future development if the proposal incrementally encourages development in the affected area.

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

No federally listed endangered or threatened plant species or State-listed sensitive plant species are known to occur within the citywide area affected by this non-project action.

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

None are applicable to this nonproject proposal. In the future, individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and applicable landscaping and planting regulations. Existing landscaping requirements would continue to apply.

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

Himalayan blackberry is known to be present within the citywide urbanized area, and others may also be present. Many species of noxious and invasive plants are commonly found within King County and the City of Seattle. See, for example, the noxious weed lists of the King County Noxious Weed Board (<http://www.kingcounty.gov/services/environment/animals-and-plants/noxious-weeds/laws/list.aspx>).

5. Animals

a. List any birds and other animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

- **Birds:** hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, **other:** crows, pigeons, starlings, robins, gulls, house sparrows and other common urban species
- **Mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, **other:** mice, rats, squirrels, opossum, raccoons, and coyotes.
- **Fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, **other:**

The citywide affected area is heavily urbanized, but may include street trees, planting strips, or other urban environments and habitats.

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

None are specifically known to be present or applicable to this non-project proposal, which affects a citywide urbanized area.

It is conceivable that protected, threatened or endangered species could be present on or near future development sites, but future individual projects that may utilize the provisions of the proposed amendments will be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental review) and applicable regulations.

In King County, five wildlife species are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but these species are not likely to be found in the affected area. These include Canada lynx (*Lynx Canadensis*; Threatened), gray wolf (*Canis lupus*; Endangered), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*; Endangered), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*; Threatened), and northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*; Threatened).

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

This is a nonproject action. The affected area is not known to be a particular migration route.

The larger Puget Sound region is known to be an important migratory route for many animal species. It includes migratory corridors for bald eagles traveling to and from foraging areas in Puget Sound or Lake Washington. Marbled murrelets travel through the planning area between marine waters and their nests in late successional/old growth forests in the Cascade Mountains. Bull trout, steelhead, and Chinook, chum, pink, and coho salmon use the Puget Sound nearshore. Chinook, coho, and sockeye salmon use Lake Washington and Lake Union as migration corridors. Anadromous trout and salmon migrate through the area river and stream systems, including urban streams in Seattle.

The Puget Sound region is also within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl, migratory songbirds, and other birds. The Pacific Flyway extends from Alaska to Mexico and South America.

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

There are no wildlife impacts from this nonproject proposal, no mitigation is required, and no measures to preserve or enhance wildlife are applicable.

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

This is a nonproject action with no specific development site. Many species of invasive animal species are found within King County and the City of Seattle, including nutria (*Myocastor coypus*), rat (*Rattus* spp), pigeon (*Columba livia*), New Zealand Mud Snail (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*), and Asian gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*).

6. Energy and Natural Resources

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would require energy to operate. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or project-specific environmental review. Electricity, natural gas, oil and solar energy are all used in Seattle for heating and other typical uses.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction or development that would affect potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

The proposed nonproject action does contemplate a code change that would allow school projects to build to an 60-foot height limit in the affected area. However, the difference between a future 45-foot structure and a future 60-foot structure would not be expected to affect the potential use of

solar energy by adjacent properties because adjacent properties would have the same screening and setbacks as they do today.

3. 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.

There are no energy impacts, no mitigation is required, and no related features is proposed for this nonproject action. Current and future-updated City energy codes will provide increasing levels of energy efficiency required of each new structure, which would ensure energy conservation is achieved in future development potentially affected by this proposal. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable project-specific environmental review and/or energy regulations. As a mitigation measure, developments would commit to meet the energy conservation building standards and demonstrate compliance with that commitment, in accordance with adopted city regulations.

7. Environmental Health

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

This proposal contemplates a non-project action that would not include any specific construction or activity that could give rise to environmental health hazards. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable project-specific environmental review and/or environmental health regulations.

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

The proposed nonproject action encompasses a citywide urbanized area that contains a diversity of conditions consistent with urbanized areas. It comprises many parcels that have been occupied by various land uses, to potentially include light or heavy industrial uses, for many decades. Different kinds of contamination likely exists at some individual sites within or adjacent to the affected area, and is possible but unconfirmed at other sites. In any event, the proposed non-project action does not include any construction or activities that would encounter contamination. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable project-specific environmental review and/or regulations concerning contamination.

1. 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 nonproject action does not include any development or design that could be affected by hazardous chemicals or conditions.

Although hazardous chemicals or conditions, including pipelines, may exist in the area, potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through

applicable project-specific environmental review and/or regulations concerning hazardous chemicals or conditions.

2. 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.

The proposed nonproject action does not include any development, construction or operating life that would store, use or produce toxic chemicals. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable project-specific environmental review and/or regulations concerning toxics or hazardous chemicals.

3. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The proposed nonproject action does not include any development, construction or operation that could require emergency services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable project-specific environmental review and/or regulations concerning emergency preparedness.

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

The proposed nonproject action has no associated environmental health hazards, no mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable environmental health regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate. Any future development that would move to a 45 foot building and 15 foot screened or enclosed rooftop mechanical equipment would be required as a condition to provide sound insulating windows, air cooling and filtration, and structures would be built to a green building standard as they are today.

b. Noise

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include any construction, development or other activity that could be affected by noise. However, the proposal would affect a citywide, heavily urbanized area that is characterized by typical city noises, particularly traffic, rail, maritime, air freight, construction and equipment noise consistent with urban areas. Different properties within the affected area are exposed to various noise levels depending on the intensities of adjacent uses.

The primary source of noise in the subject area is roadway noise from car and truck traffic. Truck traffic generally generates greater amount of noise than passenger vehicle traffic.

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 is a nonproject action that does not pertain to a specific site or project location, and no construction is proposed. Any potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable noise regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

Existing noise regulations would continue to apply, and potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable noise regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate. As an integrated feature of the proposal, development that accesses the allowed height limit would as a condition provide sound insulating windows.

8. Land and Shoreline Use

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

This nonproject proposal will affect a heavily urbanized citywide area. Generally, the affected area is characterized by a diversity of urban land uses. This proposal will not have specific effect on current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties. The proposal would not make any change to the allowed uses under the existing zoning standards. Any potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable land use regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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?

This nonproject proposal will affect a heavily urbanized citywide area, and no recent use for working farmland or forest is known. There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle, and none will be converted due to this non-project proposal.

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?

This nonproject proposal will not affect or be affected by any known working farm or forest operations of any kind. There are no designated agricultural or forest lands in Seattle.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

This nonproject proposal would affect a citywide area that is heavily urbanized. The affected area is developed with a wide range of structures, ranging from single-family residences to large industrial

structures.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include demolition of any structures. Any potential impacts of future, specific demolition proposals would be addressed through applicable land use regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

This nonproject action affects a citywide area that includes zones such as Neighborhood Residential (NR), Lowrise (LR), Residential Small Lot (RSL), Neighborhood Commercial (NC), Midrise (MR), Seattle Mixed (SM), Commercial (C), and Residential Commercial (RC).

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

This non-project action affects a citywide area which includes, but is not limited to, areas that have been designated as a “Neighborhood Residential Area,” “Manufacturing Industrial Center,” “Residential Urban Village,” “Multi-Family Residential Area,” “Urban Center,” “Hub Urban Village,” “and Commercial Mixed Use Areas,” in Seattle’s future land use map.

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

No shoreline master program designation is applicable.

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

The affected area falls within a large area of Seattle that has been mapped as a liquefaction-prone area on SDCI's GIS map.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not create any specific structure where people could reside or work. However, the underlying goal of the nonproject action is to allow for neighborhood-appropriate development that will support the programming and educational goals for students enrolled in Seattle Public Schools by providing the ability to construct new, modern school facilities that are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not directly create any specific structure that could displace existing residences or businesses. Potential displacement impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

This nonproject proposal would not directly create any displacement impacts, no mitigation is required, and no such measures are proposed.

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

The proposed nonproject action would establish regulations allowing for increased heights and the ability to have one changing image sign (subject to design criteria as part of this proposal) for school projects in the affected area. However, no compatibility impacts are expected to occur as a direct result of this non-project proposal. Potential land use compatibility impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate. Existing land use, noise and nuisance-related regulations would continue to apply, allowing for enforcement actions that would mitigate the potential for adverse compatibility impacts.

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

No such impacts will result, no mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed.

9. Housing

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

The proposed nonproject action would not provide housing.

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

The proposed nonproject action would not eliminate housing units. Any potential housing elimination impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

The proposed nonproject action would not create any housing impacts, and no mitigation is required. Potential housing impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

10. Aesthetics

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include specific new construction or development projects. However, it would allow 45 feet for the structure height with an additional 15 feet of screened or enclosed rooftop mechanical equipment.

Potential height or facade impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review and design review, as appropriate.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include specific new construction or development projects. Potential view impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review and design review, as appropriate.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not itself directly include specific new construction or development projects, nor cause any aesthetic impacts. No mitigation is required, and no related measures are proposed.

11. Light and Glare

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

The proposed nonproject action does not include construction or development projects that would produce light or glare.

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

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

No light or glare would be created by this nonproject proposal.

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

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

The proposed nonproject action does not itself directly include specific new construction or development projects that could be affected by off-site sources of light or glare. The affected area contains a diversity of light and glare sources consistent with urbanized areas.

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

The proposed nonproject action does not cause any light or glare impacts. No mitigation is required, and no related measures are proposed.

12. Recreation

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

No public parks are located within the affected area, but the City of Seattle's citywide park system is shown on the City's GIS layers.

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

The proposed nonproject action would not displace any recreational activities.

In the unlikely event that a future, specific development proposal in the affected area could have an impact on recreational uses in the area, such impacts would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

The proposed nonproject action would not have any direct impacts on recreation, no mitigation is required, and no such measures are proposed.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

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

This is a nonproject action that affects the uses permitted on Seattle Public Schools property citywide. There are many buildings that are over 45 years old, and some may be listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, and city preservation registers.

- b. **Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.**

This is a nonproject action. While Seattle today comprises a highly urbanized and developed area, it is also an area with potential for Native American cultural artifacts. It has several landmarks and evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, and cultural importance within its boundaries. The Duwamish River was an important waterway to the Coast Salish people in the area before the land and waterway was altered by white settlers.

This nonproject action does not affect a single specific project site. It applies to a citywide area. No district-wide or district-specific professional cultural resources studies are known.

- 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.**

This nonproject action does not contemplate any activities that could impact cultural or historic resources on any specific project site. Any impacts of future, specific development proposals on cultural or historic resources would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

- 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 nonproject action does not include construction or development, and there are no activities or impacts that would require the avoidance, minimization, or compensation for loss, changes to, and disturbance to historic and cultural resources. No mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed.

Future individual projects developed pursuant to the provisions of this proposal would be subject to environmental review (if they meet or exceed thresholds for environmental

review) and to the State of Washington's and City's regulations related to the protection of historic and cultural resources.

14. Transportation

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

The proposed nonproject action would affect a citywide urbanized area served by a dense grid of urban streets (residential and arterials) that provide connections to major routes. More specific information on site-specific public streets and highways would be determined during future permitting of individual projects.

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

This is a nonproject action. The City is served by King County Metro, Sound Transit Light Rail and bus service, and other transit agencies.

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 nonproject action does not require any improvements to roads or other transportation infrastructure. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

The proposed nonproject action would not use any of the described transportation modes.

- d. 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 nonproject action would not directly generate any vehicle trips. Changes in the number of vehicular trips could occur indirectly as a result of future development, if the proposal incrementally encourages more development in the affected areas than would otherwise occur.

- 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.**

The proposed nonproject action would not affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural or forest products on roads or streets in the area. Potential impacts of future, specific development

proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

None.

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 nonproject action would not result in any direct increased need for public services. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through applicable regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review, as appropriate.

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

No mitigation is required, and no such measures are proposed.

16. Utilities

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

The proposed nonproject action would be in effect throughout an urbanized citywide area of Seattle. All parcels have electricity, telephone, water and refuse service, and most (but potentially not all) have cable/fiber optics, sanitary sewers, and natural gas. Project-specific information on site-specific utilities would be determined during the design, environmental review, and permitting of individual projects.

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 nonproject action does not include construction or development of any utilities.

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.

X

Signature on file

Type name of signee: Chanda Emery

Position and agency/organization: Senior Planner, Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections.

Date submitted: March 31, 2025

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

IT IS NOT REQUIRED to 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 changes would result in no direct impacts, and are unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to increased discharges to water, emissions to air, production, storage or release of toxic/hazardous substances, or increased production of noise. The eligible locations for development and the allowed scale of development would not be significantly altered by the proposal, and the proposal does not alter procedures or regulations related to natural environment protections.

To the extent that the proposed changes to permitted heights result in slight increases in the construction of new school projects or related activity in the affected areas, the proposal could contribute indirectly to slight additional amounts of water discharge or emissions to air; however, any increase would be very marginal beyond what could occur under the existing code. Similarly, screened or enclosed rooftop mechanical equipment and related development activity would likely contribute indirectly to slight amounts of noise production, and regardless of this, the noise control ordinance sets allowable noise levels and would continue to mitigate noise impacts.

When under development, development sites are likely be fully or almost fully cleared during construction. This means that the construction-period worst-case potential for

spillover impacts to the environment, such as stormwater runoff carrying sediments from graded soils off the site, or air emissions from construction dust, or the amount of construction noise would be approximately the same with or without the proposal. Therefore, this checklist identifies no net differences in typical construction-related adverse water, air or noise impacts with or without the proposal, either on a site-by-site basis or cumulative impact basis.

Any future project-specific development application that is eligible under the proposal will likely be subject to environmental review as a part of the permit review process, and that review would not be affected by this proposal. Similarly, the stormwater and drainage codes would continue to apply and would mitigate stormwater and drainage impacts.

In areas that have not received significant investment in new construction in recent decades, including the subject area, it is common for new development to improve stormwater drainage conditions, and remove toxic or hazardous substances from past land uses. Therefore, if the proposal increases the propensity for redevelopment the proposal could have positive impacts.

See the response to Question #D.5 below for more discussion about land use and development implications.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

This nonproject proposal is not anticipated to result in significant adverse environmental impacts, no mitigation is required. Applicable regulations, including the Land Use Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program, are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions. As an integrated feature of the proposal any development taking advantage of the height would provide sound insulating windows, air cooling and filtration, and would commit to building to a green building standard.

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

The affected area is highly urban in character, and the proposed action does not alter existing protections to plants, animals, fish or marine life, so the proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The proposal is not increasing the number of parcels eligible for development nor altering any regulations related to environmental performance of new development, such as landscaping or stormwater infrastructure requirements.

The potential for adverse environmental impacts to plants, animals, fish, and marine life during and after construction is based on the rationales discussed in the response to

Question #D.1 above. There are not likely to be net differences in potential for these impacts, for scenarios with or without the proposal, either on a site-by-site basis or cumulative impact basis.

During construction, the potential degree of site clearing would be approximately the same with or without the proposal, with similar potential for worst-case spillover impacts of sediments leaving sites and reaching streams and similar areas of potential fish and wildlife habitat nearby.

After construction, there is no inherent reason why the proposal would operate dramatically differently, or generate different kinds of potential adverse plant, animal, fish, or marine life impacts.

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

This nonproject proposal is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to plants, animals, fish or marine life. No mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed. Applicable regulations, including the Land Use Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program, are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions.

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

The proposal would not be likely to generate direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts of depleting energy or natural resources. Similar to the rationales discussed in the response to Questions #D.1 and D.2 above, energy expended to build new buildings in future developments would be relatively similar on a site-by-site and cumulative basis with or without the proposal. There would be little if any difference in potential for consumption of natural resources with this future development, given the typical qualities of Seattle's properties that might experience such development.

Also, any such future development would be subject to meeting Seattle's energy codes, which are becoming progressively more energy-efficient and stringent in promoting energy conservation. This proposal does not alter any regulations directly related to energy or natural resources, such as energy performance standards for new development.

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

This nonproject proposal is not anticipated to result in significant adverse energy or natural resources impacts. No mitigation is required. Applicable regulations, including the energy code, Land Use Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program, are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions.

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 proposal would not be likely to generate direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse impacts on these kinds of environmentally sensitive areas. Implementation of the proposal is not likely to cause future development in locations that might significantly affect wilderness or wild and scenic rivers, floodplains, or prime farmlands, which do not exist in close proximity to the affected area. And similarly, although parks, wetlands and limited threatened or endangered species habitat are present citywide and on some of parcels in the affected area, future development with the proposal is not likely to generate any different potential for significant adverse impacts than if the proposal was not implemented. If present nearby to future development sites, wetlands would continue to receive the same protections through current critical area regulations. The proposed changes would not alter allowances for new development that could (or could not) otherwise occur in or near environmentally sensitive areas under existing regulations.

Regarding historic and cultural sites, see the response to Questions #B.13a – 13d earlier in this checklist. The proposal is not likely to affect whether historic sites or structures might be redeveloped. Existing historic sites or structures are effectively protected by current regulations and so they may only be demolished in rare circumstances that occur with consent of the City. The proposal analyzed in this environmental checklist does not contain provisions that would increase the possibility of future development of housing at historic sites or structures, meaning there is no net difference in the potential for adverse historic site impacts with or without the proposal.

The proposal is also not likely to result in development outcomes that would increase the potential for disturbance of cultural sites or resources. Most cultural sites and resources at risk from future development in Seattle are in unknown locations due to their being buried under soils, although certain vicinities such as near-shore areas are known to have greater potential for presence of such resources given past activities of indigenous peoples. The proposal does not include provisions that would alter the likelihood of future development occurring in any given location or type of vicinity such as near-shore areas. The proposal does not include provisions that would be likely to increase total site clearing and grading of future development, because it is likely that most future development sites would be fully or almost fully cleared during construction with or without the proposal.

Also, implementation of the proposal would not affect the strength of the City's regulatory protection of cultural sites or resources if they are discovered during future development, which is addressed by other State and local regulations, policies, and practices. With or without the proposal, such processes are mandated to stop

construction, assess the resources, and take appropriate next steps for the cultural resources' protection or preservation.

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

This nonproject proposal is not anticipated to result in significant adverse impacts to such resources and habitats. No mitigation is required, and no measures are proposed. Applicable regulations, including the energy code, Land Use Code, SEPA regulations, Environmental Critical Areas regulations, and the Shoreline Master Program, are anticipated to adequately mitigate any impacts of any future associated project-specific actions.

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 proposal would result in no direct impacts and is unlikely to result in indirect or cumulative impacts related to land or shoreline use. For any future development proposals subject to SEPA, the City would retain SEPA authority to mitigate any anticipated incompatibility that might be possible to otherwise occur in future development proposals.

As noted in Part B of the checklist above, the proposal would allow 45 feet for the structure height and an additional 15 feet for screened or rooftop mechanical equipment in the subject area.

The proposal is expected to better account for Seattle Public Schools programming that promote walking, biking and transit use to reflect daily parking demand while maintaining neighborhood compatibility. These code updates would likely allow for more efficient use of school property for playgrounds, outdoor gardening spaces and similar uses. Other portions of the proposal such as the updates to the departures process are expected to make efficient use of resources by adding clarity to this process. Updates to the bus loading standards, will allow for schools to maintain curbside bus loading same as existing practices. The anticipated benefit is better use of resources as well as the continuance in the ability to accommodate needs of staff, students and visitors. The proposal to allow one changing image sign outright with design criteria allows for messaging in multiple languages would likely match current needs of students and families. It is anticipated that the move from the allowance of a sign (not changing image) and existing requirement for a departure request to an allowance of one changing image sign outright with design criteria would maintain surrounding neighborhood compatibility. These effects of the proposal are consistent with non-City service providers goals and policies of the Capital Facilities Element in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The following is a selection of a relevant capital facilities goal and policy related to this proposal.

GOAL

- CF G5 – Make efficient use of resources when investing in facilities and service delivery that involve other agencies and organizations.

POLICY

- CF 5.3 – Partner with Seattle Public Schools to plan for expected growth in student population, explore opportunities to reduce the costs of developing new schools, encourage the siting of new school facilities in or near urban centers and villages, and make it easy for students and families to walk and bike to school.

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

No avoidance or reduction measures are proposed because no significant adverse shoreline or land use impacts are expected. Potential impacts of future, specific development proposals would be addressed through regulations and/or separate project-specific environmental review.

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

The proposal would not increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities.

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

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

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

There are no known conflicts or additional requirements.