

## **WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.**

### 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.

#### *Instructions for applicants:*

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

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.

#### *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).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

#### **A. BACKGROUND**

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

The 2009 Annual Review Docket

2. Name of applicant:

Island County Planning and Community Development – Keith Higman, Interim Director

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

Island County  
P.O. Box 5000  
Coupeville, WA 98239  
360-679-7339

4. Date checklist prepared:

May 20, 2009

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Island County Planning and Community Development

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

It is anticipated that action will be taken by the Board of Island County Commissioners in August/September of 2009.

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

None anticipated.

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

Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Island County GMA Comprehensive Plan, September 1998.

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

None.

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

None.

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

The 2009 Annual Review Docket consists of seven items. Five of those items are being considered under this SEPA review. This environmental checklist pertains to the potential environmental impacts of the following actions:

1. Essential Public Facilities. Amendments to Chapter 17.03 ICC that would list Essential Public Facilities (EPF's) as a Type III conditional use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zoning designations. The County Code does not currently list EPF's as an allowed use in these two zoning designations. Because they are not listed in the Code they are presumed to be prohibited. However, the County Comprehensive Plan does list EPF's as an appropriate use within these two land use designations. The proposed amendments are intended to make the Code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Utility Segregations. Amendments to Chapters 17.03 and 16.06 ICC that would permit unregulated land division below the minimum lot size of the underlying zone when it is for the purposes of siting a utility power substation. Chapter 58.17 RCW has identified this type of land division as an exemption from state law. The proposed amendments are intended to make the County Code consistent with State law.
3. Mini Storage. Amendments to the siting requirements for personal storage facilities within the Rural zone. These amendments would increase the minimum lot size, increase the setbacks, add security enhancements to facilities that are permitted, enhance the landscaping and fencing requirements, modify the hours of operation, modify the access requirements, clarify the storm water management requirements, and require an on-site caretaker.
4. Housing Element. Updating the County's 1998 Housing Element. Amendments are proposed that update the data and profile characteristics of the County, goals and policies and implementation strategies. There are no code changes associated with these amendments.
5. Parks Element. Updating the County's 1998 Parks Element. Amendments are proposed that update the inventory of lands and services, establish categories for different types of parks, and establish implementation strategies for parks and recreation.

The two items that are not being considered under this checklist are listed below. The reasons that they are excluded are described.

6. North Whidbey Rezone. Rezone of 13.5 acres just north of Oak Harbor on Highway 20 from Rural to Oak Harbor - Planned Industrial Park. This is a site specific rezone request and the checklist was prepared by the applicant and submitted with their rezone application.
7. Ebey's Reserve Development Regulations. Because the Town and the County are evaluating modifications to the regulations that govern development in the Reserve together, a separate SEPA checklist is being prepared to consider the amendments prepared for both jurisdictions.

Three of the amendments (essential public facilities, utility segregations, and mini storage) will amend county development regulations and will therefore be able to be utilized on a site by site basis. Environmental impacts of those actions will also occur at the time the land use action is proposed and any subsequent development activities that would occur afterwards. Two of the amendments (parks and housing) are updates to the goals, policies, objective and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan. These items will not result in amendments to the development regulations nor will they enable any specific development activity. They will, however, lay the foundation for future code and policy amendments that would help implement the goals and objectives contained within. Those future amendments, and any future project actions that could occur as a result, will require additional environmental review.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action that applies to all of Island County.

## **B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

### 1. Earth

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

The amendments will apply to all of Island County. Those areas are represented by topography that is flat, rolling, hilly and steep.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. Countywide, slopes range from 0% to 100%.

- 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.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. Countywide, there are a wide variety of clay, sand, gravel, peat, and muck soils. There are also a small portion of prime farmland soils dispersed throughout Island County.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. Countywide, there are both stable and unstable soils.

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

No filling or grading is proposed with these non-project amendments.

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

No construction is proposed with these non-project amendments.

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

No impervious surfaces are proposed with these non-project amendments.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential increase in impervious surface and erosion impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating

the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase impervious surface or erosion that does not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential increase in impervious surface and erosion control that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional impervious surface or risk of erosion. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase in impervious surface and a potential for erosion. The current development regulations address impacts of impervious surface and erosion and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to have increases in impervious surface of man induced erosion impacts, with limited exception, e.g. parking areas, kiosks, walkways. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience an increase in impervious surface and have the potential to create erosion, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. BMPs and ESC measures will be incorporated into any park improvements.

2. Air

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. Emissions to the air will not result directly from the proposed amendments.

- 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:

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for emission impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase emissions to the air that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential emissions that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional emissions or risk of emissions. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable

housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase in emissions as a result of increase automobile traffic and construction activity. The current development regulations address emission impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase emission output, with limited exception, e.g. automobiles that are used to drive to the park. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience an increase in emissions because of the increase in traffic to utilize any newly developed facilities, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches.

Additionally, current building codes and emission laws will provide normal mitigation.

### 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.

This is a non-project action which does not propose any specific development proposals. All types of surface water bodies exist in Island 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.

This is a non-project action which does not propose any specific development proposals.

- 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.

This is a non-project action which does not propose any filling or dredging.

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

This is a non-project action which does not propose any surface water withdrawals or diversions.

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

This is a non-project action which does not propose any land use activities within a 100 year floodplain, however, there are floodplains within Island County.

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

This is a non-project action which does not propose any discharges of waste material to surface waters.

#### b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

- 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.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

#### c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential ground and surface water impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase impacts to ground and surface water that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential for impacts to ground and surface water as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional ground or surface water impacts. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be potential for an ground and surface water impacts. The current development regulations address ground and surface water impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase ground and surface water impacts, with limited exception, e.g. surface water impacts generated as a result of creating a parking area. Parks that are categorized as active properties will have the potential to experience impacts to ground and surface water, e.g. drinking fountains at ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. Strategies have been incorporated that encourage the use of LID on park properties to help mitigate the impacts to ground and surface water.

#### 4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

Island County contains all of the following types of vegetation:

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, eelgrass, milfoil, other

— other types of vegetation

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

Island County is known to have the Golden Paintbrush. Additional species have been identified locally. These species are considered critical areas and protected under the critical areas ordinance.

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

This is a non-project action, therefore there are no specific proposals for landscaping, native plants or other preservation and enhancement measures. Island County Code requires the use of native vegetation in landscaping and includes a variety of different measures to encourage retention of vegetation.

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the the need to preserve or enhance vegetation on site and regulations have been developed to achieve this goal. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to harm native vegetation that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the need to preserve and enhance native vegetation as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional impact to native vegetation. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be a potential to harm native vegetation. The current development regulations address preservation and enhancement of native vegetation and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase harm native vegetation, with limited exception, e.g. creating a parking lot. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience a loss of native vegetation as a result of park improvements, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. Objectives have been incorporated to preserve native vegetation where possible and to develop a plant salvage program that helps save native vegetation that is at risk on privately properties proposed for development.

## 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:

Island County contains the following animals:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, pileated woodpeckers, other woodpeckers

mammals: deer, beaver, coyote

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, and other species found in Puget Sound

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

northern sea lion, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, marbled murrelet, salmon.

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

Whidbey and Camano Islands are part of a migration rout for avian and marine species.

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

This is a non-project action which does not propose any specific development proposals. Critical area regulations have been adopted that include standards for protecting fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. Additionally, a variety of programs are in place that provide additional protection, including the salmon recovery program, Marine Resource Committee efforts, Shore Stewards, Beachwatchers, Conservation Futures Fund and several area specific grant funded initiatives.

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for impacts to wildlife that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase risk to wildlife that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential impact to wildlife as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional impact to wildlife. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase risk to wildlife. The current development regulations address wildlife impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase risk to wildlife, with limited exception, e.g. creation of a parking lot. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience an increase risk to wildlife, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. Current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address wildlife preservation.

## 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.

This is a non-project action which does not propose any specific development proposals.

- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.  
N/A, non-project action
- 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:

N/A, non-project action

## 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.

The proposed amendments are a non-project action.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

Because this is a non-project action no measures are proposed at this time. Measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards will be addressed relative to future proposed projects that would be allowed under these amendments.

- b. Noise

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

This is a non-project action.

- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

Because this is a non-project action no measures are proposed at this time. Measures to reduce or control noise will be addressed relative to future proposed projects that would be allowed under these amendments.

## 8. Land and shoreline use

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

Current land uses include forestry, agriculture, residential and commercial.

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

None identified at this time.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

- 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?

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the issue of compatibility and established regulations that are designed to address compatibility. Those regulations will be implemented in conjunction with a project proposal. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or compatibility issues that do not already exist under current development regulations. Regulations have been adopted that address compatibility between uses. Those regulations will be implemented in conjunction with a project proposal.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered compatibility as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact and enhanced compatibility with surrounding areas. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not compromise compatibility. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed it will be reviewed for compatibility with surrounding land uses. The current development regulations address compatibility and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to compromise compatibility, with limited exception, e.g. patrons who venture on to adjacent privately owned land. Parks that are categorized as active properties will need to be reviewed for compatibility so that adjacent properties are not impacted by light, noise, traffic, trespassing, etc. Current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address compatibility.

9. **Housing**

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

This is a non-project action.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.  
N/A
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:  
The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. The only portion of these amendments that will have an impact on housing are the amendments to the housing element. These amendments are designed to have a positive impact on housing by creating strategies that, if followed, will increase the spectrum and availability of housing.

10. **Aesthetics**

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?  
N/A
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?  
N/A
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for aesthetic impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential for aesthetic impacts that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential impact to aesthetics as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional impacts to aesthetics. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be a potential risk to aesthetics. The current development regulations address aesthetics and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase risk to aesthetic value, with limited exception, e.g. creation of a parking lot. Parks that are categorized as active properties have the potential to compromise aesthetics in some ways, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches, but the overall impact is an enhancement to community aesthetics. Current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address aesthetic preservation.

11. **Light and glare**

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?  
N/A
- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

N/A

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

N/A

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for light and glare impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase light and glare impacts that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential light and glare impacts as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional light and glare impacts. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase risk of light and glare impacts. The current development regulations address light and glare impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase light and glare impacts, with limited exception, e.g. creation of a lit parking lot. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience an increase in light and glare impacts, e.g. lit ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. Current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address light and glare impacts.

## 12. Recreation

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action. The parks element is intended to enhance park and recreation opportunities throughout the entire county.

## 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 the site? If so, generally describe.

N/A

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

N/A

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for impacts to archaeological and historic resources that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to archaeological and historic resources that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential impact to archaeological and historic resources as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional impact to archaeological and historic resources. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase risk to archaeological and historic resources. The current development regulations address archaeological and historic resource impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase risk to archaeological and historic resources. Parks that are categorized as active properties are more likely to impact archaeological and historic resources, however, current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address their protection.

#### 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.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

All of Island County is served by public transit.

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

N/A

- 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).

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

N/A

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of EPF's. Those amendments included listing EPF's in the Comprehensive Plan as appropriate and allowed uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The previous environmental review considered the potential for transportation impacts that could occur as a result of the amendments. The current amendments are intended to make the code consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Utility Segregations:** The 1998 DEIS/FEIS evaluated the environmental impact of allowing major and minor utilities within various zoning designations. The current amendments do not change the size, intensity, or zoning requirements of utility siting. The current amendments enable those facilities to be located on their own parcel. The act of creating the property lines does not create any additional potential for environmental impact or any potential to increase transportation impacts that do not already exist under current development regulations.

**Mini Storage:** The environmental review conducted under Ordinance C-63-99 considered the potential adverse impacts of personal storage facilities in the Rural zone. The previous environmental review considered the potential impact to transportation as a result of the amendments. The current amendments have the impact of reducing the overall intensity of mini storage developments and therefore result in a reduced level of potential environmental impact. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Housing:** The housing element does not include changes to county development regulations or propose any project actions. Amendments to the housing element do not create any additional transportation impacts. The policies and objectives within the housing element do, however, address actions that are intended to promote affordable housing. If an affordable housing development application is proposed there will be an increase risk of transportation impacts. The current development regulations address transportation impacts and will be implemented during the application review process and construction. In addition, further environmental review will be required in conjunction with a future project action proposal.

**Parks:** The parks element does not include changes to county development regulations or proposed any project actions. Amendments to the parks element do outline various management strategies and categorization of park properties. Parks that are categorized as passive use and conservation lands are not likely to increase transportation impacts, with limited exception, e.g. traffic that will be created for using the park. Parks that are categorized as active properties will experience an increase traffic impact, e.g. ball fields, developed picnic areas, boat launches. Current regulations and strategies within the proposed plan amendments are intended to address 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.

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

#### 16. Utilities

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

The proposed amendments constitute a non-project action.

- 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 amendments constitute a non-project action.

#### 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:

Date Submitted: .....

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

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

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

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). If an EPF is proposed and approved there is a likelihood that there could be an increase in discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. These potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not increase the likelihood of discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or the production of noise over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not increase the likelihood of discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or the production of noise over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to increase the likelihood of discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or the production of noise over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Additionally, some of the implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include

limitations on housing size which will have the effect of reducing impervious surfaces. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to increase discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or the production of noise over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. However, the amendments do include standards for categorizing parks. Parks that are categorized as active use parks will have a higher percentage of impervious surface (potentially impacting discharges to water), will generate a higher level of traffic, e.g. ball games (potentially increasing emissions), and are more likely to increase noise levels during games and events. The proposed plan addresses some of these potential impacts through other implementation strategies. Additionally, these potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not increase the likelihood of increasing discharges to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or the production of noise.

**The following is list of existing regulations that will be triggered for any development activities that the proposed amendments may enable.**

**Examples of regulations that address discharge to water:**

Chapter 11.02 ICC – clearing and grading regulations which condition projects that remove vegetation and expose soil. Regulations have been adopted that designate erosion hazard areas in which specific best management practices are required.

Chapter 11.03 ICC – regulations that address stormwater impacts as a result of new land use activities. Critical Drainage Areas have been designated where heightened stormwater requirements have been established in areas that have greater erosion risk. Requirements are established for ensuring that post development runoff impacts do not exceed pre development levels.

Chapter 8.07 ICC – regulations that address septic system installation and management.

Chapter 8.09 ICC – regulations that establish pollution control conditions around wells. Critical aquifer recharge areas have been established where land use activities may pose a higher risk to aquifers.

Chapter 16.14C ICC – environmental policy that implements requirements for SEPA review of specific projects.

Chapter 17.02 ICC – regulations that protect surface water features/critical areas such as wetlands, streams, marine areas, etc. Regulations include buffers which have been sized, in part, on assuring that water quality is not degraded.

Chapter 17.03 ICC – regulations that establish impervious surface coverage limitations.

Best Management Practices and Erosion and Sedimentation Controls – all development proposals must adhere to these practices which reduce silt and erosion runoff which may enter ditches, streams, wetlands, lakes and marine waters.

**Examples of regulations that address emissions to air:**

Northwest Air Pollution Control Authority – regulates emissions to air.

Chapter 16.14C ICC – environmental policy that implements requirements for SEPA review of specific projects.

Chapter 17.03 ICC – regulations that govern dust, odor, smoke, toxic gas and other emissions from land use activities.

**Examples of regulations that address production, storage or release of toxic materials:**

Chapter 16.14C ICC – environmental policy that implements requirements for SEPA review of specific projects.

Chapter 8.07C ICC – on-site sewage regulations.

Chapter 8.08B ICC – solid waste handling regulations.

**Examples of regulations that address noise:**

Chapter 173-60 WAC – state administrative code that that establishes noise emission standards and thresholds.

Chapter 16.14C ICC – environmental policy that implements requirements for SEPA review of specific projects.

Chapter 17.03 ICC – zoning regulations limit land use and intensity within different zoning designations

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). If an EPF is proposed and approved there is a likelihood that it will affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. These potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Additionally, some of the implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include limitations on housing size which will have the effect of reducing impervious surfaces. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. However, the amendments do include standards for categorizing parks. Parks that are categorized as active use parks will likely be subject to future development and/or land improvements that affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The proposed plan addresses some of these potential impacts through other implementation strategies. Additionally, these potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not increase the affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life.

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

The County has adopted the following regulations which help protect and conserve plants, animals, fish and marine life:

Chapter 11.02 ICC – the clearing and grading regulations provide a mechanism for early identification of important plant, animal, fish and marine resources. Prior to removal or destruction of habitat and/or important plants the County is better able to identify, protect and condition projects.

Chapter 11.03 ICC – stormwater regulations help protect water quality, preserve flow patterns and control runoff.

Chapter 16.14C ICC – environmental policy that implements requirements for SEPA review of specific projects.

Chapter 17.02 ICC – regulations have been adopted that protect wetlands, streams, marine areas, locally significant flora and fauna, flora and fauna that are identified by the state and federal government, kelp and eelgrass beds, surf smelt and pacific herring spawning grounds, shellfish beds, habitats of local importance, natural heritage lands. Buffers are established which are designed to protect water quality and habitat. A water quality monitoring program has been adopted which is designed to monitor water quality conditions and initiate actions to correct any problems that are identified.

Chapter 17.03 ICC – In excess of 80% of Island County is zoned as low density (1 house per 5 acres, 10 acres and 20 acres) or is in state and/or county public ownership (e.g. passive parks).

Best Management Practices and Erosion and Sedimentation Controls – all development proposals must adhere to these practices which reduce silt and erosion runoff which may enter ditches, streams, wetlands, lakes and marine waters. Clean water helps protect plants, animals, fish and marine life.

Salmon Recovery Program – the County has adopted a Salmon Recovery Plan which establishes the policies and goals for restoring salmon habitat.

Non-Point Pollution Planning – the County has adopted three non-point pollution prevention plans that are designed to prevent and reduce water quality degradation.

Marine Resource Committee efforts – on going County sponsored initiatives to restore and protect marine resources and habitat.

Countywide grant programs – South Holmes Harbor Shellfish Protection District; Strawberry Point Assessment; acquisition, restoration and protection of Ala Spit; acquisition of Iverson Farm; acquisition of Deer Lagoon; acquisition of Swantown Lake; acquisition and enhancement of English Boom; development of stewardship plans that restore and protect Kristoferson and Chapman Creeks; WSU Beachwatchers.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). If an EPF is proposed and approved there is a likelihood that it will utilize and therefore deplete energy or natural resources. These potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments are not likely to deplete energy or natural resources over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not further deplete energy or natural resources over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to deplete energy or natural resources over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Additionally, some of the

implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include limitations on housing size which will have the effect of lessening the depletion of energy and natural resources. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to deplete energy or natural resources over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not increase the likelihood of depleting energy or natural resources.

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

International Building Code – includes standards for energy efficiency.

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?

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). Depending upon the location, if an EPF is proposed and approved it could affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection. These potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Additionally, some of the implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include limitations on housing size which will have the effect of reducing impervious surfaces. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. The implementation strategies include actions that provide increased protection and management strategies that help preserve environmentally sensitive areas.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not increase the likelihood of affecting environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for governmental protection.

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

Those same measures outlined in question #2 are the same measures that will protect environmentally sensitive areas.

Chapter 17.02 ICC – the critical area regulations protect wetlands and other environmentally sensitive areas from development. New development will be required to adhere to specific buffer setbacks.

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?

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). It has already been determined that EPF's can be compatible uses in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. Potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not adversely affect land and shoreline use, or compatibility with existing plans over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts related to compatibility with surrounding properties and other land uses. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not adversely affect land and shoreline use, or compatibility with existing plans over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to adversely affect land and shoreline use, or compatibility with existing plans over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Additionally, some of the implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include limitations on housing size which will have the effect of reducing impervious surfaces. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to adversely affect land and shoreline use, or compatibility with existing plans over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. However, the amendments do include standards for categorizing parks. Parks that are categorized as active use parks will have a higher likelihood of adversely affecting land use compatibility as a result of ball games and public events. The proposed plan addresses some of these potential impacts through other implementation strategies. Additionally, these potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not adversely affect land and shoreline use, or compatibility with existing plans.

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

Land use, zoning and shoreline regulations are in place that address compatibility with other land uses and the shoreline environment.

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

**Essential Public Facilities:** The Comprehensive Plan already lists Essential Public Facilities as an allowed use in the Rural Forest and Rural Agriculture zones. The County Code makes it clear that if there is a conflict between the Plan and the code, the Plan shall prevail. In other words, applications for EPF's in these two zoning designations can be applied for under the current policy and code framework and could be approved (provided all other regulations are met). If an EPF is proposed and approved there is a likelihood that there could be an increase demand on transportation or public services and utilities. These potential impacts would have to be considered under future SEPA environmental review and a variety of existing regulations would be triggered that are intended to address these impacts. However, because these uses are already allowed in these zoning designations this code amendment does not have the affect of increasing the likelihood of these potential impacts. Furthermore, the potential increased risk of these impacts was considered under the environmental review that occurred for Ordinance C-63-99.

**Utility Segregations:** Utility substations and facilities are already listed as permitted or conditionally permitted in each zoning designation. These facilities can already be cited on a parcel of land which can also be used for the other permitted uses that are allowed in the zone. For example, a 5 acre parcel that is zoned Rural allows for a single family residence. It also allows utilities, e.g. a power substation. Both the home and the substation could be located on the same parcel. The utility segregation provisions allow the land upon which the substation is located to be segregated out from the remainder of the property. The utility segregation provisions address ownership. They do not allow additional density or increase intensity over that which is currently allowed. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not increase the demand on transportation or public services and utilities over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations. These amendments only allow a line to be drawn on the parcel map so that ownership options expand beyond easement interest.

**Mini Storage:** The mini storage amendments have the impact of decreasing development potential and/or further mitigate potential adverse impacts. Therefore, the proposed amendments will not increase the demand on transportation or public services and utilities over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the environmental review that was conducted for Ordinance C-63-99. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Housing:** The proposed amendments are not likely to increase the demand on transportation or public services and utilities over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. Housing is allowed in all zoning designations. These amendments will not increase the development potential, density or intensity that is currently allowed. The amendments do try to expand the variety of housing that will be allowed in the future. Any housing that is allowed in the county will have some impact on the demand for transportation or public service and utilities. If an affordable housing development is approved it is likely that it will place higher demands on the public transit system. The implementation strategies suggest that close coordination is needed with Island Transit and that affordable developments should be placed in close proximity to public transit services. Other implementation strategies suggest that density bonuses and other incentives should be considered for incorporation into the existing regulations. At this time it is uncertain what those incentives will be, however, it is not certain that they will include increases in density or intensities that are currently allowed. In fact, it is just as likely that those incentives may include limitations on housing size which will have the effect of reducing impervious surfaces. Additional environmental review will be required for any proposed code changes that implement this strategy. These potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

**Parks:** Overall, the proposed amendments are not likely to increase demand on transportation or public services and utilities over that which is currently permitted or that was previously considered under the 1998 DEIS/FEIS. However, the amendments do include standards for categorizing parks. Parks that are categorized as active use parks will have a higher demand on transportation or public services and utilities. The proposed plan addresses some of these potential impacts through other implementation strategies. Additionally, these potential impacts will continue to be addressed under future SEPA environmental review and/or the implementation of a variety of existing regulations.

Overall, the proposed amendments do not increase the demand on transportation or public services and utilities.

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

Island County Transportation Plan

Island Transit

Chapter 11.04 ICC – Concurrency

Island County Coordinated Water System Plan

Island County Watershed Plan

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

It is not anticipated that there are any conflicts with local, state or federal laws for the protection of the environment. Existing environmental protections are in place and the proposed amendments do not grant any special privilege to avoid those regulations.