

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

UPDATED 2014

Purpose of checklist:

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

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Increases in Development Capacity and Related Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) Implementation in Downtown and South Lake Union

2. Name of applicant:

City of Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development

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

Office of Planning and Community Development
700 5th Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, Washington 98104
Contact: Brennon Staley, Strategic Advisor, (206) 684-4625

4. Date checklist prepared:

May 5, 2016

5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Seattle Office of Planning and Community Development

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

Approval by City Council and Mayor in mid to late 2016.

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

This proposal represents a discrete action to increase development capacity and implement mandatory housing affordability (MHA) requirements for commercial and residential development in Downtown and South Lake Union. A procedural framework for the commercial portion of MHA, along with payment and performance amounts, was adopted in November, 2015. Separate legislation, already transmitted to Council, would

establish a procedural framework for the residential portion of the MHA program, but does not set payment or performance amounts for any particular areas. Various amendments to the City's existing incentive zoning programs and the commercial portion of MHA are also under consideration. The proposal addressed in this checklist does not anticipate the need for additional follow-on actions at a later date, though rezone proposals for other areas of the City could implement MHA in those areas.

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

In addition to the SEPA determination that will be prepared for this proposal, the following documents were prepared that are related to this proposal:

- Mandatory Housing Affordability Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Design Study, May 2016
- Downtown Height and Density Draft Environmental Impact Statement, November 2003
- Downtown Height and Density Final Environmental Impact Statement, January 2005
- Livable South Downtown Planning Draft Environmental Impact Statement, November 2007
- Livable South Downtown Planning Final Environmental Impact Statement, May 2008
- South Lake Union Height and Density Alternatives Draft Environmental Impact Statement, February 2011
- South Lake Union Height and Density Alternatives Final Environmental Impact Statement, April 2012
- Mandatory Housing Affordability Transportation Study: Downtown and South Lake Union, May 2016, Fehr & Peers
- Policy Options for Refining Seattle's Incentive Zoning Program, July 2014, Cornerstone Partnership
- Seattle Affordable Housing Incentive Program Economic Analysis, October 10, 2014, David Rosen & Associates
- Seattle Affordable Housing Nexus Study, Economic Impact Analysis for Low- and Mid-Rise Residential, Mixed Use and Non-Residential Prototypes, David Paul Rosen & Associates, May 18, 2015
- Seattle Non-Residential Affordable Housing Impact and Mitigation Study, David Paul Rosen & Associates, September 15, 2015
- Recommendations for implementation of an Affordable Housing Linkage Fee, September 12, 2014, memo by Cornerstone Partnership
- City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan, Housing Appendix

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.

- A number of development proposals submitted under active applications relate to properties throughout the project area.
- MHA-Residential Framework legislation (refer to the response to question #7 above)
- Incentive Zoning and MHA-Commercial Update legislation (refer to the response to question #7 above)

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

Approval of ordinances, including zone changes, by Seattle City Council.

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.)

This is a non-project proposal. The proposal would create additional commercial and residential development capacity in the form of an increase in the amount of height or floor area allowed by zoning in Downtown, South Lake Union, and an adjacent area zoned IC 85-160. In connection with such increases in development capacity, this proposal would implement Mandatory Housing Affordability (MHA) requirements in those zones gaining additional development capacity. Under MHA, developers would be required to provide affordable housing, either through payment or performance, when creating new commercial or residential development according to the standards in Seattle Municipal Code Chapters 23.58B and 23.58C.

Key aspects of MHA include:

- Applicability:** The proposal would apply to residential and commercial uses. For residential uses, the proposal would apply to any development that adds one or more dwelling units (except accessory dwelling units and detached accessory dwelling units), live-work units, or sleeping rooms in a congregate residence as part of construction of a new structure; construction of an addition to an existing structure that increases the total number of units; an alteration to an existing structure that increases the total number of units; or a change of use to residential or live-work that results in an increase in the total number of units. For commercial uses, the program would apply to development of either a new structure, or an addition to an existing structure, that contains more than 4,000 square feet of new chargeable floor area that will be devoted to commercial use.
- Contribution to Affordable Housing.** The proposal would require provision of affordable housing by means of performance or payment. Performance means an applicant would include affordable housing on-site as part of the development. Commercial development would also have an option of providing the affordable housing off-site. Payment means an applicant would pay into a fund that the City would use to develop affordable housing. The specific requirements would vary by zone but would generally fall in the following ranges:

	Performance Option	Payment Option
	% of total housing units (for residential) or percentage of new chargeable floor area (for commercial)	\$ per square foot of above-ground gross floor area (for residential) or chargeable floor area (for commercial)
Residential	2-6%	\$5-13
Commercial	5-11%	\$8-18

- AMI target:** Housing provided through the performance option would have to be affordable to households with incomes at the time of occupancy not exceeding 60% of Area Median Income (AMI) for rental units that are 400 square feet or greater, 40% of AMI for rental units that are less than 400 square feet, and 80% of AMI for ownership units. For rental units, recertification of incomes would be required on an annual basis and households would be considered to satisfy the AMI requirement if their income at the time of recertification did not exceed 80% of Area Median Income (AMI) for rental units that are 400 square feet or greater, 60% of AMI for rental units that are less than 400 square feet.
- Exempted Areas:** The following zones would be exempt from the proposal: all Pioneer Square Mixed (PSM) zones, Pike Market Mixed (PMM), Downtown Harborfront 1 (DH1), DH2/55, DH2/85, SM-SLU 85/65-160, IDM-65-120, IDM 75-85, and C2-40.
- Additional Development Capacity:** A summary of the additional capacity that would be provided is shown below. In a limited number of zones, the proposal includes two options for additional residential capacity: either additional height or larger tower floor plates. The final legislation is anticipated to implement one of these proposals, not both.

Zone	Additional Residential Capacity	Additional Commercial Capacity
DH2/65	10 feet height	10 feet height
DMC-65	10 feet height	1 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMC-85	10 feet height	1 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMC 85/65-150	10 feet height	1 FAR increase
DMC-125	20 feet height	1 FAR increase, 20 feet height
DMC-160	10 feet height	1 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMC 240/290-400	40 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate ¹	1 FAR increase
DMC 340/290-400	40 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate ¹	1 FAR increase
DMR/C 65/65-85	10 feet height	0.5 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMR/C 65/65-150	20 feet height, 10% tower floor plate above 125 feet ²	0.5 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMR/C 85/65	10 feet height	0.5 FAR increase, 10 feet height
DMR/C 125/65	20 feet height ²	0.5 FAR increase
DMR/C 240/125	30 feet height, 10% tower floor plate above 125 feet	0.5 FAR increase
DMR/R 85/65	10 feet height ²	0.5 FAR increase
DMR/R 125/65	20 feet height ²	0.5 FAR increase
DMR/R 240/65	30 feet height, 10% tower floor plate above 125 feet	0.5 FAR increase
DOC1 U/450/U	1,000 sf tower floor plate	1 FAR increase
DOC2 500/300-500	40 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate ¹	1 FAR increase
DRC 85-150	20 feet height ²	1 FAR increase
IC 85-160	none	0.5 FAR increase, 15 feet height
IDM 75/85-150	20 feet height	1 FAR increase, 10 feet height
IDM 150/85-150	20 feet height	1 FAR increase, 15 feet height
IDR 45/125-240	30 feet height, 5 percentage increase in coverage above 125 ft ²	0.5 FAR increase
IDR 150	20 feet height ²	0.5 FAR increase
IDR/C 125/150-240	30 feet height, 5 percentage increase in coverage above 125 ft ²	1 FAR increase
SM-85	10 feet height, 0.75 FAR	0.5 FAR, 15 feet height
SM-125	20 feet height, 1.5 FAR	0.5 FAR, 20 feet height
SM-SLU 85/65-125	20 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate and 5% coverage increase ¹	0.5 FAR increase, 15 ft Height
SM-SLU 85-240	30 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate and 5% coverage increase ¹	None
SM-SLU 160/85-240	30 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate and 5% coverage increase ¹	1 FAR increase, 15 foot height

SM-SLU 240/125-400	40 feet height <u>OR</u> 1,000 foot increase in the average tower floor plate and 5% coverage increase ¹	1 FAR increase
SM-SLU/R 55/85	10 feet height	10 feet height
¹ proposal considers two options for additional residential development capacity; final legislation would implement one option or the other, not both ² could also modify height breakpoints for coverage and floor plate limits		

- Modifications of Development Standards:** Modifications to development standards would be allowed in certain situations where projects might not be able to achieve some or all of the additional development capacity that is proposed. If the final legislation included the option of allowing taller rather than wider buildings (where discussed in the table above), the following modifications would be allowed:
 - In a DMC 240/290-400, DMC 340/290-400, SM-SLU 85-240, SM-SLU 240/125-400, or SM 85/65-125 zone or in a SM-SLU 160/85-240 zone located outside of the South Lake Union Seaport Flight Corridor, if development standards, such as limits on the number of towers per block, tower separation requirements, or setbacks, would prohibit a tower or would result in a tower that would be less than 7,500 square feet, the maximum height for structures that would be allowed without meeting tower standards would be increased by 10 feet. This allowance would change the height limit for structures that do not meet tower standards from 160 to 170 feet in DMC 240/290-400 and DMC 340/290-400 zones and from 125 to 135 feet in the SM-SLU 240/125-400 zone and from 85 to 95 feet in SM-SLU 85-240 and SM-SLU 160/85-240 zones and from 65 to 75 feet in SM-SLU 85/65-125 zones.
 - For projects in a SM-SLU 160/85-240 zone located in South Lake Union Seaport Flight Corridor that could not achieve their maximum height, the average gross floor area of all stories with residential use above the podium height would be allowed to increase by 10%, except that for lots less than 12,500 square feet the upper-level floor area limit according to subsection 23.48.245.A would also be increased from 50 percent to 67 percent. If development standards in Title 23 would prohibit a development from using the larger floor plate discussed above, the maximum height for structures that would be allowed without meeting tower standards would be increased by 10 feet. This allowance would change the height limit for structures that do not meet tower standards from 85 to 95 feet.

If the final legislation included the option of allowing wider rather than taller buildings, the following modifications would be to be provided:

- In a DMC 240/290-400, DMC 340/290-400, SM-SLU 85-240, SM-SLU 240/125-400, SM 85/65-125, or SM 160/85-240, where development standards, such as limits on the number of towers per block, tower separation requirements, or setbacks, would prohibit a development from using the additional floor plate granted through this legislation, additional height equal in floor area to the amount of floor area that was granted but couldn't be used would be allowed.
- In a DMC 240/290-400, DMC 340/290-400, SM-SLU 85-240, SM-SLU 240/125-400 or SM 85/65-125 zone or in a SM-SLU 160/85-240 zone located outside of the South Lake Union Seaport Flight Corridor where development standards, such as limits on the number of towers per block, tower separation requirements, or setbacks, would prohibit a tower or would result in a tower that would be less than 7,500 square feet, the maximum height for structures that would be allowed without meeting tower standards would be increased by 10 feet. This allowance would change the height limit for structures that do not meet tower standards from 160 to 170 feet in DMC 240/290-400 and DMC 340/290-400 zones and from 125 to 135 feet in the SM-SLU 240/125-400 zone and from 85 to 95 feet in SM-SLU 85-240 and SM-SLU 160/85-240 zones.

- For projects in a SM-SLU 160/85-240 zone located in South Lake Union Seaport Flight Corridor that could not achieve the height allowed under the first bullet, the maximum height for structures that would be allowed without meeting tower standards would be increased by 10 feet. This allowance would change the height limit for structures that do not meet tower standards from 85 to 95 feet.
- **Modification of Affordable Housing Requirements:** Modifications to payment and performance amounts would be allowed in certain situations where development standards prevent use of the additional development capacity and modifications to development standards would not address the issue. Specifically, a reduction of the payment and performance amounts would be allowed if development standards in Title 23 would prohibit partial or total use of the additional development capacity that was provided as part of this proposal. The maximum reduction would vary by zone from 10-25% and would be prorated if only a portion of the extra development capacity could be used.

Additionally, the proposal would change the point in the permit process that would be used for considering which proposal is first for purposes of determining tower regulations. Under existing rules in certain zones, new towers must be separated from existing towers by specified distances and, in some cases, may not be located on the same half block as an existing tower. Where two towers are proposed to be located in close proximity, the City relies on the provisions of Seattle Municipal Code Section 23.48.245 for Seattle Mixed zones and Section 23.49.058 for Downtown zones to determine which project is first. Currently, this decision is generally based on which project receives a Master Use Permit decision. This situation can be very problematic where projects have similar timelines as it is not known until the end of the permit process which project will be issued the Master Use Permit. Additionally, it could result in a situation where factors outside the control of the applicant such as the workload and vacation schedule of permit reviewers could determine the outcome. This proposal would change the key point from issuance of the MUP permit to point at which a complete application for early design guidance has been filed.

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

This ordinance would affect certain zones in the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers as well as a limited geographic area zoned IC 85-160 that abuts the southern boundary of the Downtown Urban Center. The following zones that are present within the project study area would be exempted from the proposal: all Pioneer Square Mixed zones, Pike Market Mixed, Downtown Harborfront 1, DH2/55, DH2/85, SM 85/65-160, IDM 65-150, IDM 75-85, and C2-40.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

** PER WASHINGTON STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, THIS SECTION IS LEFT BLANK. **

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site
(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous,
other _____
- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.
- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.
- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.
- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.
- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

3. Water

- a. Surface Water:

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.
- 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.
- 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.
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
- 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.

b. Ground Water:

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

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.
- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.
- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

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

4. Plants

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

____deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

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

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?
- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:
- e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

5. Animals

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

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

- b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
- e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

6. Energy and natural resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.
- 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:

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.

- 1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.
- 2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.
- 3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.
- 4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.
- 5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

b. Noise

- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?
- 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.
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

8. Land and shoreline use

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

b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

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

c. Describe any structures on the site.

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

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:
- m. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with nearby agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

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?
- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

11. Light and glare

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

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.
- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers located on or near the site? If so, specifically describe.
- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.
- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.
- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

14. Transportation

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.
- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?
- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?
- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?
- g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.
- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
 electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
 other _____
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service,
 and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might
 be needed.

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:	on file
Name of signee:	Brennon Staley
Position and Agency/Organization:	Urban Planner City of Seattle Office of Planning & Community Development
Date Submitted:	May 26, 2016

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions

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?

Overall, this non-project proposal would not result in any direct impacts to water, air, toxic or hazardous substances, or noise because it does not directly propose development. In terms of its effects upon future possible development, the proposed changes to development standards would slightly increase development potential in Downtown and South Lake Union, by authorizing zoning and regulatory changes that would add incrementally to the maximum buildable density and height of future buildings. The increment of additional future development that could occur if added development capacity is used could generate minor adverse impacts commonly associated with development in urban areas, such as emissions from automobile trips and heating in new buildings, and incidental contributions to environmental noise and stormwater runoff. The increment of difference in impacts, compared to development under today's regulations, would be only that amount attributable to the buildings being incrementally bigger, as described in the response to question #A.11 earlier in this checklist. No significant adverse impacts in the form of discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise are identified as likely due to this proposal.

Construction activities associated with the increment of additional future development are not likely to generate significantly different adverse impacts on water or air quality under the proposed zoning changes. The proposed increases in allowable height, floor plate size, or lot coverage would allow for incremental increases in building intensity, scale, and duration of construction activity for a given development project, but these would make only a minor difference in the total potential for emissions to air, noise and release of toxic or hazardous substances – due to slightly longer construction timeframes. Any development or redevelopment will have to comply with City regulations for management of stormwater runoff and other construction practices and requirements.

Any incremental increase in greenhouse gas emissions resulting from additional development in the Downtown and South Lake Union areas could be offset at least partially by reductions in commuting over future buildings' lifetimes as more residents and employees would be able to live and work in these centrally located urban centers. It is not possible to reliably quantify these offsetting factors for comparative purposes, but they would factor into estimations of the net change in greenhouse gas emissions resulting from this proposal.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: None proposed.

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

Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers are highly urbanized and central portions of Seattle. There are vegetated portions of properties intermittently present within these areas, and various wildlife habituated to urban areas, such as squirrels and birds, are present. To the extent these areas also include urbanized shoreline areas (Puget Sound, Lake Union), these also provide habitat value for birds, fish and other marine life. This non-project proposal would result in no direct impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life because it does not directly propose development. The proposal could indirectly affect the potential for impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life because additional development resulting from the increase in development capacity in Downtown and South Lake Union might slightly affect these habitats. The nature of such adverse impacts from different levels of future development could relate to factors such as higher buildings affecting birds' use of the area, or adding slightly to traffic related deposits

of pollutants on local streets, or theoretically leading to higher stormwater flows ultimately released from the affected properties. However, the actual potential for these theorized differences could be affected by the nature of drainage controls and similar features on development sites, which could essentially neutralize or minimize the potential for greater adverse impacts. Similarly, while deposition of pollutants on local streets from traffic could lead to incrementally worsened water quality in marine areas, it is also possible that long-term trends toward greater mass transit use could lead to future conditions where automobile traffic per capita generated by area residents or employees could be held in check or even reduced. No significant adverse impacts to plants, animals, fish, or marine life are likely as a result of this proposal.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are: None proposed.

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

The proposed changes would result in no direct negative impacts to energy or natural resources because it does not directly propose development, and are not likely to indirectly cause significant adverse depletion of energy or natural resources. The proposed additional development capacity could result in incrementally larger residential or commercial buildings that, in some cases, could result in incrementally higher energy use for a particular project. The differential levels of impacts given potential increments in future development are not likely to be significant. New buildings will continue to be required to comply with the Seattle Energy Code and other standards for energy efficiency. Additionally, to the extent that additional development capacity results in an increase in the number of housing units and commercial floor area in Downtown and South Lake Union, the proposal may in certain cases reduce demand for energy and natural resources by increasing residential and commercial density in an area with frequent transit service and a mix of land uses, increasing the likelihood that people will walk and use transit for work and other daily trips.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: None proposed.

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?

Overall, this proposal is not likely to result in significant adverse environmental impacts to environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated for government protection. The proposed zoning changes would not affect the types of construction or uses allowed in Downtown and South Lake Union and would only incrementally increase the potential size of future development on a range of redevelopable properties. The proposal would also not alter existing regulations for development in environmentally critical areas contained in Chapter 25.09 of the Seattle Municipal Code, which includes regulations for wetlands and flood-prone areas. There are no wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, or prime farmlands in the area where the proposal would apply. However, it is noted that species such as bald eagles and salmon are known to inhabit the general vicinities near the affected area, which adds a degree of interest in preserving water quality from degradation.

This proposal is not likely to generate significant adverse impact on historic landmarks or historic districts as it would not modify existing protections for historic landmarks and contributing structures in historic districts and is not likely to significantly increase the number of sites that would be redeveloped. Known existing historic landmarks would not be more likely to be developed under this proposal. Potential landmarks, which have been inventoried by the City, could in some case be redeveloped, but would first be evaluated in order to determine whether they should receive a landmark designation. Increases in development capacity requiring

use of incentives, such as transfer of development rights from Landmark structures, could result in the transfer of additional development rights from these properties and further reduce the likelihood of redevelopment.

This proposal is not likely to generate significant adverse impacts on sites containing archaeological and cultural resources. Such resources' locations are not known, but might be present in portions of this study area in or near current or historic shoreline areas. The proposal would not modify existing protections for these resources and is not likely to significantly increase the number of sites that would be redeveloped. Rather, it could enable future buildings that are slightly taller or bulkier than would be the case if developed under today's regulations. Future possible development projects in these areas would continue to be subject to the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program, State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Historic Preservation Policy and other state laws for potential archaeologically significant sites, as applicable.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: None proposed.

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

The proposal would result in no direct impacts to land and shoreline use as it is a non-project action. Furthermore, the proposal would not modify the types of uses that are allowed in the affected areas. The proposal would make an incremental difference in the height/bulk/scale of future development.

Housing

This proposal is intended to implement regulations that would require new development to contribute toward the production of affordable housing. Analysis contained in many documents related to this proposal as well as the Housing Appendix of the Comprehensive Plan demonstrates that there is a substantial unmet and growing need for affordable housing in the City.

New development generally creates an additional need for affordable housing beyond existing needs. Modeling of this proposal suggests that it could result in 2,300 new affordable housing units over 10 years. From the standpoint of addressing the need for affordable housing, the impact of this proposal will be positive.

Adverse impacts on existing housing could occur if the proposal results in an increase in demolition of existing buildings in order to develop new market-rate buildings or affordable housing generated through payments received under the MHA program. Overall, the proposal is not likely to increase demolition, as the additional development capacity is more likely to result in larger buildings (e.g., taller structures or larger floorplates) than in entirely new buildings. Moreover, some of the developments using the extra capacity provided under the proposal will be residential developments, and under the proposal both residential and commercial developments would generate affordable housing units or money for affordable housing units, which would offset or partially offset the impact of any housing units demolished through redevelopment.

Use and Development Patterns

Minor adverse environmental impacts could occur where the proposal results in changes that:

1. increase or decrease the total amount of development in Downtown and South Lake Union,
2. influence the types of development that occur in Downtown and South Lake Union, or
3. shift development between Downtown and South Lake Union and other areas.

These changes could occur where the proposal changes the relative margins of profitability for development sites or the proposed additional capacity allows for more housing units or non-residential development within existing sites. It is generally expected that the cost of the required affordable housing contribution,

taking into account the value of the additional development capacity, will not discourage development. However, the effects could vary on a site by site basis such that the proposal could result in minor differences in the types or intensities of development occurring in certain parts of Downtown and South Lake Union, or in other parts of the City, than would otherwise occur.

This proposal could also result in the development of more housing units or non-residential square footage in Downtown and South Lake Union where additional development capacity encourages developers to build larger buildings on development sites where they were already proposing, or intending to propose, future development. Downtown and South Lake Union are generally land-constrained areas, such that the allowance for additional development capacity will, over time, facilitate additional growth occurring. However, there is also limited regional demand for residential units and non-residential space in these sub-markets, which suggests that the development of larger individual developments may also lead to a smaller overall number of developments occurring in a given future timeframe.

The majority of land in Downtown and South Lake Union is already developed with significant structures which are unlikely to be redeveloped over the next 20 years. Analysis in the Mandatory Housing Affordability Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Design Study identifies approximately 160 sites in Downtown and South Lake Union with lesser degrees of existing development on them such that they could be redeveloped under existing market conditions over an indefinite period of time. Covering the immediate 20-year period through 2035, growth estimates contained in the proposed Seattle 2035 Comprehensive Plan update provide an indicator of future possible development levels that could occur over the next 20 years. Analysis of this information and of the projects currently undergoing permitting or construction suggest that the proposed increase in development capacity could result in an increase in square footage of new development equal to approximately 5.9% above existing regulations if the proposal does not change the viability of individual projects and if all future projects utilize the extra increment of development capacity.

Given the unique nature of the Downtown and South Lake Union sub-markets and overall City policy-based goals to accommodate substantially more jobs and housing units in this area, and their reflection in zoning choices made by the City of Seattle, it is unlikely that this increase in capacity would lead to land use conditions or outcomes that would be incompatible, in any significant and adversely impacting fashion, with surrounding uses or any relevant adopted City land use regulations, goals or, policies.

Height, Bulk, and Scale

The proposal could result in changes to the height, bulk, and scale of future development in Downtown and South Lake Union. Where the proposal would incrementally increase the maximum height limit, it is likely that future development in Downtown and South Lake Union under MHA would in most cases result in taller buildings. Similarly, if incremental increases in upper-level lot coverage and/or floor plate size is allowed, it is likely that future development under MHA would in most cases result in wider and bulkier towers. For commercial development, the result of an increase in the maximum FAR density allowance would in most cases result in taller structures because developers already tend to seek maximized floor plate sizes.

Overall, the height, bulk and scale of development projects allowed under this proposal would continue to be reasonably compatible with the general character of development anticipated by the goals and policies set forth in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan regarding Land Use Categories, the shoreline goals and policies, the procedures and locational criteria for shoreline environment redesignations set forth in SMC Sections 23.60.060 and 23.60.220, and the adopted land use regulations for the area in which they are located. Downtown would continue to maintain the broadest mix of activities and greatest intensity of development in the region. Furthermore, the proposal would promote the continued economic vitality of Downtown Seattle by allowing for more residential and commercial development and also opportunities for a broader

range of worker households that work in this area to live there too. This proposal would also support the land use goals for South Lake Union by encouraging more employment, service, retail and housing development to encourage business creation and provide additional opportunities for residents to live in neighborhoods where they can walk to services and employment.

Downtown and South Lake Union in their existing condition contain a wide variety of in-city environments, spanning places that are more residential, more commercial or mixed-use in nature, or that have historic and cultural components as in Pioneer Square and International District. A large portion of the area is undergoing change already as significant amounts of new development have occurred or are occurring now, and the area is transforming into an even denser and varied urban environment. This is gradually or even immediately altering the character of the different districts in the affected area, with newer features, new ground-floor use attractions, new economic activity, and increased pedestrian activity lending an increasing air of vitality in many vicinities. These newer features are coexisting with other older buildings and features of the various districts. Overall, this dynamic urban environment illustrates how newer, denser development is helping to visually and actively transform the physical nature of Downtown and South Lake Union.

There are presently a number of situations in which, under existing regulations, towers can be located relatively close to each other, including in DOC zones where no tower separation regulations exist and in DMC zones where tower separation regulations exist but do not apply to towers built prior to 2006. In SM zones in South Lake Union, tower separation between residential towers and limits on the number of towers per block tend to minimize the likelihood that towers would be relatively close to each other. In some circumstances, towers can already be located as little as 10 feet (or closer if there are no windows) from other towers on adjacent property, or as little as 20 feet across an alley. While this proposal would not change the regulations governing minimum distances between towers, the allowance for larger floor plates could in limited circumstances reduce the probable distance between proposed structures and other structures, or increase the amount of building area that is located close to another structure. This circumstance could occur where larger floor plates would be likely to result in an expansion of the floor

plate in a direction toward an existing tower (see scenario A) or where width of a building that is located close to other structures is expanded in length (see scenario B). These situations mean that the proposal would incrementally change the likelihood of increased building bulk and its relationships to neighboring buildings. Potential adverse effects as experienced by building users could be an increased sense of building proximity and loss of privacy, relating to the experience of what is visually seen of neighboring buildings. However, the proposal would not result in changes to minimum



SCENARIO A



SCENARIO B

separations (buildings are already allowed to be located relatively close to each other), and the incremental effects of the proposal on building height/bulk/scale are concluded to not result in height, bulk, or scale outcomes that would be incompatible with existing goals and policies.

Because the additional development capacity would be given in the majority of zones in Downtown and South Lake Union, this proposal will only represent a minor degree of change to the overall gradation of allowed building heights through Downtown and South Lake Union. Similarly, the broad application will help to moderate the degree of differential changes to transitions between zones, except where certain zones are exempted from the proposal. Exemptions for specific areas such as Pioneer Square, the core of

Chinatown-International District, Pike Market, and certain waterfront areas means that the proposal will result in incrementally steeper transitions surrounding these zones. In particular, areas with more dramatic transitions include:

- Northern Pioneer Square (PSM 100/100-120 and PSM 100/100-130 to DMC 340/290-400)
- Chinatown-International District (IDM 75-85 to IDR/C 125/150-240, IDR 150, and IDM 75/85-150)
- Central Waterfront Across Alaskan Way (DH1/45 to DMC-160)
- Pike Place Market (PMM to DMC 240/290-400)
- West South Lake Union across Aurora (SM-SLU 160/85-240 to SM-85, NC-85, and C1-65)

Overall, most of these transitions are not substantially different than existing transitions between zones within downtown (which commonly include transitions in maximum height of 120 to 160 feet between blocks or across alleys) or between existing buildings (which often result in low scale buildings next to towers). The presence of physical buffers, particularly I-5, Mercer Street, Aurora Avenue, and I-90 off ramps also helps to ensure reasonable physical transitions in scale between the project area and adjacent areas.

Given that the proposed additional capacity would, in most cases, be used by projects that are at least 65 feet in height, it is likely that almost all new projects that use the additional capacity will also be subject to design review which will also help to minimize the potential future impacts.

Public View Protection

Minor adverse impacts to certain SEPA-protected views could occur because the proposed zoning changes could result in taller and/or larger structures than allowed under current regulations. Section 25.05.675 of the Seattle Municipal Code identifies certain public views that should be considered including views of the Space Needle from multiple points such as Myrtle Edwards, the Sculpture Park, and various points in West Seattle; views of Mount Rainier, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, and Puget Sound from public areas including Plymouth Pillars Park (formerly known as Four Columns Park/Boren-Pine-Pike Park), Harborview Hospital Viewpoint, Kobe Terrace Park and the publicly owned portions of the International District Community Garden, Myrtle Edwards Park, Victor Steinbrueck (Market) Park, Volunteer Park, and Waterfront Park; and certain scenic corridors.

Minor adverse impacts on views to the Space Needle could occur where taller or wider buildings are allowed. Existing development standards, in combination with topography, would already allow for the development of buildings that could obscure the view of the space needle from most areas within the area of study with the exception of views through public rights-of-way. This proposal could incrementally impact views, particularly where buildings that are currently developed below the existing development standards are redeveloped. Overall, these impacts are likely to be minor as the proposal would not modify setbacks on public rights-of-way where the most significant views occur.

Minor adverse impact on views of Mount Rainier, the Olympic and Cascade Mountains, and Puget Sound could also occur where taller or wider buildings are allowed. Below is a description of potential impacts on specific viewpoints. Existing view corridor setbacks, where currently required, would be retained.

Jose Rizal Park

The Livable South Downtown Planning Study Final Environmental Impact Statement modeled the impact of views from this Park and found that there would be limited impacts from heights less than 240 feet. Minor adverse impacts could occur in those areas with existing height limits of 240 feet. However, these zones have very limited geography and the proposal would result in only minor changes to the potential width of towers in this area thus the proposal would have only minor impacts. Existing development and potential future development under existing regulations in DMC and DOC zones already substantially preclude views

through these areas, so the proposed additional capacity in these areas is not likely to impact views from the park.

Plymouth Pillars Park (formerly known as Four Columns Park/Boren-Pine-Pike Park)

Views through Downtown and Denny Triangle from this park are already substantially blocked by existing development. The incremental additional of height or width on future towers would not substantially change this existing situation.

Harborview Hospital Viewpoint

Views of the Olympics and Puget Sound from this viewpoint are already significantly obscured due to existing development in the DMC and DOC zones immediately to the west. Analysis in the Mandatory Housing Affordability Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Design Study shows that there are very few redevelopable lots with heights greater than 160 feet within the corridor between this viewpoint and the Olympics and Puget Sound. Visual analysis from the Livable South Downtown Planning Study Final Environmental Impact demonstrates that the proposal would have limited impacts on other views from this viewpoint, with the potential exception of the zones in Chinatown-International District allowing heights of 240 feet. However, these zones have very limited geography, and the proposal would result in only minor changes to the potential width of towers in this area. Therefore, the proposal would have only minor impacts.

Kobe Terrace Park and the publicly owned portions of the International District Community Garden

Visual modeling included as part of the Livable South Downtown Planning Study Final Environmental Impact Statement shows that new development allowed under existing regulations could already substantially obscure views from this park and garden to the west and the south with the exception of certain corridors through public rights-of-way. This proposal would have minimal potential impacts on views to the west and south as it would not allow wider buildings in those zones located to the west and south that could further obstruct remaining view corridors.

Myrtle Edwards Park, Victor Steinbrueck (Market) Park, and Waterfront Park

No additional development capacity is proposed to be added in zones located directly between these parks and views to the west and south.

Volunteer Park

Visual Analysis from the South Lake Union Height and Density Alternatives Draft EIS demonstrates that the incremental height or width considered as part of this proposal would have a limited impact on views from this viewpoint.

Minor adverse impacts could occur to views from designated scenic corridors. Impacts on views from non-elevated roadways in Downtown and South Lake Union would be negligible as views outside of those allowed through public rights-of-ways are largely obscured by existing buildings. Minor adverse impacts could occur along elevated roads and their off-ramps where incrementally larger buildings, primarily in zones currently allowing heights of 150 to 240 feet, are allowed. Visual modeling included as part of the Livable South Downtown Planning Study Final Environmental Impact Statement and the South Lake Union Height and Density Alternatives Draft EIS suggests that these impacts would be minor as they would only tend to affect limited views in specific parts of the highway rather than modifying views from these roadways within the core of Downtown (where they are already substantially blocked) and the approaches to Downtown and South Lake Union where the impacts would be negligible.

Minor adverse impacts to protected views of historic landmarks from certain public places could also occur but are not likely to be significant because most of these landmarks structures are low- and mid-rise structures and the proposal generally does not affect the allowable building envelope at these elevations.

Shadows on Open Space

Incremental increases in the shading of public places and the right-of-way could occur as a result of taller, wider, and/or bulkier buildings allowed under the proposed zoning changes. Some areas that would not be shaded by a lower or narrower structure could be shaded as a result of this proposal. As the proposal would only result in incrementally small changes to existing development standards, potential impacts are likely to be minor.

Light and Glare

The increased size of buildings could increase the cumulative level of artificial illumination in Downtown and South Lake Union. The new buildings will include towers that may potentially incorporate reflective surfaces that could on occasion create glare impacts. The exposure may extend to adjacent hillsides and the freeway. As the proposal would not change the materials that could be used on individual buildings, potential impacts are likely to be minor.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are: production of new affordable housing in Seattle.

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

Overall, this proposal is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts in the form of increased demands on transportation or public services and utilities.

The Mandatory Housing Affordability Transportation Study for Downtown and South Lake Union produced by Fehr & Peers evaluated the expected transportation effects that could occur with the additional housing and employment growth in the Downtown and South Lake Union areas. This study analyzed the 2035 Preferred Alternative included in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan EIS as the No Action Alternative (representing future traffic and land use conditions under expected growth levels without any changes to heights or densities) and a 2035 "With Action" condition, representing future traffic and land use conditions with increased employment and population resulting from increased building heights and densities. The 2035 MHA Proposal evaluated an additional 1,250 housing units and 2,570 jobs in the study area compared to the No Action scenario. The study analyzed the following key indicators:

- Corridor travel time to evaluate auto level of service (LOS)
- Transit route load factors (ratio of riders to number of seats on a bus)
- Screenline vehicle volume-to-capacity ratios, which is the City's existing LOS standard
- Drive alone mode share, which is the City's proposed new LOS standard

Qualitative evaluations of pedestrian, bicycle, freight, parking and safety conditions were also completed.

Overall, the MHA Transportation study found that while the potential incremental increase in growth resulting from the MHA program would add trips to all modes, the difference in effects on the transportation system would be minimal when compared to the No Action Alternative. Therefore, this study found no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to the transportation system as a result of the MHA program's implementation in Downtown and South Lake Union. A more detailed summary of findings is

below.

Under this proposal, corridor travel times are expected to increase slightly, but LOS grades are not expected to vary between the MHA Proposal and the No Action Alternative. Compared to the No Action Alternative, the MHA Proposal travel times are not expected to increase by more than ten seconds on any corridor. The largest increase in travel time is expected along southbound 1st Avenue. As no study corridor travel times are forecast to increase by more than 20 seconds (the standard deviations for all corridor travel times observed during the existing conditions data collection period) compared to the No Action Alternative, no travel time impacts were identified. The minor increase in travel times is consistent with the project team’s expectations because the increased vehicle traffic generation of the MHA proposal is less than one percent higher than the traffic generation stemming from existing land use and planned growth. Travel time and LOS grades for key travel corridors are summarized below.

2035 PM Peak Period Auto Travel Times													
ID	Study Corridors	Existing (2015) LOS / Travel Time				No Action Alternative (2035) LOS / Travel Time				MHA Alternative (2035) LOS / Travel Time			
		NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB				
1	Aurora Ave – Denny Way to Aloha St	B	1:16	C	1:20	D	1:56	C	1:29	D	1:59	C	1:29
2	Westlake Ave N – Denny Way to 9th Ave N	F	9:54	D	4:13	F	10:43	E	4:34	F	10:43	E	4:35
3	Eastlake Ave E/Howell St/Stewart St – 8th Ave to Aloha St	F	10:39	F	12:20	F	12:47	F	23:13	F	12:48	F	23:16
4	5th Ave/Westlake Ave – Denny Way to S Jackson St			F	16:12			F	22:44			F	22:47
5	1st Ave – Battery St to S Jackson St	B	6:36	C	8:46	C	9:03	E	14:37	C	9:03	E	14:47
6	2nd Ave – Battery St to S Jackson St			B	6:42			D	10:27			D	10:30
7	4th Ave – Battery St to S Jackson St	B	6:10			C	7:41			C	7:41		
8	Mercer St – 5th Ave N to Fairview Ave N	F	15:22	C	3:11	F	23:21	D	4:02	F	23:23	D	4:02
9	Denny Way – 5th Ave N to Bellevue Ave E	D	7:10	E	8:45	E	8:05	E	9:32	E	8:06	E	9:32
10	Olive Way – 4th Ave to Bellevue Ave	F	15:43			F	17:30			F	17:30		
11	Spring St – 1st Ave to Boren Ave	F	7:40			F	8:27			F	8:27		
12	Madison St – 1st Ave to Boren Ave			D	5:34			E	6:04			E	6:05
13	James St – Yesler Way to Boren Ave	F	9:01	F	11:20	F	9:21	F	14:10	F	9:21	F	14:10
14	S Jackson St – 1st Ave S to 12th Ave S	E	8:20	D	5:53	F	9:22	E	7:03	F	9:22	E	7:04

Transit ridership in the study area under the No Action Alternative is expected to increase by approximately 73 percent over existing conditions. King County Metro, Sound Transit, and PSRC all have long-range planning efforts underway that are aimed at accommodating roughly double the current ridership, i.e. a 100 percent increase. Therefore, the transit agencies that control Seattle’s transit system are planning for service that would accommodate the transit ridership forecasted by the project travel demand model. King County Metro regularly reallocates its resources to accommodate demand and limit overcrowding. For routes that are expected to exceed load factor thresholds under the No Action and Action alternatives, it is assumed that King County Metro would add service to maintain the LOS standard. Because all routes under the No Action Alternative and the MHA Proposal are expected to be able to meet the load factor threshold with reasonable headways, no significant adverse transit impacts are identified.

All of the City's screenline v/c ratios were reviewed to identify meaningful changes between the No Action Alternative and the MHA Proposal. The forecasted PM peak hour screenline v/c ratios that are expected to change under the MHA Proposal compared to the No Action Alternative are summarized below. The v/c ratios that are expected to increase under the MHA Proposal compared to the No Action Alternative are bolded; however, no screenline changes by more than 0.01 compared to the No Action Alternative. Because none of the screenlines are projected to exceed their designated thresholds, no impacts are identified.

2035 Screenline Volume-to-Capacity Ratios						
Screenline #	Screenline Location	LOS Standard	No Action Alternative (2035)		MHA Proposal (2035)	
			NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB
1.11	North City Limit - 3rd Ave NW to Aurora Ave N	1.20	1.04	0.80	1.04	0.80
1.12	North City Limit - Meridian Ave N to 15th Ave NE	1.20	0.77	0.62	0.77	0.63
1.13	North City Limit - 30th Ave NE to Lake City Way NE	1.20	0.97	0.84	0.97	0.84
2	Magnolia	1.00	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.56
3.11	Duwamish River - West Seattle Fwy & Spokane St	1.20	0.69	1.15	0.69	1.15
3.12	Duwamish River - 1st Ave S & 16th Ave S	1.20	0.38	0.55	0.38	0.55
4.11	South City Limit - MLK Jr. Way to Rainier Ave. S	1.00	0.56	0.93	0.56	0.93
4.12	South City Limit - Marine Dr SW to Meyers Way S	1.00	0.56	0.71	0.56	0.71
4.13	South City Limit - SR 99 to Airport Way S	1.00	0.58	0.74	0.58	0.74
5.11	Ship Canal - Ballard Bridge	1.20	1.18	0.72	1.18	0.72
5.12	Ship Canal - Fremont Bridge	1.20	0.79	0.71	0.79	0.71
5.13	Ship Canal - Aurora Bridge	1.20	0.92	0.82	0.92	0.82
5.16	Ship Canal - University & Montlake Bridges	1.20	0.95	1.05	0.95	1.05
6.11	South of NW 80th St - Seaview Ave NW to 15th Ave NW	1.00	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.50
6.12	South of N(W) 80th St - 8th Ave NW to Greenwood Ave N	1.00	0.87	0.78	0.88	0.78
6.13	South of N(E) 80th St - Linden Ave N to 1st Ave NE	1.00	0.54	0.41	0.54	0.41
6.14	South of NE 80th St - 5th Ave NE to 15th Ave NE	1.00	0.74	0.67	0.74	0.67
6.15	South of NE 80th St. - 20th Ave NE to Sand Point Way NE	1.00	0.63	0.58	0.63	0.58
7.11	West of Aurora Ave - Fremont Pl N to N 65th St	1.00	0.65	0.87	0.65	0.87
7.12	West of Aurora Ave - N 80th St to N 145th St	1.00	0.65	0.76	0.66	0.76
8	South of Lake Union	1.20	0.91	0.82	0.91	0.82
9.11	South of Spokane St - Beach Dr SW to W Marginal Way SW	1.00	0.59	0.72	0.59	0.72
9.12	South of Spokane St - E Marginal Way S to Airport Way S	1.00	0.60	0.70	0.60	0.70
9.13	South of Spokane St - 15th Ave S to Rainier Ave S	1.00	0.66	0.89	0.66	0.89
10.11	South of S Jackson St - Alaskan Way S to 4th Ave S	1.00	0.64	0.84	0.64	0.84
10.12	South of S Jackson St - 12th Ave S to Lakeside Ave S	1.00	0.80	0.99	0.81	0.99
12.12	East of CBD	1.20	0.39	0.52	0.39	0.52
13.11	East of I-5 - NE Northgate Way to NE 145th St	1.00	0.86	0.79	0.86	0.79

2035 Screenline Volume-to-Capacity Ratios						
Screenline #	Screenline Location	LOS Standard	No Action Alternative (2035)		MHA Proposal (2035)	
			NB/EB	SB/WB	NB/EB	SB/WB
13.12	East of I-5 - NE 65th St to NE 80th St	1.00	0.51	0.53	0.51	0.53
13.13	East of I-5 - NE Pacific St to NE Ravenna Blvd	1.00	0.72	0.76	0.72	0.77

The forecasted Single-Occupancy-Vehicle (SOV) mode share is essentially identical between the MHA Proposal and the No Action Alternative. Both scenarios forecast an 18 percent SOV mode share in 2035. As the MHA Proposal is expected to meet the SOV mode share LOS standard, no mode share impacts are identified.

The City’s pedestrian and bicycle network is expected to provide enough capacity for the growth projected under the No Action Alternative and MHA Proposal. Moreover, the City has identified robust plans to improve the pedestrian and bicycle network through its Pedestrian Master Plan and Bicycle Master Plan. These plans are actively being implemented and are expected to continue to be implemented regardless of which land use alternative goes forward. Given that the pedestrian and bicycle environment is expected to provide sufficient capacity for expected growth as well as become more robust under either land use alternative, no significant deficiencies or impacts are expected to the pedestrian and bicycle system for either the No Action Alternative or MHA Proposal.

Although no travel time related impacts are expected for freight, there may be potential issues with changes to loading zones or access needs as individual projects are developed. At this programmatic level of analysis, it is not possible to evaluate these effects; these issues would need to be analyzed and mitigated at the project level.

There are currently some locations in the study area where on-street parking demand exceeds parking supply. Given the projected growth over the next 20 years and the fact that the supply of on-street parking is unlikely to increase by 2035, there will likely be more competition for on-street parking supply under the No Action Alternative. Because the MHA Proposal would include a slightly higher intensity of land use, competition for parking spaces is expected to be somewhat higher than under the No Action Alternative. While there may be short-term on-street parking shortages as individual developments are completed, it is expected that over the long term, parking supply and demand would reach a new equilibrium as drivers shift to other modes or to using off-street parking facilities in response to the City’s ongoing on-street parking management program. The on-street parking supply is a relatively small fraction of total supply and off-street parking in downtown and South Lake Union is still likely to be readily available. Therefore, the parking impacts are not considered significant.

While collision rates would not be expected to meaningfully change based on the increase in growth, the total number of collisions could likely be slightly higher due to the small increase in vehicle trips. Therefore, the MHA Proposal is expected to result in an incremental adverse impact. However, given that the difference in vehicle trips is less than one percent and that the collision rates are not expected to increase, this impact is not considered significant.

Reviews by Seattle Public Utilities and Seattle City Light staff indicate that the water, sewer, drainage, and electrical utility systems are likely to be adequate to serve future demand levels. While some site-specific improvements may be needed, these improvements will be identified at the time of the future development. New development projects in this area could be required to perform analysis of

development-related impacts on utility system infrastructure and, where necessary, to construct improvements that increase capacity and avoid service degradation. New development will also be required to provide storm water control and meet energy efficiency standards as required under the Drainage and Energy Codes.

Impacts to other public services, including fire and police services, parks, and schools, are also expected to be insignificant. Demand for fire and police services are influenced by a number of factors including the number of service requests received and overall response times. While overall demand is not directly correlated with population and job growth, it is likely that additional population and job growth will result in some increase in demand for fire police services. The Police and Fire Departments regularly reassess their staff and facility needs to ensure they are appropriate given expected demand. Reviews by Fire and Police Department staff indicate that expected growth will not result in significant adverse impacts.

Similarly, school enrollment is driven by a diversity of factors that are indirectly related to population and job growth. Service and facility needs are regularly reviewed to ensure they are appropriate given expected demand. Given the small number of children currently enrolled in public school and living in the project area as well as the ability of the School District to modify enrollment boundaries to deal with small changes in enrollment, it is not expected that his proposal will have a significant impact on school services.

The project area currently has numerous park, green street and open space features that serve current employees and residents, and is gaining more plazas and similar spaces as new development occurs. However, despite the range of available facilities, the existing inventory falls short of meeting certain aspirational goals for per capita amounts and distribution within the Downtown and South Lake Union Urban Centers. These goals are expressed by Seattle Parks and Recreation plans for the purpose of understanding relative spatial distribution and sizing needs for future possible park and open space improvements. Seattle Parks and Recreation will continue planning the implementation of improvements citywide, which may include facilities that would help address identified geographical gaps or shortfalls in recreational facilities in this affected area. The goals themselves are anticipated to be updated soon as Seattle Parks and Recreation updates its functional plan beginning in 2016. It should also be noted that the City's current Comprehensive Plan (as of May 2016) expresses a conclusion that "The City currently provides a good citywide system of libraries, parks and recreation facilities which are available and accessible for use by all the City's residents...While additions to these facilities would enhance the City's quality of life, such additions are not necessary to accommodate new households." This suggests that recreational needs are not expected to be satisfied exclusively by facilities located in a person's neighborhood, which diminishes the relevance of meeting per capita and geographic distributions as the primary measure of sufficiency.

Analysis of impact potential for this proposal acknowledges the existing context that includes geographic and per capita shortfalls in meeting aspirational parks and open space goals, as currently expressed. Within this context, the incremental potential for future additional non-residential and residential growth resulting from this proposal is judged to generate an adverse impact but not a significant adverse impact. This is because it would add to resident and employee populations in an area evaluated as underserved by parks and open space. But because of the relatively limited magnitude of change (compared to total populations in these areas), a degree of uncertainty about the timing and degree of full usage of the added development capability, and the non-binding aspirational qualities of the goals, such impacts should not be judged as "more than moderate" or significant and adverse.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are: None proposed.

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

The proposal is believed to avoid conflicts with local, state, and federal laws and requirements for protection of the environment.

The City's Comprehensive Plan, in its current form and its proposed update, includes multiple goals and policies directing the creation of both market-rate and affordable housing as well as non-residential development. This proposal seeks to balance and accomplish many of these objectives.

Specifically, the proposed affordable housing program could:

- help to achieve the city's goals for accommodating its share of affordable housing needs consistent with the countywide planning policies (HG1)
- reduce involuntary housing cost burden for households by supporting the creation and preservation of affordable housing (HG2.5)
- provide new low-income housing through market-rate housing production (HG13)
- encourage dispersion of housing opportunities for low-income households throughout the city and throughout King County to support inclusion and opportunity (HG15)
- help provide low-income households with access to education, employment, and social opportunities; support the creation of a more inclusive city; and reduce displacement of households from their neighborhoods or the city as a whole through the provision of housing affordable to low-income households. (H29.8)

Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan contains many goals and policies that articulate the amount, distribution, and character of growth that should occur throughout Seattle. These goals and policies include the Growth Targets contained in Urban Village Appendix, the General Distribution goals in UVG32, the Jobs/Housing Ratio goals in UVG7 and UVG20, and many other goals and policies that describe the Urban Village strategy, the type of housing the City wants to generate, the desire to use land efficiently, and the mix of uses desired. As discussed in question D.5, it is possible that this proposal could have minor impacts on the amount, distribution, and character of development occurring citywide. However, it is unlikely that this proposal would have significant negative effects on the City's ability to achieve these policies. Moreover, these policies must be balanced with other goals and policies to address housing affordability.