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**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

# PURPOSE OF CHECKLIST

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter [43.21C](http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=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.

# PRE-APPLICATON MEETING

A pre-application meeting is used to determine whether a land use project is ready for review, to review the land use application process, and to provide an opportunity for initial feedback on a proposed application. Some land use applications require a pre-application – in particular: short and long subdivisions, lot line revisions, shoreline permits, variances, and critical area determinations. The City strongly recommends that all land use applications use the pre-application process to allow for feedback by City staff.

**Please note:** pre-application meetings are held on Tuesdays, by appointment. To schedule a meeting, submit the meeting request form and the pre-application meeting fee (see fee schedule). Meetings must be scheduled at least one week in advance. Applicants are required to upload a project narrative, a list of questions/discussion points, and preliminary plans to the Mercer Island File Transfer Site one week ahead of the scheduled meeting date.

# SUBMITTAL REQUREMENTS

In addition to the items listed below, the code official may require the submission of any documentation reasonably necessary for review and approval of the land use application. An applicant for a land use approval and/or development proposal shall demonstrate that the proposed development complies with the applicable regulations and decision criteria.

1. **Completed pre-application.**
2. **Development Application Sheet.** Application form must be fully filled out and signed.
3. **Development Plan Set.** Please refer to the Land Use Application- Plan Set Guide in preparing plans.
4. **Title Report.** Less than 30 days old.
5. **SEPA checklist.**

# 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

For nonproject proposals complete this checklist and the supplemental sheet for nonproject actions (Part D). The lead agency may exclude any question for the environmental elements (Part B) which they determine do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal. 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:

Calvert/Goe request for a Critical Area Deviation and Reasonable Use Exemption.

1. Name of applicant:

De Calvert; Walther K. Goe, Molly B. Goe

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Primary Contact |
| De Calvert | Walther K. Goe & Molly B. Goe |
| 5335 Butterworth Rd. | 5325 Butterworth Rd. |
| Mercer Island, WA 98040 | Mercer Island, WA 98040 |
| 206.232.7282 | c.206.852.9980 |
| decalvert@hotmail.com | wgoe@hotmail.com |

1. Date checklist prepared:

TBD

1. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Mercer Island, Community Planning & Development

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

This non-project proposal contemplates the ownership transfer of a vacant lot to an unknown future buyer with construction of a single-family dwelling to be completed as soon as is practicable.

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

Yes, envisaged is construction of a single-family home along with a requisite bridge and connections to existing available utilities located at Butterworth Road.

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

|  |
| --- |
| 1. GeoTech, Exhibit x
 |
| 1. Wetlands Resources, Exhibit x
 |
| 1. Arborist, Exhibit x
 |
| 1. Bridge engineer, Exhibit x
 |
| 1. Concept site plan, Exhibit x
 |

1. 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.

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

TBD

As noted in the City of Mercer Island, Notice of Decision (NOD) 02.08.2016, a Tree Permit is required before the commencement of construction. Additionally, the NOD requires, “A bridge or other access to the proposed building pad as approved by the Development Services Group shall be completed prior to issuance Temporary Certificate of Occupancy or the Certificate of Occupancy, whichever comes first.” The NOD also requires a Hydraulic Project Approval for the proposed bridge over the watercourse.

City of Mercer Island, (revised) Conditions of Approval, 02.08.16, Exhibit xx

 *\*Please note this is an excerpt – the full document is not in our files*

XX

1. 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 non-project proposal envisages the future construction on this currently vacant 18,875 square foot lot located within a well-established residential neighborhood, of a single-family home within the designated 6,270 square foot building pad along with a requisite access bridge and connections to existing available utilities located at Butterworth Road. Contemplated on this heavily vegetated and sloped site is, restricted to an absolute minimum, vegetation removal and soils grading to be remediated by revegetation.

M.W.Marshall, Site Plan, 08.20.2013, Exhibit xx

1. 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 .43-acre (18,873 square feet) vacant lot does not have an assigned address. The lot sits south of Butterworth Road between 5335 Butterworth Road on the lot’s east and 5325 Butterworth Road on the lot’s west.

*(a portion of)* Section 19, Township 24N, Range 5E, WM

Parcel Number: 866140-0101

Legal Description: TONJA ESTATES PCL "C" OF MERCER ISLAND SP #SUB 15-020 REC #20161118900002 SD SP DAF LOTS 6 & 10 OF SD PLAT

Nearest Cross-street/Intersection: Butterworth Road and East Mercer Way

|  |
| --- |
| Exhibits: |
| M.W.Marshall, Site Plan, 08.20.2013 (Includes Topography), Exhibit xx |
| Google Map, Vacinity Map, 5325 & 5335 Butterworth Rd, 02.21.2022, Exhibit xx |
| King County, Parcel Viewer Map, 02.11.2022, Exhibit xx |
| King County, Parcel Viewer Map, Vacinity, Neighborhood, 02.11.2022, Exhibit xx |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B.**  | **ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**  |
| **1.**  | **Earth**  |

* + 1. General description of the site (check one):

 Flat ☐ Rolling ☐Hilly ☐Steep slopes ✔Mountainous ☐Other ☐

* + 1. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Page 1, paragraph 3 of the PanGeo Geotechnical Engineering Study, xx.xx.20xx, indicates, “Review of topographic survey map indicates the generally north- to northeast-facing slope gradient in the range of 30 to 55 percent.”

PanGEO, Engineering Study, xxx – Exhibit xx

* + 1. 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.

Page 4 of the PanGEO Geotechnical Engineering Study, x.xx.20xx, indicates , “Topsoil/Fill/Colluvium – Very loose to medium dense, moist to very moist, sand with silt, silty sand, and gravelly sand were encountered from surface to about 2 to 7 feet in the test borings and hand borings.” “Pre-Olympia Deposits – Below the topsoil/fill or colluvium, medium dense to very dense, fine to coarse sand with trace to some silt were encountered.”

PanGEO, Engineering Study, xxx – Exhibit xx

 No portion of the site is agricultural land. The proposal envisages de minimus soil removal.

* + 1. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Page 5, paragraph 1 of the PanGeo Geotechnical Engineering Study, xx.xx.20xx, indicates , “The site is mapped within a potential landslide hazard area accordance to the City of Mercer Island’s Geologic Hazards Map. However, no past known slides were mapped at the subject site and adjacent properties located on the north-facing slope where the subject site is situated.”

Furthermore, Page 5, paragraph 3 of the PanGeo Geotechnical Engineering Study, xx.xx.20xx, indicates, “Based on our observations of ground features and the results of our field exploration, it is our opinion that the site is globally stable in its current configurations. It is also our opinion that the proposed short plat is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint and the future development of the short platted lot will not adversely impact the overall stability of the subject and surrounding properties, provided that the future development is properly designed and constructed in accordance with current codes and engineering standards.

PanGeo, Engineering Study, xxx – Exhibit xx

* + 1. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

This non-project proposal envisages the future construction of a single-family home along with a requisite access bridge. ~~Based on a concept home developed for marketing purposes,~~ These calculations are slated to be provided by PanGeo, see OneNote.

* + 1. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Page 5, paragraph 5 of the PanGeo Geotechnical Engineering Study, xx.xx.20xx, indicates, “The site is well and heavily vegetated at the time of our field exploration. We did not observe obvious isgns of soil erosions during our field exploration and site visits. Based on the borings drilled at the site, it is our opinion that site soil has a low erosion potential. However, we recommend best management practices be implemented to prevent the soil erosion during construction. Additionally, landscaping should be properly designed and implemented for permanent erosion control post-construction. During construction, the temporary erosion potential can be effectively managed with an appropriate erosion and sediment control plan, including but not limited to installing silt fence at the construction perimeter, limiting removal of vegetation to the construction area, placing rocks or hay bales at the disturbed/traffic areas and on the downhill side of the project, covering stockpile soil or cut slopes with plastic sheets, constructing a temporary drainage pond to control surface runoff and sediment trap if necessary, covering cut slopes with plastic sheets, placing rocks at the construction entrance, etc. The temporary erosion control measures should be observed and monitored by a qualified geotechnical engineer. Permanent erosion control measures should include establishing vegetation, landscape plants, and hardscape established at the end of project.

 PanGEO, Engineering Study, xxx – Exhibit xx

* + 1. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

 These calculations are slated to be provided by PanGeo, see OneNote.

PanGEO, Engineering Study, xxx – Exhibit xx

* + 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

As mentioned in response to Environmental Checklist B.1.f, the PanGEO, Engineering Study, xx.xx.20xx defines best practices and protocols requisite to erosion control. Applicant will incorporate these requirements into any Purchase and Sale Agreement as conditions precedent.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2.**  | **Air**  |

* + 1. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, and industrial wood smoke) during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

The proposal does not create, nor does it contemplate, the creation of any meaningful tempory or permanent air emissions beyond the minimal output from normal limited light construction and the occupancy of a single-family dwelling.

* + 1. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no known or reasonably conceptualized influencing off-site emissions including smoke and other particulate matter, ozone, carbon monoxide, and ordors.

* + 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

There are no contemplated mitigation measures as any emission potential is de minimus.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3.**  | **Water**  |

 a. Surface:

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

Yes. Page 1, paragraph 3, of Wetland Resources Environmental Consulting, Stream Determination Report and Significant Tree Inventory, December 23, 2021 indicates, “A perennial stream is located between the toe of the steep slope and Butterworth Road on the northern quarter of the property. It originates well off-site to the west and across East Mercer. This stream flows from west to east, eventually through a constructed channel and into Lake Washington. None of the existing available resources indicate that there is fish usage within the on-site stream. The on-site portion of the stream is generally between three to four feet wide and has an average gradient to Lake Washington of less than 12 percent.”

 Wetland Resources, Stream Determination, 12.23.2021, Exhibit xx

ii. 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.

Yes. This non-project proposal envisages the future construction of a single-family dwelling within 200 feet of the mid-stream. Additionally, a requisite access bridge would cross the watercourse and bear suspended utilities. Additionally, a controlled-release water detention vault with would be implemented. A site plan is attached as exhibit.

PanGEO, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013, Exhibit x

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

The PanGEO Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013 shows the proposed building pad. No fill or dredge will occur in the surface water. De minimus removal or fill will be required within the building pad area.

PanGEO, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013, Exhibit x

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

 No, this proposal requires neither water withdrawal or diversion.

* + - * 1. Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

No. The proposal is not within a 100-year floodplain.

FEMA, FIRM, King County, 08.19.2020, Exhibit xx

* + - * 1. Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No. Absolutely not.

 b. Ground

* + - * 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.

No. The proposal will be serviced via city water and discharge to city sewer.

* + - * 1. 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.

Not applicable. The proposal will be serviced via discharge to city sewer and landscaping will be maintained in a “natural” state largely precluding the need for fertilizers.

 c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

i. Describe the source of runoff (including stormwater) 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.

Water runoff is confined to stormwater normal for a single-family dwelling with a driveway and parking area. Rooftop based stormwater will be collected via the house’s gutter system and directly channeled to an engineered stormwater detention system. In the event that an impervious surface is used for the driveway and parking area, a preliminary oil and gas trap will be implemented to contain any incidental vehicle leakages prior to dispersal to the primary stormwater detention system. The stormwater detention system will be properly engineered to release the detained water at proper seepage rates. No stormwater will be discharged directly into surface waters, i.e. the stream.

 ii. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

The creation of bulk waste materials is not contemplated in this proposal. Proper implementation of best management practices will preclude meaningful incidental waste contaminates, e.g. vehicle petroleum products drippings from entering the ground or surface waters.

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

In addition to a properly engineered stormwater detention system scaled to the surface collection areas of the dwelling and impervious surfaces (if any) of the eventually selected house design; page 6, paragraph 1 of PanGeo, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013 indicates, “Permanent erosion control measures should include establishing vegetation, landscape plants, and hardscape at the end of the project.”

PanGEO, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013, Exhibit x

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4.**  | **Plants**  |

* 1. Check types of vegetation found on the site

 ✔ Deciduous tree: Alder, Maple, Aspen, other

 ✔ Evergreen tree: Fir, Cedar, Pine, other

 ✔ Shrubs

 ☐ Grass

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  ☐  | Pasture  |
|  ☐  | Crop or grain  |
|  ✔  | Wet soil plants: Cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other  |
|  ☐  | Water plants: Water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other  |
|  ☐  | Other types of vegetation  |

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

Arborist Report

Arborist Report, xx.xx.20xx, Exhibit X

* 1. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None.

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

PanGEO, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013, page 6, paragraph 1, instructs to “limiting removal of vegetation to the construction area.”

Arborist Report

Arborist Report, xx.xx.20xx, Exhibit X

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

Arborist Report

Arborist Report, xx.xx.20xx, Exhibit X

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5.**  | **Animals**  |

* 1. State any birds and 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:

 Birds: hawk, songbirds

Mammals: deer, racoons, rats, squirrels

Fish: none

* 1. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

None known.

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

Not to our knowledge.

* 1. Proposed measure to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

By adopting best management practices during construction to limit disruption or removal of vegetation, controlling erosion and siltation, timely restoration of any disrupted areas and a absolute protection of the surface water will preserve wildlife in the project area.

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

There are no known invasive animal species on or near the site.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6.**  | **Energy and natural resources**  |

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

The project is within a mature residential neighborhood. Electricity and natural gas are available at Butterworth Road for connection. The non-project proposal contemplates an eventual single-family house which would potentially utilize a combination of the aforementioned energies for normal household lighting, heating, cooking, hot water, etc. It is conceivable that the future residence will avail itself of the ambiance and back-up heat of a wood burning fireplace. It is unlikely that solar will be utilized in any future residence due to the extensive tree canopy.

Prior to the completion of the contemplated future residence, the project will indirectly consume diesel and/or gasoline fuels for workers transportation and for onsite construction equipment, e.g. earth moving equipment. Additionally, propane may be used to fuel portable equipment such as space heaters. Electricity is readily available to provision energy via a temporary construction meter, therefore eliminating the need for petroleum-fueled power generators. Measurable electricity will be consumed during the construction process.

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

No. This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. That dwelling structure site sits well apart from east and west neighbors and below the southerly neighbor. Therefore, the house will not interfere with solar “sight lines.” Vegetation in the area is dense so the removal of any limited amount of vegetation, nor its multiple-factored replacement will be meaningful to the quantity or quality of shade coverage. It is not conceivable that the project would detract from, nor benefit, the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties.

* 1. 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:

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence in an upper-middle class neighborhood. Homes in this area typically incorporate state-of-the-art best practices for energy efficient holistic house design including upgraded insulation and air sealing, and high-end windows and doors coupled to an emphasis on the utilization of natural light. Moreover, the owners are financially able and desirous of implementing energy efficient fixtures. This would include, but not be limited to, high efficiency heating systems, energy efficient appliances, on-demand high-efficiency water heaters, LED lighting, and other electronic systems designed to curtail energy consumption. Additionally, this owner group is able to afford proper maintenance to keep the dwelling and fixtures operating at peak energy efficiency.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7.**  | **Environmental health**  |

1. 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.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. The proposal itself does not create a physical, chemical or biological health factor external to a person. The act of constructing a house is inherently fraught with such hazards due to the potential for physical injuries, spills or contact with hazardous chemicals, and proximity to other workers which increase the potential for disease infection. Fortunately, these construction exposure factors can be greatly mitigated through the hiring of reputable firms with solid safety records achieved through training and monitoring of safety practices through assigned officials. The contemplated house contruction itself is not extraordinary would not create any unusual exposure to workers or residents of the neighborhood. Likewise, the residents of the completed house will not be exposed to health hazards uncommon to any other new or well maintained house.

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

The site is a vacant lot within an established neighborhood. There is no documentation or visual evidence that the land is other than a virgin site. There has been no observation of trash or debris indicating that the vacant site has ever been abused as a dump site. The site is fully covered with lush healthy vegetation suggesting the absence of non-observable waste dumping. A review of the Department of Ecology Cleanup Site Database Map shows no designations at the Butterworth site.

Department of Ecology, Cleanup Site Database Facility/Site Map, 02.12.2022, Exhibit xx

ii.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.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. There are no known hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This specifically addresses surface mounted or buried bunkers or transmission lines within the proposed building site. There is a buried “feeder” natural gas line within the public easement fronting Butterworth Road. This is well isolated from the future development except for temporary deliberate exposure to make a supply connection for the new dwelling. As the gas supply line construction is contemporaneous to the new dwelling, its design is well contemplated and integral to the overall plan.

iii.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.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. Potential toxic or hazardous chemicals which might be stored or used during the construction period include: acetylene, diesel fuel, gasoline, propane, adhesives, coatings, flame retardants, lubricants, paints, sealants, and solvents. Upon occupancy, many or all of these same chemicals may be stored and used as is customary of a private residence owner.

iv.Describe special emergency services that might be required.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. During the construction period, the need for special emergency services relative to potential hazardous waste emergencies can be greatly mitigated by the hiring of well-established firms with a solid safety record borne in proper industrial hygiene training and monitored by an assigned safety officer. Included in this safety program would be limiting the onsite quantities of hazardous chemicals and training of the detection, containment, and cleanup of these products. Additionally, an established plan to respond to hazardous chemicals incidents including the use of emergency equipment, and communications and alarms systems would further reduce the requirement for special emergency systems.

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

 This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. Reducing and controlling environmental health hazards during a future construction is a function of hiring a well-established reputable contractor. This contractor would be characterized by having a solid safety record founded in adherence to best management industrial hygiene practices proscribed by OSHA. This contractor would realzed that cleanup after an incident is the most expensive way to deal with environmental health hazards. The contractor would have training and monitoring of the complex system of rules to propery manage and dispose of toxic substances. Ultimately, this contractor would subscribe to the mantra that the smartest, cheapest and healthiest approach to reducing toxic threats is preventing contamination in the first place.

b.Noise

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence in a well-established upper-middle class neighborhood situated on a narrow dead-end street which ‘dog-legs’ to front Lake Washington. The site located on Butterworth Road is situated in a heavily treed, ravine-like setting giving the feel of a secluded private road. There is an absence of inherently noise emitting sources such as mixed-use buildings, multi-family residences, institutional buildings, and commercial buildings. Also absent in the vicinity is any public recreation areas or utility substations. Traffic is primarily local and extremely limited due to the low number of houses accessed via the road. The only meaningful noise pollution is limited non-systematic aircraft from Renton Municipal Airport and SeaTac Airport, climatically conditional highway noise travelling across Lake Washington from Interstate 405, and boating noise emanating from Lake Washington. None of this noise, when occasionally occurring, present any effect on the construction or eventual occupancy of the dwelling.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. During the period of a future development, construction equipment will create noise audible to neighbors. However, sources of noises are somewhat self-mitigating. Heavy equipment work is minimal due to the small building site and limited earthwork. Incremental vehicle noise is restricted as street parking is limited so that during periods of higher staffing engagement, personal vehicle parking is typically limited to the exceptionally wide shoulder of SE 53rd Place Open Space approximately one-quarter mile west of the site. This has been the customary practice of remodel and new construction workers in the neighborhood for a minimum of the past 28 years. There is no requirement for high noise pollution equipment for drilling, blasting, and crushing. Vegetation removal is minimal so noise generated by cutting and grinding equipment will be of a very short duration. Noise created by the construction will be the normal and customary banging, and small tool noise of electric air compressors, pneumatic nailers, saws, and drills, etc. WAC 173-60-050 (3)(a) provides an exemption for these reasonable noises: “The following shall be exempt from the provisions of WAC 173-60-040, except insofar as such provisions relate to the reception of noise within Class A EDNAs between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (a) *Sounds originating from temporary construction sites as a result of construction activity* [italics added].” Construction activity will be limited to 07:00-19:00 Monday through Saturday.

There should be no indirect noises short- or long-term with the contemplated project as a causation.

On long-term basis, noises and noise levels will those normal and customary to an occupied family dwelling.

. Construction equipment will create construction noise audible to neighbors and in-water. Noise disturbance will be short-term and should have negligible effects on fish and wildlife in the area

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. During the period of a future construction, noise levels can be abated or controlled with the following measures:

* Maintenance of, and immediate replacement of any removed, vegetation buffers.
* Restricting the vehicular traffic to the construction site.
* Limiting construction hours.
* Limiting the use of petroleum fueled equipment, e.g. generators.

It is further noted that the site’s location in heavy vegetation and a ravine location lower than southerly and northernly residences coupled to a meaningful setoff from eastern and western residences (which are occupied by the co-applicants) create a natural sound buffer.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8.**  | **Land and shoreline use**  |

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

The site is a vacant (single-family) lot Type “R” Zoned “R-15 within a well-established residential neighborhood. All contiguous properties are of the same nomenclature and are developed with a single-family dwelling.

No, on a long-term basis the contemplated future dwelling will have no effect on nearby or adjacent properties. As the area is heavily vegetated restricting territorial views, and the location of the the contemplated house sits within lowered ravine area, the proposal does not adversely impact views or property values. All neighboring properties are self-contained relative to independence of utility resources or access easements involving this site. Long-term, the proposal does not adversely impact the enjoyment or use of neighboring properties. Moreover, issues relating to impediments to potential agricultural, commercial, community and public services, or industrial uses are struck moot via zoning ordinances and lack of land availability.

Short-term, there is the conceivable impact of inconvenience on the neighborhood should larger construction related trucks create a partial blockage of the narrow Butterworth Road. This will be mitigated by utilizing the Applicant’s driveway as a turn-off and providing good neighbor courtesy notices should there be any anticipated blockage. Furthermore, there is a maintained gravel road which provides a “back-door” ingress/egress to the neighborhood through bordering Dawn Terrace.

* 1. 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?

No, the project site is a newly created lot formed from two portions of adjacent residential lots. The site has never been used as working farmlands or working forest lands.

c.Describe any structures on the site.

There are no buildings, bridges, cell towers, fuel tanks, or pipelines (save utility “feeders” within the public easement), etc. on the site.

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

No, there are no structures; there is no demolition.

* 1. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The King County Department of Assessments shows the site’s zoning as “R-15,” elsewhere described as, “Urban Residential District Zoning.” The Mercer Island Washington Comprehensive Plan, Section 2, Land Use Element, Subsection I, Introduction; defines the “R-15” designation in Table 2, Land Use Zones and Acreage (2014), “Single Family - R-15.” This is further defined in MICC, 19.02.020, Development Standards, A. Net Lot Standards as “R-15, The net lot area shall be at least 15,000 square feet. Lot width shall be at least 90 feet and lot depth shall be at least 80 feet.” There are no plans to propose changes to this zoning designation.

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

MERCER ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN Codified through Ordinance No. 21C-16, enacted July 6, 2021. (Oc)

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

Website for the City of Mercer Island, Community Planning & Development, Environment, What is the Shoreline Master Program (<https://www.mercerisland.gov/cpd/page/environment>) states, “ The SMP regulates development generally within 200 feet of the shoreline of Lake Washington.” The site is not located on the shoreline nor within 200 feet of a shoreline of the state. It therefore does not meet the standard for designation in the Washington Administrative Code as shoreline nor its complement in the Mercer Island SMP as “Shoreline, Urban Residental.”

The SMP Guidelines establish the standard of no net loss. No net loss means that over time, the Citywide existing condition of shoreline ecological functions should, at a minimum, remain the same as when the SMP is implemented. Simply stated, the no net loss standard uses mitigation and restoration to balance impacts to shoreline ecological functions resulting from new development. The City must achieve this standard through both the SMP planning process and by appropriately regulating individual developments as they are proposed in the future. Any amendments to the SMP that may occur through the periodic update process would need to comply with the no net loss standard.

It provides a description of existing site conditions, proposed watercourse restoration, proposed shoreline enhancement, and mitigation sequencing to ensure no net loss of critical area or buffer functions..

* 1. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify.

Yes. Included within the meaning of “environmentally sensitive areas” are the following conditions which apply to the site: streams or stream corridors, and geological hazardous areas specifically erosion and landslide.

Critical areas” and “environmentally sensitive areas” mean and include any of the following areas and ecosystems:

1. Wetlands;

2. Streams or stream corridors;

3. Frequently flooded areas;

4. Geologically hazardous areas:

a. Erosion hazard areas,

b. Landslide hazard areas,

c. Seismic hazard areas;

5. Fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; “fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas” does not include such artificial features or constructs as irrigation delivery systems, irrigation infrastructure, irrigation canals, or drainage ditches that lie within the boundaries of, and are maintained by, a port district or an irrigation district or company;

6. Locally unique features:

a. Ravines,

b. Marine bluffs,

c. Beaches and associated coastal-drift processes;

7. Critical aquifer recharge areas; and

8. Buffers as established under SMC [18.80.070](https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Sequim/html/Sequim18/Sequim1880.html#18.80.070).

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. In the absence of a defined future resident, published demographic data for Mercer Island shows an average household consisting of three residents. (https://www.point2homes.com/US/Neighborhood/WA/Mercer-Island-Demographics.
)

* 1. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

The site currently is a vacant lot. No people will be displaced directly or indirectly by the proposal.

* 1. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

The site is currently vacant and will not displace any persons therefore making avoidance and mitigation measures nonapplicable.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence which is precisely consistent with the the current land use designation, i.e., R-15. The proposal does not rely on, nor does it seek, the attainment of a change to the current designation. The proposal does not fall within the Shoreline Master Program plan. The proposal will not have any adverse impact on any local subarea plan or overlay zones, air-quality non-attainment areas, state salmon recovery plans, state wildlife plans, watershed management plans, habitat conservation plans, or county weed control.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9.**  | **Housing**  |

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

This non-project proposal contemplates one future single-family residence on the site. Based on a budgetary forecast of the eventual dwelling project cost, and assuming standard mortgage arrangements compared to the 2000 Census Median Household Income: $147,566 provided by the City of Mercer Island, Community Planning and Development, Mercer Island Demographic Information (<https://www.mercerisland.gov/cpd/page/mercer-island-demographic-information>), the dwelling would be designated as high-income housing.

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

The site is currently vacant and will therefore not result in the reduction or elimination of any dwelling units.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates one future single-family residence on the site which currently is a vacant lot. The net effect creates no meaningful beneficial or detrimental effect on the overall housing supply and no impact whatsoever on lower- or middle- income socio-economic population.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10.**  | **Aesthetics**  |

* 1. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas? What is the principal exterior material(s) proposed?

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. Exact proposed dwelling plans are therefore not available to provide precise height, total window area, exterior cladding materials or color. The eventual plans will be in conformity with height restrictions of the then existing MICC for single-family residences. This currently is promulgated in MICC 19.02.010, E. Building height limit. “Maximum building height. No building shall exceed 30 feet in height above the average building elevation to the highest point of the roof.” Moreover, it can be assumed that the proposed dwelling design of this upscale neighborhood will be prepared by a registered architect utilizing modern energy efficient engineering and an aesthetic accretive to the neighborhood ambiance.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. Upon completion of construction, the eventual dwelling will sit within a heavily vegetated and sloped area. Both of these natural features impede line of sight thus mitigating impact of a new dwelling to existing houses. Moreover, the curve of Butterworth Road adds a further re-orientation sight lines and a lessening impact of view obstruction.

* 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetics impacts, if any:

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. It can be assumed that the future developer will further mitigate the natural view obstruction limiters described in answer 10.b. by maximizing the benefit of the Arborist Report to revegetate in the most opportunistic locations for creating natural visual barriers and creating optimal visual appeal. Additionally, the dwelling’s aesthetic design should complement both the neighborhood and fit well into the natural landscape which creates its own focal point of interest due to the stream, multitude of vegetation shapes, sizes, textures and colors. Maintenance of the natural landscape in lieu of a developed grass yard will preserve the character of the existing park-like setting. Together, these measures will greatly maintain, if not enhance, the neighborhood “viewshed.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11.**  | **Light and glare**  |

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. In the short-term during construction, there will be limited vehicle lighting due to the short duration of heavy equipment and limited personal vehicle parking. Workers will periodically utilize portable work lights in addition to lighting built-in to certain small tools such as drills. All lighting will be normal household intensity and the use of high intensity outdoor trailered spotlights will not be required. Construction lighting will be utilized during the period of 07:00-19:00 Monday through Saturday.

Long-term lighting includes the limited ingress/egress of (typically) a two-car household, standard interior and exterior lighting, bridge lighting, and potentially some muted landscaping accent lights. No street lighting or signage is contemplated.

There is no contemplation of mirrored glazing or the incorporation of highly reflective cladding materials.

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

No.This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. The contemplated dwelling is greatly setback from the street frontage which contains meaningful vegetation. The dwelling will be situated in a setting providing natural mitigation to view interference including heavy vegetation, generous placement offset, and a curved road and sloped terrain precluding direct alignment of line of sight. The project will not present as a hazard to vehicles, pedestrians, boats, aircraft, neighborhood residents, or animals.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. The proposal is situated in a well-established residential neighborhood within a heavily vegetated and sloped surrounding. Light infiltration from adjacent dwellings will be normal, reasonable, and diffused resulting in no meaningful light or glare impact on the proposal during construction or eventual residency. Neither the construction nor the occupancy lighting will result in an accretive nuisance of light or glare.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a single-family residence developed by a future buyer. The proposal has the opportunity to implement the following measures to further reduce or control light and glare by utilizing inherently lower glare LED lights instead of incandescent or fluorescent lighting; utilization of interior window curtains and shades; ensuring that all outdoor lighting is properly aimed and shaded; using well-designed, muted, “washed,” and properly aimed landscape lighting; and employing thoughtful placement of revegetation plantings.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12.**  | **Recreation**  |  |

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

At 6.38 square miles, the entirety of Mercer Island might be considered the immediate vicinity including all 475 acres of parkland and open space. Nearby the neighborhood is SE 53rd Open Space, playground equipment and fields at Island Park Elementary School, sidewalks on Island Crest Way, Island Crest Park, Deane’s Children’s Park, Engstrom Open Space, Pioneer Park, Clarke Beach, and Ellis Pond. Additionally, there is the Mercer Island Saddle Club. Informal recreation opportunities include access to the Mercer Way velodrome suicide ride.

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

No. This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence on a currently vacant lot within a well-established residential neighborhood. No existing recreational uses will be directly impacted now or in the future.

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. With an average occupancy on Mercer Island of 2.5-3.0 people per household, the direct and indirect impact on recreational opportunities is negligible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **13.**  | **Historic and cultural preservation**  |

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

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence on a currently vacant lot. There are no structures on the property.

* 1. 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.

There is no known evidence of the site being a historical or archeological place of significance. There are no know professional studies having been conducted at the site.

* 1. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence on a currently vacant one-half acre shy lot within a well-established residential neighorhood. There has been no known consultation study to assess potential archeological or historical significance.

* 1. 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.

There are no proposed measures to mitigate potential impact upon the undiscovered archeological or historical assets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **14.**  | **Transportation**  |

* + 1. 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.

Butterworth Road is reached from the north (Town Center or I-90), via the arterials of either Island Crest Way, or East Mercer Way. Butterworth Road, located approximately mid-island, is a short, narrow, dead-end city owned neighborhood road the end half of which is the street access for waterfront homes. Butterworth is accessed from the west via East Mercer Way approximately fifty feet north of SE 53rd. This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence which will directly front Butterworth Road to its south.

Upon occupancy this single-family dwelling averaging 2.5-3.0 residents with an assumed two primary vehicles, will insignificantly add to any existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation problems including road usage. Traffic hazards will not be a risk factor as the East Mercer Way-to-Butterworth Road, and Butterworth Road itself are not significant in crash history. The proposal will not require any changes to street or traffic operations. The proposal does not meaningfully create or exacerbate risks to vehicles, trucks, transit riders, pedestrians, bicycles, or animals.

Google Map, Butterworth, 02.15.2022, Exhibit xx

Google Map, Butterworth Including Island Crest, 02.15.2022, Exhibit xx

* + 1. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

The site is served by Mercer Island School District transportation. The nearest school bus stop, which at different times services all grades, is at the corner of Butterworth Road and East Mercer Way. This is approximately 0.1 mile and a two-minute walk per “Distance Calculator” (<https://www.myrateplan.com/how_far>). King County Metro provides transit services via Dart Route 204 and Route 630. The transit stop is at the corner of SE 53rd and Island Crest Way. This is approximately 0.5 mile and a twelve minute walk per “Apple Map.”

Mercer Island, School Bus Routes and Stops Map, 02.15.2022, Exhibit xx

King County Metro Map, Dart Route 204, 02.15.2022, Exhibit xx

King County Metro Map, Route 630, 02.15.2022, Exhibit xx

* + 1. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or nonproject proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence on a currently vacant lot. The proposal would provide two-or-three defined (garage) parking spaces in compliance with Mercer Island City Code 19.02.040,G. “Parking.1. Applicability. Subsection (G)(2) of this section shall apply to all new construction and remodels where more than 40 percent of the length of the structure's external walls have been intentionally structurally altered. 2. Parking required. a. Each single-family dwelling with a gross floor area of 3,000 square feet or more shall have at least three parking spaces sufficient in size to park a passenger automobile; provided, at least two of the stalls shall be covered stalls. b. Each single-family dwelling with a gross floor area of less than 3,000 square feet shall have at least two parking spaces sufficient in size to park a passenger automobile; provided, at least one of the stalls shall be a covered stall.” The proposal site is currently a wooded undeveloped vacant lot and therefore no parking spaces are eliminated.

* + 1. 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).

No. This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. The site is situated in a well-established residential neighborhood serviced by a well maintained city owned road. The site directly abuts Butterworth Road and does not require any modifications or enhancements to the number of lanes, road surfacing, lighting and signage, stormwater conveyance, or safety barriers.

* + 1. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No, This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. The future developed dwelling will not directly utilize air, rail, or water transportation nor require such in the near vicinity. All construction equipment, materials, workers, and the removal of any waste will utilize regular general purpose vehicles.

* + 1. 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 non-passenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

What?

* + 1. 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.

No, this non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence within a suburban community without commercial agricultural or forest harvesting activities.

* + 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence within a well-established neighborhood. Impacts on all manner of transportation are negligible thus precluding the need for any amelioration or mitigation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **15.**  | **Public services**  |

* + 1. 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.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. Overall impact on the public service infrastructure including emergency services, school enrollment, police and law enforcement, public transit, energy and utilities, and health care will be negligible as the demographic averages suggest an impact of 2-3 persons and 2-3 personal vehicles.

* + 1. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence within a well-established neighborhood. Impacts on all manner of public service infrastructure are negligible thus precluding the need for any amelioration, mitigation, or impact fees.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **16.**  | **Utilities**  |

* + 1. Check utilities currently available at the site:

 Electricity ✔Natural Gas ✔Water ✔Refuse Service ✔

 Telephone ✔ Sanitary sewer ✔Septic system ☐ Other ☐

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence within a well-established neighborhood. All required utilities are currently available for hook-up at Butterworth Road on which the site fronts.

* + 1. 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.

This non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence. The proposed dwelling will connect directly to existing utilities distribution lines available in the site’s public easement at Butterworth Road. Cable is provided by Comcast, electricity and natural gas are supplied by Puget Sound Energy, recycle and refuse are provided by Recology, sewer and water are provided by the City of Mercer Island, telephone (land line) is provided by Verizon, and telephone (cellular) is provided by a number of carriers including T-Mobile. No new utilities will be required to be placed to facilitate this proposal. Utilities related construction activities include digging to access the distribution line connection, trenching to carry the utilities to the bridge, under-bridge mounting of utilities, and trenching to carry the utilities from the bridge to the dwelling access point. The City of Mercer Island has required for the proposal to replace the existing neighborhood fire hydrant closest to the site.

City of Mercer Island, (revised) Conditions of Approval, 02.08.16, Exhibit xx

 *\*please note this is an excerpt – the full document is not in our files*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C.**  | **SIGNATURE**  |

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the answers to the attached SEPA Checklist 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:

De Calvert

Signature:

Molly B. Goe, Walther K. Goe

Date Submitted:

# SEPA RULES

**SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS**

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because this non-project proposal contemplates a future single-family residence, answers to the foregoing SEPA Environmental Checklist have been answered complete giving consideration, to every extent possible, to the contemplated future project.

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; productions, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

 Proposed measures to avoid or reduce increases are:

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

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

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

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

1. 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?

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

1. 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?

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

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

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

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

[Statutory Authority: RC[W 43.21C.110.](http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=43.21C.110) WSR 16-13-012 (Order 15-09), § 197-11-960, filed 6/2/16, effective 7/3/16. Statutory Authority: RC[W 43.21C.110](http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=43.21C.110) an[d 43.21C.100 [](http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=43.21C.100)43.21C.170]. WSR 14-09-026 (Order 13-01), § 197-11-960, filed 4/9/14, effective 5/10/14. Statutory Authority: RC[W 43.21C.110.](http://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=43.21C.110) WSR 13-02-065 (Order 12-01), § 197-11-960, filed 12/28/12, effective 1/28/13; WSR 84-05-020 (Order DE 83-39), § 197-11-960, filed 2/10/84, effective 4/4/84.]

**SEPA Checklist: Calvert/Goe CAE and RUE, 02.xx.2022**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **List of Exhibits** | **Exhibit Ref.** |
| Chicago Title, Title Report, Guarantees, 12.01.2021 |  |
| City of Mercer Island, Conditions of Approval (revised), 02.08.2016 | Exhibit xx |
| City of Mercer Island, Critical Areas Determination, Notice of Decision, 02.08.2016 |  |
| City of Mercer Island, Development Application Sheet. Xx.xx.xx |  |
| City of Mercer Island, Notice of Decision, Setback Deviation, DEV 13-041, 04.04.2014 |  |
| DNW, Site Plan with Concept Dwelling |  |
| FEMA, FIRM, King County, 08.19.2020 |  |
| Google Map, Vicinity Map, 5325 & 5335 Butterworth Rd, 02.21.2022 |  |
| King County, Parcel Viewer Map, 02.11.2022 |  |
| King County, Parcel Viewer Map, Vicinity, Neighborhood, 02.11.2022 |  |
| M.W.Marshall, Site Plan, 08.20.2013 (Includes Topography) |  |
| PanGEO, Engineering Study, xx.xx.xx |  |
| PanGEO, Site and Exploration Plan, 01.26.2013 |  |
| PND Engineers, Bridge Cost Analysis Report, 11.26.2014 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |