

SEPA

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist

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

Instructions for applicants

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

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

Instructions for lead agencies

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

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals

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

A. Background [Find help answering background questions](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Cedar Hills Adjacent Properties Deconstruction Design (Removal of 9 structures)

2. Name of applicant:

Tien Pham (Engineer III)

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

King County Solid Waste Division, Facility Engineering & Science Section

16645 228th Ave SE, Maple Valley WA 98038

Office Phone: 206-477-5232

Tien.Pham@kingcounty.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

August 21, 2024.

5. Agency requesting checklist:

King County Solid Waste Division.

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

The project would be completed in multiple phases. Demolition of existing structures and stabilizing the cleared and graded areas would be completed in 2025, and disturbed area stabilized.

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

No.

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

The following environmental documents have been prepared for the project:

- KCSWD Cedar Hills Landfill Buffer Critical Areas Report - Existing Conditions (KPG Psomas 2024);
- Final Environmental Impact Statement King County Cedar Hills Regional Landfill 2020 Site Development Plan and Facility Relocation (King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks Solid Waste Division 2022);

- 2019 Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan (KCSWD 2019); and
- Final Environmental Impact Statement King County Cedar Hills Regional Landfill 2020 Site Development Plan and Facility Relocation (KCSWD. 2022).

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

None known.

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

King County

- Grading Permit (approval for Critical Areas Alteration and Erosion and Sediment Control is provided under the grading permit);
- Demolition Permit (for removal of structures)
- Clearing Permit (for removal of trees and other vegetation); and
- A pre-submittal meeting with King County staff may be required.

Ecology

- Stormwater General Permit (if clearing is 1.0 or more acres)

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

The Cedar Hills Landfill Buffer Restoration project is intended to restore at least partial stream and wetland buffer functions on approximately 22.4 acres of previously developed residential property located along the west side of 230th Ave SE to the east of the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill Facility (CHRLF) in unincorporated King County. The King County Solid Waste Division (KCSWD) has acquired 9 parcels adjoining the CHRLF property. The proposed project would remove existing structures and stabilize to return these areas to restore buffer function in the landfill's 1,000-foot buffer.

The proposed project does not include work in wetland, streams, or other regulated waterbodies, but will require clearing and grading within regulatory buffers.

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.

It is located east of the CHRLF along the west side of 230th Ave SE and to the east of the City Renton in unincorporated King County (Figure 1). It is in the western ½ of Section 27, Township 23 North, Range 06 East, but study area extends westward into Section 28. The approximate center of the project site is at latitude 47.455970°, longitude -122.035873°.

Type text here

B. Environmental Elements

1. Earth [Find help answering earth questions](#)

a. General description of the site:

The proposed project work area is approximately 22.4 acres in size, and consists of 9 parcels (2723069093, 2723069129, 2723069132, 2723069138, 2723069099, 2723069098, 2723069141, 2723069140, and 2723069097) on the west side of 230th Avenue SE. The project study area for this report includes the project work area and also extends 300 feet beyond the work area to account for all potential regulatory buffers.

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

The local terrain is predominantly rolling hills separated by stream valleys. The site generally slopes from northwest to southeast. Elevations ranges from 560 to 615 feet above sea level. Localized drainages cross the northern and southern portions of the site.

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

Approximately 16 percent.

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.

The Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA NRCS 2023a) map identified one soil type present in the project area, Alderwood gravelly sandy loam. Alderwood gravelly sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes (AgC) is a moderately well drained soil extending to a depth of approximately 60 inches. This soil is found on hills and ridges and originates from glacial drift and/or outwash over dense glaciomarine deposits. Alderwood gravelly sandy loam is not considered a hydric soil, however a restrictive layer may be found 20 to 39 inches below the surface that can support the presence of wetland in some conditions. Areas mapped as Alderwood gravelly sandy loam may include unmapped subareas of Indianola (5%), Everett (5%), Shalcar (3%) and Norma (2%) soils. Shalcar and Norma soils are hydric.

There is no agricultural land of long-term commercial significance within or near the proposed project.

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

A review of the King County data (iMap 2024) did not indicate a history of unstable soils within the project site or mapped landslide hazard areas, erosion hazard areas, or seismic hazards located within, or adjacent, to the proposed project.

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.

Clearing and Grading:

Structures: 39,200 sq. ft., 0.90 acre

Pavement: 87,000sq. ft., 2.00 acres

Gravel Pavement

Total: 126,170 sq. ft., 2.90 acres

Excavation/Backfill: 4,302 CY

All existing structures on the parcels will be salvaged or demolished, and salvaged material will be removed from the site. All slab on grade, foundations, footings and/or basement will be removed, retaining walls will be removed down to 18" below grade. All concrete, asphalt, gravel driveways will also be removed.

All excavated locations will be filled as necessary to match existing grade. Existing soils will be re-used to the extent possible. All fill used on the site would consist of clean fill material obtained from an off-site approved source. Appropriate topsoil will be added (if required) to create a suitable planting substrate, and all areas will be hydroseeded with an appropriate native erosion control mix to stabilize the site and prepare it for future replanting.

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

The proposed work includes clearing, excavation and filling to remove existing residential structures, outbuildings, and hardscaping. As with any construction project, erosion could occur during construction. However, the site is stable with low gradient slopes and disturbance is expected to be limited and best management practices would be implemented to minimize the erosion potential.

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

The existing project area includes approximately 133,106 square feet (3.06 acre) of impervious surfaces, or 13.6% of the total site area. Approximately 39,200 square feet (0.90 acre, or 4.01% of the total site area) of this impervious surface is composed of the roofs of residences, garages, decks, and outbuildings, which will be removed. The remaining 93,950 square feet (2.16 acres, 9.6% of the total site area) of impervious surface consists of paved driveways. Demolition and removal of the structures and pavement would remove 126,200 square feet (2.90 acres) of impervious surface. These graded areas would be stabilized following construction. Removal of the structures will result in a decrease in impervious surface on these lots from 12.9% to 0.71%. The remaining impervious surfaces on the site consisted of property driveways and stream crossing that will be retained to allow access to the properties.

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

Best management practices (BMPs) are physical, structural, and/or managerial practices that can prevent or reduce the erosion and pollution of water caused by construction activities. The following mitigation measures and BMPs would be incorporated during construction to minimize the potential for erosion:

- Construction of the proposed project, including all staging areas, would be restricted to the project site and/or previously disturbed areas (e.g., roadways, sidewalks, and

paved parking lots)

- All debris and spoil material would be transported off-site to an appropriate disposal facility.
- Add here that contractor will be required to obtain a Construction stormwater general permit from ecology and develop a SWPPP, perform required monitoring, inspecting and reporting, done by a CESCL, maintain a log/recordkeeping, etc.
- Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) plans would be required to prevent sediment transport from the project site.
- Other erosion control measures would be incorporated, as necessary, in accordance with King County requirements.
- Erosion control measures could include use of silt fencing, catch basin inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, straw wattles, silt dikes, and other measures as specified in the ESC and SWPPP.
- Following construction, all disturbed areas would be restored. Operation of the project is not anticipated to result in any erosion.
- Disturbed soil areas actively being worked, and the duration of disturbance will be limited.

Between the months of October and April, erodible soil not being actively worked for 2 days will be covered with an approved soil cover. Between the months of May and September, erodible soil that is not being actively worked for 7 days will be covered with an approved soil cover.

2. [Air Find help answering air questions](#)

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.

During construction there may be a small increase in exhaust emissions from construction vehicles and equipment and a temporary increase in fugitive dust. No long-term emissions would result from this project.

Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions during construction may include but are not limited to:

- Wetting exposed soils to minimize dust;
- Covering stockpiled soils;
- Equipping construction equipment with working mufflers; and
- Minimizing idling of equipment when not in use.

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

The nearest source of odor is the CHRLF. This off-site sources of emissions or odors that would not affect the project.

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

Contractors would use best management practices to minimize construction-related emissions. These emissions are expected to be minimal. Construction equipment would also be equipped with the appropriate emission controls.

3. [Water Find help answering water questions](#)

a. **Surface Water:** [Find help answering surface water questions](#)

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.

KPG Psomas staff delineated wetlands within the work limits and County owned portions of the study area to the west according to the three-parameter definition in the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (USACE 1987) and the guidance in the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region, ver. 2.0 (USACE 2010). Wetlands outside of the work limits, but within the 300-foot study area and not owned by the County were identified based on existing wetland and stream inventories and soil maps and verified in the field from publicly accessible areas.

Staff identified and flagged seven wetlands (Wetland 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6/7, and 8). Note that Wetland

6/7 is a single wetland but was flagged in the field as two units separated at the Bonneville Power Authority (BPA) utility corridor boundary fence.

Wetland communities were classified according to the system outlined by the USFWS in Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States (Cowardin, et al. 1979) and the hydrogeomorphic classification System (HGM) (Brinson 1993). Six of the wetlands are depressional scrub-shrub or forested systems and one is a riverine scrub-shrub system.

Wetlands were rated using the Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington – 2014 Update (Version 2) (Hruby, T. & Yahnke, A. 2023), and King County critical area buffer widths were determined using the Ecology ratings and the criteria in KCC 21A.24.325. Six of the wetlands were rated as Category III wetlands and have a standard 60-foot buffer. One wetland (Wetland 8) was rated Category II and has a 75-foot buffer.

Streams and water bodies were identified using the definitions in KCC 21A.06.1240 and KCC 21A.06.072C, and the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of streams and waters were determined using the guidance from USACE for OHWM identification (Mersel and Lichvar 2014), the criteria in the Ecology publication Determining the Ordinary High Water Mark for Shoreline Management Act Compliance in Washington State (Anderson et al. 2016), and definitions in KCC in KCC 21A.06.072C, 21A.06.1240.

KPG Psomas identified and flagged three unnamed streams (Streams 1, 2, and 3) in the project study area, which are tributaries to Issaquah Creek. All of the streams show evidence of past alteration, lack structural and habitat diversity, and lack suitable gravels for anadromous fish spawning. Two of the three streams have slopes in excess of 16% downstream of the project area, and all three streams have artificial barriers to fish passage identified onsite and/or downstream that preclude access by anadromous fish. However, as the presence of resident fish cannot be precluded, these streams were Typed as fish bearing (Type F) using the criteria in WAC 222-16-031 and KCC 21A.24.355, and have a standard stream buffer of 165 feet due to their location outside the Urban Growth Area (KCC 21A.24.358).

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.

The proposed work will not include work within or over waters. There will be grading work within 200 feet of water to remove existing structures, and hardscaping.

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.

The proposed project would not require any work within the boundary of any wetland and for streams, work will occur above the ordinary high water (OHWM) mark in the piped segment of the unnamed tributary to Forbes Lake. No fill or dredging would occur in either surface waters or wetland areas.

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

The project would not require surface water withdrawals or diversions.

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

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Maps (Flood Insurance Rate Map, King County, Washington and Unincorporated Areas, Panel 1008 of 1725 [Map Number53033C1008G, Revised August 19, 2020]), the site is not located within a 100-year floodplain.

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.

The proposal would not involve the discharge of waste materials to any surface waters.

b. Ground Water: [Find help answering ground water questions](#)

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

No groundwater would be withdrawn for drinking or other purposes.

Wetlands and streams identified at the site confirm the presence of perched saturated zones in the CHRLF buffer described in the Final EIS (KCSWD, 2022). As a result, contractors should expect to encounter water while excavating the existing building foundations and pavement areas, and construction dewatering is likely to be required. Any discharged water would be discharges in a manner that complies with all federal, state, and local environmental regulations.

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

No waste materials would be discharged into the ground. The project would not utilize septic tanks, and existing septic tanks will be pumped out, disabled, and filled with sand or gravel per King County Department of Health requirements.

c. Water Runoff (including stormwater):

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

The sources of existing stormwater runoff include structure roofs, pollution-generating driveways pavement and non-pollution-generating walkways and landscape areas within the site. Stormwater that does not infiltrate into landscape area is collected in a series of ditches and swales along 230th Ave SE. These ditches and swales drain either offsite to the east or to the south where they enter Streams 2 or 3, contributing to flows in Issaquah Creek. What about Stream 1? Please add statement about that

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

There is the potential for runoff from construction, possibly containing equipment-related materials such as motor oil, diesel fuel and hydraulic fluid, as well as sediment. BMPs will be implemented and installed to reduce the potential for materials leaving the site and entering nearby surface waters.

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

Removing buildings and hardscape will reduce Impervious surfaces at the site, and the potential for infiltration will be increased. The proposed project will not otherwise alter or affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the project.

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

The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable King County permits, which would specify a range of BMPs and temporary erosion and sedimentation control (TESC) measures designed to reduce or control potential surface, ground, or runoff water impacts. BMPs may include installation of hydroseed, compost, straw, jute matting and/or other appropriate cover measures. BMPs and TESC measures specific to the site and project would be specified by the County in the construction contract documents, and the construction contractor would be required to implement them. The selected contractor is required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and obtain a Washington Department of Ecology's (Ecology) Construction Stormwater General Permit, detailing the means and methods to manage runoff and water quality during project construction.

4. Plants [Find help answering plants questions](#)

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

- ✓ **deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other (black cottonwood, landscape specimens)**
- ✓ **evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- ✓ **shrubs (vine maple, red-flowering currant, common hardhack, salmonberry, Oregon grape, common snowberry, and devil's club)**
- ✓ **grass (colonial bentgrass, reed canarygrass)**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- orchards, vineyards, or other permanent crops.**
- ✓ **wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other (creeping buttercup, lamp/soft rush, reed canarygrass, youth-on-age)**
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- ✓ **other types of vegetation (western sword fern, bracken fern, disturbance tolerant or invasive species, including Himalayan blackberry, evergreen blackberry, Robert geranium, common dandelion, hairy cat's ear)**

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

The project area includes developed residential lots, the CHRLF and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) electrical utility right-of-way (ROW) corridors. Vegetation within the study area includes landscaped yards, maintained (mowed) utility ROW, and mixed canopy forest.

The landscaped yards occupy the majority of the proposed project work area. These areas are dominated by mowed grasses and disturbance tolerant forbs, Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus armeniacus*), and relic native trees (bigleaf maple [*Acer macrophyllum*], red alder [*Alnus rubra*], black cottonwood [*Populus balsamifera*], western red cedar [*Thuja plicata*], and Douglas fir [*Pseudotsuga menziesii*]). Other species present include English holly (*Ilex aquifolium*), creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*), colonial bentgrass, common dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*), hairy cat's ear (*Hypochaeris radicata*).

The maintained utility ROW occupies the southern portion of the study area includes mowed grasses similar to the residential yards, along with stands of Himalayan blackberry, red-flowering currant (*Ribes sanguineum*), and common hardhack (*Spiraea douglasii*). Lamp rush (*Juncus effuses*) and Reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) are also present.

The mixed canopy upland forest areas have a canopy that includes bigleaf maple, red alder [*Alnus rubra*], black cottonwood, and western red cedar, and Douglas fir. The subcanopy includes vine maple (*Acer circinatum*), Himalayan blackberry, salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), evergreen blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), Oregon grape (*Mahonia nervosa*), common snowberry (*Symphoricarpos albus*), and devil's club (*Oplopanax horridus*). Dominant herbaceous species include western sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), bracken fern (*Pteridium aquilinum*), youth-on-age (*Tolmeia menziesii*), and Robert geranium (*Geranium robertianum*).

Approximately 2.90 acres of the site would be cleared for the demolition and removal of structures and driveway pavement. This includes approximately 1.54 acre of existing, non-conforming stream and wetland buffer. Existing vegetation in these affected areas consists of

previously maintained lawn and ornamental trees and shrubs.

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

No threatened or endangered plant species are either known or expected to be onsite based on a review of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) Priority Habitats and Species Data (WDFW, 2024) and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program data (WDNR, 2024). No such species were observed during five days of field work associated with critical areas delineation.

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

e. Post construction, the disturbed areas will be stabilized using standard erosion control measures, such as application of compost, straw, or application of an approved erosion control hydroseed mix. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

No noxious weed populations are mapped within the project area (King County iMap 2024). Invasive species observed onsite include European holly, Himalayan and evergreen blackberry, and reed canarygrass.

5. Animals [Find help answering animal questions](#)

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

Examples include:

- **Birds:** hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:
- **Mammals:** deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:
- **Fish:** bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

Table 7-2. Wildlife Species Observed at CHRLF (King County, 2010)

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Sightings | Sig |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Birds | | | |
| American crow | <i>Corvus brachyrhynchos</i> | X | |
| American robin | <i>Turdus migratorius</i> | X | |
| Bald eagle ¹ | <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> | X | |
| Bewick’s wren | <i>Thryomanes bewickii</i> | X | |
| Black-capped chickadee | <i>Parus atricapilus</i> | X | |
| Bufflehead | <i>Bucephala albeola</i> | X | |
| European starling | <i>Sturnus vulgaris</i> | X | |
| Gull | <i>Larus species</i> | X | |
| Hummingbird | | X | |
| Mountain bluebird | <i>Sialia currucoides</i> | X | |
| Pileated woodpecker ¹ | <i>Dryocopus pileatus</i> | | X |
| Raven | <i>Corvus corax</i> | X | |
| Red-tailed hawk | <i>Buteo jamaicensis</i> | X | |

| Mammals | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| Black-tailed deer | <i>Odocoileus hemionus</i> | X | X |
| Eastern cottontail | <i>Sylvilagus floridan</i> | X | |
| Mountain beaver | <i>Aplodontia rufa</i> | | X |
| Raccoon | <i>Procyon lotor</i> | | X |

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

According to the WDFW PHS program maps, no threatened or endangered species are known to be on or near the site. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Environmental Conservation Online System (ECOS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IpaC) online tool indicates that the following species maybe present in the project area: North American Wolverine (*Gulo gulo luscus*, Proposed Threatened), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*, Threatened), yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*, Threatened), northwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*, Proposed Threatened), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*, Threatened). monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*, Candidate) is also identified as potentially present. However, habitat that meet the requirements of these species are not present in the project area or in the vicinity, and IpaC does not designate critical habitat for these species on or near the site.

Streams 1- 3 do not support any ESA-listed anadromous fish species under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), including the Puget Sound Chinook salmon and the Puget Sound steelhead. The nearest mapped fish presence is approximately 1.3 miles downstream, where Four Lakes empty into an unnamed tributary to Issaquah Creek (WDFW LLID# 1220226474615). Coho salmon have been documented at this location, and the stream is also mapped as gradient accessible to fall-run Chinook and sockeye salmon and winter-run steelhead trout.

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

The Puget Sound area is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway extends south from Alaska to Mexico and South America. No portion of the proposed project would interfere with or alter the Pacific Flyway.

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

The proposed project will restore buffer area that is currently disturbed by the presence of impervious surfaces and multiple structures. Over time, these activities will result in restoration of currently impacted wildlife habitat functions. No additional measures to preserve or enhance wildlife habitat are proposed.

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

The proposed project would not have any negative impacts on wildlife; therefore, no measures have been proposed.

6. Energy and Natural Resources [Find help answering energy and natural resource questions](#)

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 would not require energy post construction.

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

This project would not affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent property owners.

3. **What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any.**

N/A

7. Environmental Health [Find help with answering environmental health questions](#)

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

As with any construction project, associated risks are leaks and spills from equipment. The risks of this project are within the typical range of construction projects. There would be no toxic or hazardous chemicals stored on site besides the fuels and oils needed to power equipment.

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

Potential contamination in the project vicinity was assessed using The Washington State Department of Ecology's What's in My Neighborhood Tool and the Facility/Site Database (Ecology, 2024a and b).

Ecology's What's in My Neighborhood Tool (Ecology 2024a) did not identify contaminated sites in the work area or within 0.25 mile of the center of the work area

The Washington State Department of Ecology Facility/Site Database identified two facilities in or in close proximity to the project work area: the South Seattle Delivery Lateral and Northwest Pipeline South Seattle transmission pipes. County utility maps show a gas easement south of the project area that appears to match the point location for the Northwest Pipeline South Seattle transmission pipeline. The exact location of the South Seattle Delivery Lateral is not shown in Ecology data or current County utility mapping, however it may extend across the project site. Avoidance of the pipeline during project construction would be required.

Utility locates should be conducted prior to any demolition work to identify potentially affected utilities.

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.

There are no other known, existing hazardous chemicals/conditions within the proposed project footprint that would affect project development and design. The South Seattle Delivery Lateral is in the project vicinity and may extend across the site. Utility locations should be field confirmed to avoid any potential impacts during project construction.

Good faith surveys were conducted for the nine parcels in the work area.

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.

Chemicals stored and used during construction would be limited to gasoline and other petroleum-based products for heavy equipment operation. No chemicals will be stored on-site during project operation. A Spill Pollution Control & Countermeasures (SPCC)/Spill Response and Clean-up (SPC) Plan will be developed and implemented by the selected contractor.

4. Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Workers on the site may be exposed to construction related injuries, such as slips, trips, falls, cuts, edema, abrasion. and other common construction work related injuries. Safety measures during construction would minimize risks associated with these or other injuries or accidents. The project would not require any special emergency services.

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

To minimize environmental health hazards, construction BMPs would be implemented. There would also be a spill plan in place.

b. Noise

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

Noise in the project area results from residential uses of parcels to the north, south and east, motor vehicle noise from 230th Ave SE, and use of heavy equipment at the CHRLF. These existing noise sources would not affect the proposed project.

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)?

There will be temporary, short-term increase in noise associated with the demolition and removal of the existing structures and hardscape, including increased vehicular traffic and the operation of heavy equipment. Construction equipment generally operates intermittently or in cycles of operation, while stationary equipment, such as generators and compressors, generally operates at fairly constant sound levels. Other common noise sources typically include impact equipment, which could be pneumatic, hydraulic, or electric-powered.

Trucks would be present during most phases of construction and would not be confined to the Project site, so noise from trucks may affect more sensitive noise receivers than other types of construction noise. Demolition work is expected to occur during daytime hours and construction hours will adhere to County noise regulations.

During demolition and restoration of the site, vehicle traffic count will increase very slightly and therefore noise related to the number of the vehicles passing by will increase very slightly. These changes in noise are temporary and short-term in nature.

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

King County regulates noise related to construction activities under K.C.C. 12.86 (Noise). To mitigate the impacts from noise, construction hours of operation for heavy equipment, shall be between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. weekends. Other construction activities shall be between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekends. A Noise Variance would be required for any work outside of these permitted construction times.

Other noise measures may include:

- Turning off construction equipment during prolonged periods of nonuse.
- Locating stationary equipment away from receiving properties.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [Find help answering land and shoreline use questions](#)

- 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.**

The project would take place within existing developed residential parcels. Land use adjacent to the street improvements include includes other residential properties and the buffer areas of the CHRLF. The work can be expected to inconvenience residents, however these effects will only occur during construction. No permanent impacts are expected to the adjoining property's land use.

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

The site is not currently used for working farmlands or forestlands, and has been in residential use since the 1980. No agricultural or forest land would be converted to other uses as a part of the project.

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?**

The project will not affect or be affected **by** affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, as no such industries are in the project vicinity.

- c. **Describe any structures on the site.**

Structures on the site include nine residential structures, associated garages/carports, and 16 outbuildings ranging in size from 130 to 1,600 square feet in size.

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

Yes. Nine residential structures and the associated garages, carports, and outbuilding will be demolished.

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

The study area includes parcels currently zoned as residential (RA-5 - rural area, one DU per 5 acres [including the project work area and areas to the north, east, and south]), and RA-10 - rural area, one DU per 10 acres [to the west]).

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

The current comprehensive plan designation of the site is rural area 2.5-10 ac/du.

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

The project is not within a designated shoreline zone.

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

Yes. Portions of the site meet the King County definitions of wetlands and streams and their applicable buffers. See above section on surface waters and the project's Critical Area Report (KPG Psomas 2024) for details on these features.

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

None.

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

None. Residences have already been purchased, and the scope of the proposed is limited to the demolition and removal of structures and stabilization of the disturbed areas.

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

N/A

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

The proposed work is consistent with the mandated use of the project as buffer for the CHRLF.

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

N/A, the project will not result in any impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance.

9. Housing [Find help answering housing questions](#)

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

No housing units would be provided as part of the project.

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

Nine middle- to- high-income housing units would be eliminated. These residences are owned by the County and are vacant.

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

N/A, the proposed work is consistent with the mandated use of the project as buffer for the CHRLF.

10. Aesthetics [Find help answering aesthetics questions](#)

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

N/A, no new structures are proposed as part of the project.

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

The project will not obstruct or alter any view in the immediate vicinity of the project.

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

As the project will not result in aesthetic impacts, no reduction or control measures regarding aesthetics are proposed.

11. Light and Glare [Find help answering light and glare questions](#)

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

The site currently only has residential lighting.

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

The proposed project will not create light or glare and will remove light from the existing residential uses.

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

Light or glare from off-site sources will not affect this proposal.

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

The project will not create new light or glare. As a result, no measures to reduce or control light and glare are proposed.

12. Recreation [Find help answering recreation questions](#)

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

The site currently consist of privately owned residential properties. There are no formal/designated recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity. Informal uses are limited to walking or bicycling in the public ROW.

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

The proposed project would not displace any existing recreational uses.

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

N/A

Since the project will not result in recreation impacts, no mitigation measures are proposed

form recreational uses.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation [Find help answering historic and cultural preservation questions](#)

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

KPG Psomas conducted a desktop analysis for cultural resources within the proposed Project site. The main goal of the investigation was to gather and analyze information needed to determine if the Project would have a significant impact and/or adverse effect on cultural resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Preservation (NRHP).

The results of the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data (WISAARD) search identified three (3) previously recorded historic-era cultural resources within 0.8 km (0.5-mile) of the Project site. The previously recorded resources include two (2) transmission lines – BPA Rocky Beach Maple Valley Transmission Line and Sammamish Maple Valley Transmission Line – and one historic-era barn located on the Horrock Farm (roughly ½-mile due east of the project). The BPA Rocky Beach Maple Valley Transmission Line (Property ID: 722999) is located due south of the Project and was evaluated in 2020 and determined eligible for the NRHP. The Sammamish Maple Valley Transmission Line (Property ID: 731548) is located due west and adjacent to the Project and was documented in 2023 and is currently listed with an eligibility status of No Determination. The historic barn located on Horrock Farm (Property ID: 537404) was evaluated in 2010 and is listed as ineligible for the NRHP.

None of the historic-era cultural resources discussed above are located within the Project site; therefore, the Project will not have an adverse effect and/or significant impact on these resources. Therefore, the improvements described in this SEPA Checklist are not anticipated to significantly impact and/or have an adverse effect on known cultural resources or contributing components to historic districts.

- 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.**

Based on a review of the DAHP WISAARD, no precontact archaeological sites, historic register properties, or cemeteries have been recorded within, or adjacent to, the Project site; however, the WISAARD search did identify the area as being within the ancestral territory of several Native American communities and a predictive model for the region has assigned the area moderately sensitive for precontact cultural 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.**

As discussed above, the WISAARD database did not indicate any cultural or historic resources within the project site.

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.

KPG Psomas has prepared an Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) for the project. The IDP will require the selected contractor to adhere to protocols outlined in the IDP during construction and ground disturbing activities. This will ensure, in the unlikely case archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, the project will follow all DAHP recommendations and adhere to state law regarding notification and preservation requirements.

14. Transportation [Find help with answering transportation questions](#)

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

The project is located to the west of 230th Ave SE. This road serves residences located immediately to the east and west, providing access to Cedar Grove Road SE, which in turn provided access to Issaquah Hobart Road SE to the north and Renton Maple Valley Road SE to the south. These arterials in turn provide access to State Route 18 to the east, I-405 to the west, and I 90 to the North.

- 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?**

No. There is no public transit within 1 mile of the project site.

- c. 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. The proposed project will require not new transportation facilities or improvement to existing transportation facilities.

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

No. The proposed project will not use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation facilities.

- e. 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?**

Additional trips would be generated by construction equipment entering the site for demolition and grading work, removing salvage and debris, and leaving the site after completion of the work. The exact number of trips has not been determined, but due to the limited work area and temporary nature of the demolition and restoration, these additional trips are not expected to alter traffic patterns in the area.

No additional trips would be generated during operation of the buffer. Existing trips would be reduced since nine residences would be removed.

- f. Will the proposal interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.**

The proposed project will not interfere with, affect, or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area.

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

N/A – the completed project operation would reduce traffic in the vicinity.

15. Public Services [Find help answering public service questions](#)

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

The project would remove existing residential structures, outbuildings, and hardscape and will not result in an increased need for public services.

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

N/A

16. Utilities [Find help answering utilities questions](#)

- 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.**

N/A

The proposed project will not require utility services.

C. Signature [Find help about who should sign](#)

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

X 

Type name of signee: Tien Pham

Position and agency/organization: Project Manager / KCSWD

Date submitted: 12/16/2024

